

THE

DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.

www.CreationismOnline.com

BY

JAMES H. WHITMORE.

"Christ.... hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel."—PAUL.

"In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity."—AUGUSTINE.

BUCHANAN, MICHIGAN:
Western Advent-Christian Publishing Association.
1870.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
The Western Advent-Christian Publishing Association,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

Who first taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul? The Egyptians. Testimony of Herodotus. Of Bunsen. Egyptian belief. Testimony of Tyler. Were Egyptian priests superior to the writers of the Old Testament? Buddhism. Brahminism. Grecian school of philosophy. The Ionic. The Italic. The Academy. The Peripatetic. The theories of Thales, Anaxagoras, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. The opinion of Cicero. Testimony of Bishop Warburton. The Grecian schools unanimous in teaching a future life through the natural immortality of the soul. The Arabian school an exception to ancient belief. Testimony of Dr. Good. The Double Doctrine. The Pious Fraud. Plato's sanction. Cicero's admission. Testimony of Dr. Whately. Summary of historical inquiry.....1-18

CHAPTER II.

JEWISH BELIEF.

Common opinion erroneous. Testimony of Bishop Lowth. Of Dr. Kitto. Of Gibbon. Josephus — his reliability as a historian of religious belief. His account of the doctrine of the Essenes. Speech of Titus to his soldiers. The argument of Josephus *against* suicide founded on the assumption that the soul is immortal. Its ill success. Eleazer's argument in *favor* of suicide based on the deathless nature of the soul. Its complete success. Belief of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their doctrine condemned by our Lord. Testimony of the Apocrypha. Summary of Jewish belief.....19-33

CHAPTER III.

EARLY CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers—Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Testimony of Polycrates. Of Irenæus. Of Lactantius. Origin of the controversy in the Christian Church. First instance of the use of the phrase "immortal soul" in a Christian work. Tertullian: A. D. 210 the first Christian who affirmed the doctrine of endless torments. Platonism *vs.* Christianity. Their union in the second century. Mediæval doctrine. The decree of the Lateran Council. Plato triumphs over Aristotle. Testimony of Martin Luther. Of William Tyndale. The first Protestant motto. The Helvetic Confession. Opinions and influence of John Calvin. The immortality of the soul adopted as an article of faith in most Protestant churches during the latter part of the 16th century. Dependent doctrines.—Purgatory. Indulgences. Endless misery. The inquisition and burning of heretics justified as being an imitation of Divine justice..... 34-52

CHAPTER IV.

THE ARGUMENT FROM REASON.

Metaphysical arguments for the soul's immortality examined. The orthodox definition of death—of man. The real question to be determined. Absurdity of the Double Substance theory. The argument from indestructibility to immortality. The obvious fallacy of the syllogism employed. The argument based on the immateriality of the soul examined. The prejudice against the capacities of matter essentially of heathen origin. We should first ascertain all that matter *can* do before we positively assert what it *cannot* do. Our ignorance of immateriality and the reason of it. The contradiction involved in the phrase "immaterial substance." The absurdity of assigning locality to that which is said to be immaterial and therefore incapable of occupying space. Buck's definition of the mind. Do brutes think? Assertions of Luther Lee and President Dwight. What is instinct? Proofs that brutes think, remember, and reason. The reason that Immaterialists deny that any of the brutes are capable of thinking or of reasoning. Admissions of Isaac Taylor and of Richard Watson. The whole argument yielded. The argument based on the capacities of the human mind. The argument founded on the desire for immortality. The proposition that mind is the result of

animated organization—considered. The necessity of an active brain for the production of thought. Mr. Locke's definition of volition. Illustrations of the dependence of consciousness upon an active brain. Is the brain, properly speaking, the organ of the mind? Allegations of Immaterialists examined. Is the soul always conscious? Mr. Lee's confident, but fatal position. Does the soul ever sleep? Admission of Richard Watson. The argument from insanity. From the decay of memory. From the loss of some of the mental faculties. Personal identity. Is the mind or soul unchangeable? The basis of argument shifted. The conclusion reached. Reason can never prove that man is immortal.....53-93

CHAPTER V.

SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

Principles of interpretation.

The Lesson of Creation.

Was man created immortal? The Mosaic history. Man a material being. An inspired definition. The scope and meaning of the expression "breath of life." The decisive testimony of the seventh of Genesis. The use and value of the phrase "living soul" examined. The term applied to all living animals. Testimony of Adam Clarke, Moses Stuart, and Prof. Bush. The argument from the fifteenth of Corinthians. The creation of Eve. Decisive evidence of the mortality of living souls.....94-110

CHAPTER VI.

THE ADAMIC PENALTY.

The orthodox definition. Its mysteries and contradictions. Did Adam understand the true nature of the threatened penalty? Could he have understood it according to the popular interpretation of a tripartite death? The necessity of announcing a penalty in plain language. Was the Adamic penalty thus announced? It was. Statement of John Locke—of Isaac Watts—of Dr. Taylor. The consequences of accepting the orthodox definition of death as true. Reasons for considering the penalty to be literal death. The argument from the fifth of Romans. The Tree of Life. Statements of Jeremy Taylor—of Richard Whately. Benson's paraphrase of Gen. 3:19. Gross inconsistencies of

the common view The Judge of all the earth did right. He did not veil a threat of everlasting misery in the words "thou shalt surely die." The conclusion stated: He who truly loves God will delight to honor him. 111-130

CHAPTER VII.

TRADUCTION VS. CREATIONISM.

The question discussed. Is the soul transmitted from parents to children, or does it owe its existence to an immediate act of God? The answer to be decided by Scripture testimony. Did the work of creation finally end on the seventh day of this world's history? The doctrine of traduction argued from the command of God to our first parents in Gen. 1:28; and from the plain declaration of our Savior in John 3:6—"That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Peter's conclusive testimony. Personality associated with the terms "flesh" and "body." Four different opinions on the origin of souls. Admissions of Richard Watson and of John Wesley. The doctrine of creationism refuted. The necessary conclusion. 131-142

CHAPTER VIII.

LIFE AND DEATH.

The importance of determining the exact meaning of these words as used in Scripture. Life and death defined. The orthodox or "theological" definition, and the reason of it. Life does not necessarily include the idea of happiness; nor does death include the idea of misery. The orthodox doctrine stated by Hiram Mattison: "Immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his [the Savior's] name." Can this position be supported by Scripture? It cannot. Scripture testimony. An inspired definition of life. The literal sense of the word life argued from the titles given in Scripture to our Redeemer, especially from those found in the Syriac New Testament. "Immortal existence" the same as "eternal life," and is to be attained only through faith in Jesus Christ. The orthodox interpretation of the words "life" and "death" viewed as an outrage upon human reason, and as a reflection upon the character of God. 143-166

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE.

The argument from the seventh of Genesis. Is the soul a "living substance?" The doctrine of man's mortality taught by express assertions of Scripture. His mortality argued from his being so frequently compared by the inspired writers to things transitory and perishable. Admissions of Albert Barnes and Adam Clarke. The use and application of the words "immortal" and "immortality" in the New Testament. The silence of the Scriptures respecting the immortality of the soul. The immortality of the soul always assumed by orthodox writers, and never proved. Assertions of Tillotson, Vinet, and others. The direct testimony of Scripture in reference to the soul's mortality....167-183

CHAPTER X.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

Three adverse theories concerning the state of the dead between death and resurrection. The First Theory stated. Second Theory stated. The Third Theory stated. Authorities cited for the First Theory. Presbyterian Confession of Faith. Baptist belief. Testimony of Prof. Bush. Of Adam Clarke. Of Thomas Scott. Of Albert Barnes. Of Joseph Benson. Of S. C. Bartlett. Of Hiram Mattison. Of Montgomery. Of Charles Wesley. Of Isaac Watts. Of Jonathan Edwards. Proposition deduced therefrom. Scripture testimony. Time of the judgment. Time of reward. The absurdity of placing the judgment in the intermediate state. Our Savior's argument addressed to the Jews in John 8. His refutation of the Sadducean heresy. Conclusions therefrom. Peter's argument concerning the early resurrection of our Lord in the second of Acts. The promise made to Abraham in Gen. 15:15. The argument based upon the resurrection of Lazarus. The argument from Acts 2:34. Conclusions in regard to the First Theory. The proposition deduced from the Second Theory. Statement of W. W. Clayton. Of C. W. Fitch. Critical authorities concerning *hades*—Wakefield, Campbell, Parkhurst, Stuart, and Eadie. The use and value of *sheol* in the Old Testament. Of *hades* in the New Testament. Dives and Lazarus. The use of the word *tartarus*. Of *paradise*. Conclusions respecting the Second Theory. The Third Theory examined. Scripture testimony direct and positive. The sleep of the dead a Bible doctrine. Paul's method of com-

forting mourners contrasted with the orthodox custom. Which theory has the most of gloom in it? Is death really esteemed as a friend by orthodox theologians? Beauties of the Third Theory. Remarks of Abp. Whately. Conclusion.....184-262

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHRISTIAN REDEMPTION.

The grand object of Christ's mission. Eternal life attained only through him. The new birth. What it is to be born of the Spirit. The resurrection. Statement of three adverse theories. The First Theory considered. The phrase "resurrection of the body" and "reunion of soul and body" not Scriptural terms. Testimony of William Tyndale. Of H. H. Dobney. The Second Theory considered. Its difficulties and absurdities. Conclusion in regard to it. The Third Theory examined. The resurrection of the dead the Gospel hope. The doctrine as taught in our Lord's discourses; and as exemplified in his raising the dead to life. The Apostolic doctrine. Is the *body* a rewardable subject? Watson *vs.* Spurgeon. The absurdity of reducing the glorious doctrine of the resurrection of *the dead* to the resurrection of dead bodies, merely to serve as *instruments* of the soul either for pleasure or for pain. Admissions of Adam Clarke and Albert Barnes. Paul's conclusive argument to the Corinthians. The argument from 2 Cor. 5:1-8. Testimony of Carmichael, Muller, and Clarke. The doctrine of the New Testament contrasted with the teachings of popular theologians. The Bible doctrine of *immortality*..263-299

THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

The Pentateuch, or five books of Moses, contains the only history that we have of mankind for twenty-five hundred years after the creation. Aside from the fact that it is an inspired record, it must be considered by far the most important history ever written. It contains an account of the creation of man, his trial, failure, and consequent death. It is, however, entirely silent in regard to the immortality of the soul.

In profane history, the origin of the doctrine of the soul's immortality is generally ascribed to the Egyptians. Herodotus, the earliest writer of regular history among the ancients whose works have been preserved, speaking of the Egyptians, says:

"They are the FIRST OF MANKIND WHO HAVE DEFENDED THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL. They believe that on the dissolution of the body, the soul immediately enters some other animal, and that after using as vehicles every species of terrestrial, aquatic, and winged creatures, it finally enters a second time a human body. They affirm that it undergoes

all these changes in the space of three thousand years. This opinion some among the Greeks have adopted as their own."¹

Bunsen, in his work on Egypt, says :

"The Egyptians were the first who taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul—a fact mentioned by all Greek writers from Herodotus to Aristotle."²

Alluding to the belief of immortality prevalent among the Egyptians, a recent writer says :

"Incredible that the long series of inspired men from Moses to Malachi should have been so far below Egyptian priests and kings as never to have alluded to a great truth which had been published to the empire long before the days of Moses."³

That the Egyptians should have originated the doctrine of the soul's immortality, or that they should have taught it as a fundamental article of religious belief before, as well as after, the days of Moses, ought not to be a matter of surprise to any person who has even a tolerable knowledge of Egyptian history. Their doctrine of immortality was quite in keeping with the rest of their theological tenets. "The Egyptians supposed the material world to have arisen from the joint operation of three principles. The first was the Great Intelligence, or Universal Spirit—the *anima mundi*—which gives form to the Universe and all its parts. The second was matter, which they supposed to have existed from all eternity. The third was the nature

¹ Bedloe's Herodotus, b. 4, pp. 263-4.

² *Egypt's Place in Univ. Hist.*, vol. IV.

³ S. C. Bartlett. *Life and Death Eternal*, p. 148.

of that matter, which, from its imperfection, opposed that good which the Universal Spirit always aimed at producing, and frequently contaminated his works with evil. To these three principles in their mythology they gave the appellations of Osiris, Isis, and Typhon. The priests illustrated these radical doctrines by numberless allegories and fables, which, being literally received by the vulgar, produced a thousand absurdities in their worship and opinions, while the real meaning was known but to few.”¹

It seems that the Egyptians not only originated the notion of the immortality of the soul, but also held as a radical doctrine, that evil was an inherent property of matter. It will be seen hereafter, that the modern doctrine is but a refinement of the Egyptian conception, and that so far as the essential nature of man is concerned what is now popularly regarded as a “fundamental article of revealed religion” was held as a radical doctrine of religious belief in Egypt three thousand years ago.

Incredible as it may seem to Mr. Bartlett, “the long series of inspired men from Moses to Malachi” have never alluded to the immortality of the soul, and consequently, according to his standard, they must have been “far below the Egyptian priests and kings.”

Although the Egyptians were the first who taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the tes-

¹ Tytler's *Univ. Hist.*, b. 1, pp. 43-4.

timony of historians, ancient and modern, would hardly lead us to believe that they were either patterns in theology or models in practice. The superstition of the priests, and the credulity of the people, won for them the contempt of other nations; while the variety and difference of the objects of religious worship in the different provinces of the kingdom were a fruitful source of discord among themselves. Tytler says:

“The same animals that were regarded, in one province, with the most superstitious reverence, were, in another, the objects of detestation and abhorrence. In one quarter they tamed the crocodiles, adorned them with gold and jewels, and worshiped them; in another they killed those animals without mercy. In one province the most sacred animal was a dog; in another they reckoned dog’s flesh as the most delicate food. Cats were adored in one district, and rats in another. From these differences arose perpetual and violent animosities; for there are no contentions so rancorous as those which spring from the most trifling differences in religious worship or opinion. ‘The multitude,’ says Diodorus, ‘have been often inflamed into the highest pitch of fury, on account of the sacrilegious murder of a *divine cat*.’

“The extravagant length to which the Egyptians carried their veneration for their consecrated animals exceeds all belief. The sacred crocodile, the dog, or the cat were kept in an inclosed space set apart adjoining to the temples dedicated to their worship. They were constantly attended by men of the highest rank, whose business was to provide them with the choicest victuals, which they were at pains to dress in the manner they supposed most agreeable to their palate. They washed them in warm baths, and anointed them with the richest perfumes. The finest carpets were spread for them to lie on; chains of gold and circlets of precious stones were hung

around their legs and necks ; and when the stupid animal, insensible of the honors that were bestowed on him, died, like the rest of his kind, the whole province was filled with lamentation ; and not only the fortunes of the priests, but the public revenue was without scruple expended in the performance of the most sumptuous funeral obsequies.

“ It is not then to be wondered at that the superstitions of the Egyptians were a copious subject of ridicule to other nations of antiquity, and contributed to degrade them in the opinion of those whose objects of religious worship, if not fundamentally more rational, were less ludicrous, less childish and unmanly. What could they think of a nation where, as Herodotus tells us, if a house was on fire, the father of a family would take more pains to save his cats than his wife and children ? where a mother would be transported with joy at the news of her child being devoured by a crocodile ; or where the soldiers, returning from a military expedition, would come home loaded with a precious booty of dogs, cats, hawks, and vultures ?

“ The general character of the Egyptians, with respect to morals, contributed likewise to draw upon them the disesteem of other nations. They have been generally accused by the ancients of great cunning and insincerity in their dealings.”¹

It does truly seem incredible that the inspired writers of the Old Testament should have been inferior to such a people as this ; yet if an expressed belief in the immortality of the soul were to be taken as a standard of excellence ; then certainly the Egyptian priests must obtain the preference. What can be said in favor of the faith of a people who believed that the human soul is a divine being, and that a cat is a divine animal ?

¹ *Hist.*, vol. I., pp. 46-7.

Let it be understood, then, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul owes its origin to a superstitious, deceitful, and idolatrous people.

THE ASIATICS.

The Buddhists of Eastern Asia believe that the final end to be gained by a life of virtue, and the highest ultimate good, are attained by the human soul when it reaches a bare existence without action or consciousness. This state is called *nirvana*, or the deliverance of the soul from all pain and illusion. Buddhism, therefore, is but another name for *nihilism*. The rotation of metempsychosis is arrested by preventing the soul from being born again.

Buddhism is the principal religion of the Chinese, and numbers among its adherents one-third of the human race.

Among the Brahmins of India, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls is extensively entertained. They believe that the virtuous are rewarded by higher rank and *caste* in their next existence, while the vicious will suffer degradation, and even inhabit the bodies of lower animals.

The Hindoo belief as to the nature of the soul may be illustrated by the following extracts from the *Bhagavad Gite*, which is said to contain a compend of Brahminical philosophy :

“The soul neither killeth nor is killed. You cannot say of it, it hath been, is about to be, or is to be hereafter. It is a thing without birth. It is ancient, constant, and eternal.

. . . . As a man throweth away old garments and putteth on new, so the soul, having quitted its old mortal frames, entereth into others which are new. The weapon divideth it not; the fire burneth it not; the water corrupteth it not; the wind drieth it not away. It is *indivisible, inconsumable, incorruptible*; it is universal, permanent, immovable."¹

The italicised words in the last sentence are used in the modern definition; but it will be observed that the Hindoo omits the absurdity of saying that the soul is an "immaterial substance."

GRECIAN SCHOOLS.

The oldest school of philosophy was that B. C. 640. founded by Thales, of Miletus, about 640 years before the Christian Era, and known as the Ionic, from the country of its founder. Thales is said to have studied in Egypt. His metaphysical opinions are but imperfectly known. He supposed that the Deity framed the world out of the original element of water, and animated it by his essence, as the soul does the body; that the Deity, therefore, resided in every portion of space; and that this world was only a great temple, where the sight of everything around him reminded man of that Great Being which inhabited and pervaded it.

Of the disciples of Thales, Anaxagoras is the most celebrated, and his opinions the best known. He taught that the first efficient principle of all things was an immaterial and intelligent Being, who had existed from all eternity; that the subject of

¹ Wilkins' Trans., pp. 36, 37, 40.

his operations was *matter*, which likewise existed from all eternity in a chaotic state, comprehending the confused rudiments of all different substances, which the intelligent mind of the Creator first separated, and then combined for the formation of the universe, and of all bodies, animate and inanimate. Anaxagoras regarded the mind of the Deity to be altogether distinct from matter; incapable of being included in space or substance of any kind, and of a nature entirely pure and spiritual.¹

The next school of philosophy was the B. C. 580. Italic, so-called from the country where its founder, Pythagoras, is said to have first taught. Pythagoras is said to have spent thirty years in foreign countries, studying with the priests of Egypt, the magi of Persia, and the gymnosophists of India. He taught the pre-existence and transmigration of souls; that no real entity was made or destroyed; and that, as a consequence, the souls of men are eternal. Pythagoras regarded the human soul as a part of the divine nature, and, therefore, as possessed of inherent immortality. He taught that the soul, at the death of the body it inhabits, enters into another, and so passes through many transmigrations. He held that wicked souls were punished by being made to inhabit the bodies of inferior animals. It was this notion that led him and his disciples to abstain from eating the flesh of animals."²

¹ Tytler's *Untiv. Hist.*, vol. I., p. 262.

² "Xenophanes, a contemporary of the philosopher, relates

B. C. 469-399. Socrates, though not a founder of a school, was one of the most distinguished philosophers of ancient times. For a knowledge of his doctrines, which he never committed to writing, we are indebted to Plato and Xenophon. Socrates regarded the soul as a divine being, and, therefore, immortal. Although the soul is derived from God as a spark of divinity, it then ceases to be a part of God, and is henceforth to be regarded as a distinct personality.

He believed in one Supreme Being, and exposed the polytheistic delusions of the Sophists, who, in revenge, preferred against him the false charge of corrupting the morals of the Athenian youth. His sad fate is well known. He is generally regarded as one of the wisest and purest-minded men of antiquity; yet so far as his faith in a future life was concerned, the last words of his defense before his judges evince a hope very different from that expressed by Polycarp and the Christian martyrs. He closed by saying, "I am going out of the world, and you are to continue in it; but which of us has the better part is a secret to every one but God."

B. C. 429-348. The most celebrated of the disciples of Socrates was Plato, a philosopher whose writings and doctrines have had a more extensive and powerful influence over mankind than

that Pythagoras, seeing a dog beaten, and hearing him howl, begged the striker to desist, adding, 'It is the soul of a friend of mine, whom I recognize by his voice.'—*Cyclop. Ant. Pythagoras.*

perhaps those of any other of the ancients. It was a fundamental doctrine with Plato, *that from nothing, nothing can proceed*. Believing, therefore, in the eternal existence of the Deity, he believed likewise in the eternity of *matter*.

Plato taught that the souls of men are eternal, and that the number is fixed and definite; so that whatever the number of souls, all must have existed from eternity. He likewise held the Pythagorean doctrine of the migration of souls through various human and brute bodies.

Two circumstances greatly contributed to the popularity of the Platonic philosophy: the one, the eloquence and ability with which its doctrines were taught and defended; the other, *the pleasing effect of a doctrine which, by making man a partaker of the Divine nature, flattered his pride, and increased his self-importance*.

Aristotle, the illustrious founder of the B. C. 348. Peripatetic school of philosophy, was for twenty years a favorite disciple of Plato. Endowed with great, original genius, and possessing a mind richly stored with useful learning, he disdained to follow the doctrines of Plato, or those of any other philosopher. He had the courage and ambition to think and reason for himself on every branch of human knowledge. His reputation for universal learning procured for him the important situation of tutor to Alexander the Great.

The statements in his writings concerning human

immortality are so conflicting that critics and commentators are divided in opinion as to whether he thought the human soul mortal or immortal. Ritter, in summing up the controversy, says:

“We must draw our conclusion on this point from the general context of Aristotle’s doctrine; and from this it is clear that he had no conception of the immortality of any individual rational entity, although he did ascribe an eternal existence in God to the universal reason.”¹

Cicero having summed up the opinions of the philosophers concerning the immortality of the soul, in conclusion says, “Which of these opinions is true some god must tell us; which is most like truth is a great question.”²

An opinion that had many adherents in the Grecian schools was, that “God is the soul of the world,” from which all human souls emanated, and to which they would return, some immediately at death, and others only after various transmigrations. The incurably wicked were thought to be very few, and to be composed mostly of wicked princes, and great men who had wronged their subjects.

Concerning this want of belief of individual immortality among the Greek philosophers, Bp. Warburton well observes:

“That the reader may not suspect these kind of phrases, that *the soul is part of God, discerpted from him, of his nature*, which perpetually occur in the writings of the ancients,

¹ *Hist. of Anc.*, Phil. III., p. 256—note.

² *Tusc. Quæst.*, lib. 1

to be only highly figurate expressions, and not to be measured by the severe standard of metaphysical propriety, he is desired to take notice of one consequence drawn from this principle, and universally held by antiquity, which was this: that *the soul was eternal, a parte ante as well as a parte post*, which the Latins well express by the word *sempiternus*.

“But when the ancients are said to hold the pre and post-existence of the soul, and therefore attribute a proper eternity to it, we must not suppose that they understood it to be eternal in its distinct and peculiar existence; but that it was discerned from the substance of God in *time*, and would in *time* be rejoined and resolved into it again; which they explained by a bottle's being filled with sea-water, that swimming there awhile, on the bottle's breaking flowed in again, and mingled with the common mass. They only differed about the time of this *reunion* and *resolution*; the greater part holding it to be at death; but the Pythagoreans not till after many transmigrations. The Platonists went between these two opinions, and rejoined pure and unpolluted souls immediately on death to the Universal Spirit. But those which had contracted much defilement were sent into a succession of other bodies to purge and purify them before they returned to their parent substance.”¹

The Grecian schools were unanimous in reprobating the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. So when Paul preached before the Areopagus, the highest court of Athens, it is said: “When they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked; and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter.”²

Most of the ancient schools of philosophy taught

¹ *Divine Legation*, b. 3.

² Acts 17 : 32.

that a future state of existence was to be attained through the natural immortality of the soul. The doctrine of the resurrection appears to have been unknown or discarded. To these teachings of ancient philosophy, the Arabian doctrine appears to have been a notable exception. Dr. Good says:

“If we turn from Persia, Egypt, and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which *it is certain* that Persia, and highly probable that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject [*of the immortality of the soul*] left in as blank and barren a silence as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt and sometimes disbelief. The tradition, indeed, of a future state of retributive justice seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, and to have been generally, though perhaps not universally, accredited; *but the future existence it alludes to is that of a resurrection of the body, and not of a SURVIVAL OF THE SOUL after the body's dissolution.*”

After speaking of the book of Job, which he terms “that astonishing and transcendent composition, that ought assuredly to raise the genius of Idumea above that of Greece,” Dr. Good continues:

“Yet in this sublime and magnificent poem, replete with all the learning and wisdom of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before us is merely as I have stated it, a patriarchal or traditional belief of a future state of retributive justice, *not by the NATURAL IMMORTALITY of the soul, BUT BY THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.*

“The Hindoo philosophers, totally and universally denying a resurrection of the body, support the doctrine [*of a future life*] alone upon the NATURAL IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, while

the Arabian philosophers [among whom was Job], passing over the immortality of the soul, rested it alone upon *the resurrection of the body.*"¹

The ancient philosophers, who taught that virtue would be rewarded and vice punished, when they saw good men die untimely deaths, and unrewarded in this life, being ignorant of a resurrection, or disbelieving the doctrine, taught their scholars that men had immortal souls that entered at death a state of happiness or misery. It is highly probable, however, that motives of political expediency had more to do with originating and propagating the doctrine than any moral or religious considerations whatever.

It should be recollected that the private belief of the ancient philosophers was very different from the public doctrine in which the masses were instructed. This is what is known as the "double doctrine"—the esoteric and exoteric faith, the latter of which was for the guidance of the populace, while the former could only be safely imparted to the wise, the learned, and the virtuous. Something was deemed necessary to encourage the virtuous and restrain the vicious; the result was the fiction of Elysium and Tartarus. This has been called the "pious fraud," and was defended by Cicero and others on the ground of expediency.

Plato in his *Republic* gives an indirect sanction to the pious fraud:

"If falsehood be indeed of no service to the gods, but use-

¹ *Book of Nature*, p. 333.

ful to men, in the form of a drug, it is plain that such a thing should be touched only by physicians, but not meddled with by private persons. To the governors of the state, then, if to any, it especially belongs to speak falsely, either about enemies or citizens, for the good of the state; whereas, for all the rest they must venture on no such thing.”¹

Thus it would seem that political motives dictated the exoteric utterances of the philosophers, while their esoteric faith or real opinions could not be safely imparted to the populace. Gibbon's famous saying is a complete and pithy illustration of this. “The ancient systems of religion were with the people equally true; with the philosopher equally false; and with the statesman equally necessary.”

But, notwithstanding these facts so patent to all who will take the trouble to read the testimony embraced in the history of ancient belief, Christian theologians are in the habit of justifying their adhesion to the doctrine of the soul's immortality by an appeal to the opinions of the Greek philosophers. Nothing can be more inconsistent than such appeals to the opinions of heathen sages, who did not themselves believe the doctrines that they publicly advocated. Cicero, incomparably the ablest defender and most eloquent advocate of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul that the heathen world has ever produced, makes this frank admission :

“I have perused Plato with the greatest diligence and exactness, over and over again; but know not how it is,

¹ Lib. 3, p. 389.

whilst I read him I am convinced; when I lay the book aside and begin to consider by myself of the soul's immortality, *all the conviction instantly ceases.*"¹

In this connection, nothing could be more appropriate than to cite the testimony of the learned Dr. Whatel y, Archbishop of Dublin, as an authority eminently deserving of respect:

"As, however, even the faintest conjecture of a future existence, though it must not be confounded with a full assurance of it, is, as far as it goes, an approximation toward the knowledge of the truth, so also notions considerably incorrect respecting that existence, if they are but such as to involve the idea of enjoyment or suffering, corresponding with men's conduct in this life, have so far something of a just foundation, and of a tendency to practical utility. This, however, appears by no means to have been the case with the systems of any, as far as we can learn, of those ancient philosophers who contended the most strenuously for the immortality of the soul. For not only do they seem to have agreed that no suffering could be expected by the wicked in another life, on the ground that the gods were incapable of anger, and therefore could not punish; *but the very notion of the soul's immortality, as explained by them, involved the COMPLETE DESTRUCTION OF DISTINCT PERSONAL EXISTENCE.* Their notion was (I mean when they spoke their real sentiments; for in their exoteric or popular works they often inculcate for the benefit of the vulgar the doctrine of future retribution, which they elsewhere laugh at), that the soul of each man is a portion of that Spirit which pervades the universe, to which it is reunited at death, and becomes again an undistinguishable part of the great whole; just as the body is resolved into the general mass of matter. So that their immortality, or rather eternity, of the soul was anterior, as well as posterior; as it was to have no end, so it

¹ *Tusc. Quæst.*, lib. 1.

had no beginning; and the boasted continuance of existence, which, according to this system, we are to expect after death, *consists in returning to the state in which we were before birth; which every one must perceive is the same thing, virtually, with annihilation.*

“Let it be remembered, then, when the arguments of the heathen sages are triumphantly brought forward in proof of the soul’s immortality, that when they countenanced the doctrine of future retribution, they taught with a view to political expediency what they did not themselves believe; and that when they spoke their real sentiments on the subject, the eternity of existence which they expected, as it implied the destruction of all distinct personality, amounted practically to nothing at all.”¹

SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

1. The Egyptians, according to profane history, were the first who taught the immortality of the soul; and as sacred history is entirely silent on the subject, the doctrine must be regarded as of heathen origin.

2. The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul was, in the Egyptian, Indian, and early Grecian philosophy, blended with the belief in its pre-existence and proper eternity.

3. The doctrine of individual immortality was not held in the Grecian schools, except as an exoteric faith, promulgated from motives of public policy.

4. In Arabia, the doctrine of a future life was through a resurrection of the dead, and, as a consequence, the notion of natural immortality was dis-

¹ *Revelations of a Future State*, s. 5.

carded. As this was the country of Job, the inspired author of the oldest of writings, this notable exception may be reasonably traced to the illuminating beams of revelation.

CHAPTER II.

JEWISH BELIEF.

Any historical inquiry into the opinions of the ancients in regard to the nature and destiny of man would be imperfect that did not include a notice of the belief of the Jews. It is commonly supposed that the Jews, as a people, have always been believers in the immortality of the soul. For this supposition, however, there seems to be no good authority. The Hebrew Scriptures nowhere mention that man's nature is compounded of two antagonistic substances, or that he has an immortal soul. It is evident that the inspired writers were strangers alike to the "double substance" theory of modern theology, and the "double doctrine" of pagan philosophy. Bp. Lowth, in his *Lectures on Hebrew Poetry*, says:

"That which struck their senses they delineated in their descriptions: we there find *no exact account, no explicit mention of immortal spirits.*"

This testimony is important, as the writer was an earnest advocate of the immortality of the soul. But this state of doctrinal purity did not long survive the return from Babylon. When the sacred

oracles became silent, when the voice of prophecy ceased with the awful warning of Malachi, rival sects of religionists sprang up among the Jews, who sought by tradition and philosophy to obscure the faith of their fathers. "There is good reason to refer the origin of the Pharisees to the time of the return from the Babylonish captivity, a period which constitutes a marked epoch, as dividing the Hebraism of the older and purer age from the Judaism of the latter and more corrupt times. . . . In Persia, the scattered Jews were subjected to *new and impure currents of opinion*, which would do something to overflow and overlay the primitive doctrines and usages. Here, then, at once, is a soil for sectism. Puritans would spring up, wishing to preserve or restore the original form of doctrine and worship. They naturally called forth defenders of things as they were. But in the disputes which would hence arise, *appeal must be made to reason*; for the voice of prophecy was extinct; the divine oracles were silent; there remained only the Scriptures and the interpretation of them by means of tradition—a questioned instrument—and reason, to which all were, in the nature of the case, compelled to appeal. But when there is a general appeal to reason in religious questions, then philosophy is born in the Church, and may be expected to take the several directions into which the diversities of formation and complexion urge the mind of man to run. Accordingly, it is the name *philosophy* which Jose-

phus gives to the three leading sects—‘the Jews had three sects of philosophy.’”¹

As early as the third century before the Christian Era, the Greek philosophy was cultivated in the East, and found many warm admirers among the Jews. The testimony of Gibbon is explicit and to the point. “*Since* the introduction of the Greek or Chaldean philosophy, the Jews were persuaded of the pre-existence, transmigration, and *immortality* of souls, and Providence was justified by a supposition that they were confined in their earthly prisons to expiate the stains which they had contracted in a former state.”²

That the doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees were corrupt, we have the highest possible authority in the words of Jesus to his disciples. “Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. . . . Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.” (Matt. 6 : 6, 12.)

The Pharisees had many Pagan notions respecting the soul; but Bp. Bull, in his *Harmonia Apostolica*, has clearly proved that they held a resurrection of the body, and they supposed a certain bone to remain incorrupted, to furnish the matter of which the resurrection body was to be formed. *They did not, however, believe that all mankind were to be raised from*

¹ Kitto's *Cyc. Bib. Lit.*; Art., Pharisees.

² Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. IV., p. 491.

the dead. A resurrection was the privilege of the children of Abraham alone, who were all to rise on Mount Zion; their incorruptible bones, wherever they might be buried, being carried to that mountain below the surface of the earth." ¹ •

Josephus is much quoted as the transcriber of the doctrines of the Jewish sects in the first century. In regard to the reliability of Josephus as the chronicler of the religious opinions of the Jews, Dr. Kittosays he "is not to be relied upon in the account which he gives of the belief of his countrymen (Ant. 18 : 2 ; Wars 2 : 7), as he appears to use terms which might suggest one thing to his Jewish readers, and another to the Greeks and Romans, who scouted the idea of a resurrection." ²

It has been remarked that Josephus attempts to render the belief of his countrymen as unexceptionable as possible to the Greeks and Romans. His deferential allusions to their authors, especially those of the Platonic school, and his apologetic, almost deprecatory, manner of alluding to the customs, usages, and doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees would lead one to think that he was not a faithful historian of Jewish opinion. His use of words and terms, so unlike anything found in the Hebrew Scriptures, seems better adapted to the philosophy of Athens and Rome than to the dignified simplicity of the Jewish law. The preceding statements are well il-

¹ Buck's *Theol. Dict.*; Art., Pharisees.

² *Cyc. of Bib. Lit.*; Art., Res.

lustrated by the summary which Josephus gives of the doctrines of the Essenes :

“That bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent; but that the souls are immortal, and continue forever; and they come out of the most subtile air; and are united to their bodies as in prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement; but that when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount upward. *And this is like the opinion of the Greeks*, that good souls have their habitation beyond the ocean, in a region that is neither oppressed with storms of rain or snow, or intense heat, but that this place is such as is refreshed by the gentle breathing of a west wind that is perpetually blowing from the ocean; while they allot to bad souls a dark and tempestuous den, full of never-ceasing punishments, and indeed *the Greeks seem to me* to have followed the same notion, when they allot the islands of the blessed to their brave men, whom they call heroes and demigods; and to the souls of the wicked the region of the ungodly in *hadēs*, where their *fables* relate that certain persons, such as Sisyphus, and Tantalus, and Ixion, and Tityus, are punished; *which is built on this first supposition, THAT SOULS ARE IMMORTAL.* And thence are those exhortations to virtue and dehortations from wickedness collected, whereby good men are bettered in the conduct of their life by the hope they have of reward after their death; and whereby the vehement inclinations of bad men to vice are restrained by the fear and expectation they are in, that although they should lie concealed in this life, *they should suffer immortal punishment after their death.* These are the divine [?] doctrines of the Essenes about the soul, which lay an unavoidable bait for such as once had a taste of their *philosophy.*”¹

From this extract it appears that the *Greek fables*

¹ Wars, b. 2, c. 8.

concerning "immortal punishments" in *hades* are built upon the supposition that *souls are immortal*. It is a very significant fact that Josephus, in his account of the Jewish sects, never bases their belief upon the Hebrew Scriptures, but is principally anxious to discover some analogy between their philosophy and that of the Greeks.

No better illustration of the exoteric faith of the ancients can be given than that embraced in the speech of Titus to his soldiers, as reported by Josephus :

"I shall at present waive any commendation of those who die in war, and omit to speak of the immortality of those men who are slain in the midst of their martial bravery, yet cannot I forbear to imprecate upon those who are of a contrary disposition, that they may die in time of peace, by some distemper or other, since *their souls are already condemned to the grave, together with their bodies* ; for what man of virtue is there who does not know that those souls which are severed from their fleshly bodies in battle by the sword, are received by the ether, that purest of elements, and joined to that company which are placed among the stars ; that they become good demons and propitious heroes, and show themselves to their posterity afterward ?¹ for while upon those souls that wear away in and with their distempered bodies, comes a subterranean night to *dissolve them to nothing.*"²

Here the privilege of immortality is restricted to a class. None but good, or rather none but *brave*

¹ *Ancient* spiritualism seems to have held some tenets in common with modern spiritualism. Each relies upon the same Pagan dogma—the immortality of the soul.

² Wars, b. 6, c. 1.

souls are immortal. All others perish with their bodies. Titus is represented as using the same expedient that generals from his time to that of Mohammed have used so effectively to render their soldiers brave and fearless in battle—the expedient of a Greek fable.

Josephus resorted to the same expedient on a certain occasion, for the laudable purpose of saving his own life, and as an argument against the suicide of his companions. At the conclusion of Vespasian's siege of Jotapata, Josephus, with about forty persons of eminence, hid himself in a cave; but being discovered on the third day, Vespasian offered him security for his life if he would surrender. This he at length determined to do; whereupon his comrades sought to kill him, and to prevent this he addressed them such sentiments as these:

“O my friends, why are we so earnest to kill ourselves? and why do we set our soul and body, which are such dear companions, at such variance?”

Then follows this truly Platonic sentence:

“The bodies of all men are indeed mortal, and are created out of corruptible matter; *but the soul is ever immortal, and is a portion of the Divinity that inhabits our bodies.*”

He further sought to dissuade his companions from suicide by continuing thus:

“Besides, if any one destroys or abuses a depositum he hath received from a mere man, he is esteemed as wicked and perfidious; but then if anybody cast out of his body this *divine depositum*, can we imagine that he who is there affronted does.

not know it? Do not you know that those who depart out of this life according to the law of nature, and pay that debt which was received from God, when he that lent it is pleased to require it back, enjoy eternal fame? that their houses and posterity are sure, that their souls are pure and obedient, and obtain a most *holy place in heaven, from whence in the revolution of ages they are again sent into pure bodies*, while the souls of those whose hands have acted madly against themselves are received by the darkest place in *hades*?"¹

If this passage exhibits the doctrine held by Josephus, who was a Pharisee, it proves that he believed in the pre-existence and transmigration of the soul, a doctrine which, as we have seen, constituted a marked feature in the teachings of Eastern philosophy.

The argument, based on the immortality of the soul, is more effective in favor of suicide than against it. This is clearly seen in the different results of the arguments of Josephus at Jotapata and Eleazer at Masada. The former argued the immortality of the soul as a reason why his companions should not destroy themselves. But they very naturally concluded that the argument, if good for anything, proved quite the contrary. So they decided to die, and Josephus saved himself only by an artifice or happy chance. Eleazer, at the seize of Masada, thus addressed the sicarii [robbers], urging them to self-destruction :

“While souls are tied down to a mortal body they are partakers of its miseries; and really, to speak the truth, they *are*

¹ Wars, b. 3, c. 8.

themselves dead; for the union of what is divine to what is mortal is disagreeable. . . . It is this soul which hath one nature, and that an incorruptible one, also; but yet is it the cause of the change that is made in the body; for whatsoever it be which the *soul touches*,¹ that lives and flourishes; and from whatsoever it is removed, that withers away and dies; such a degree is there in it of immortality.

"Let me produce the state of sleep as a most evident demonstration of the truth of what I say; *wherein souls, when the body does not distract them, have the sweetest rest, depending on themselves*, and conversing with God by their alliance to him: *they then go everywhere and foretell many futurities*: and why are we afraid of death, while we are pleased with the rest we have in sleep? and how absurd a thing is it to pursue after liberty while we are alive, and yet to envy it to ourselves where it will be eternal!

"In continuation of his argument, he urged the example of those Indians [Hindoos] who profess the exercise of philosophy, who have such a desire for a life of immortality that they tell other men beforehand that they are about to depart; and nobody hinders them, but every one thinks them happy men, and gives them letters to be carried to their familiar friends; so firmly and certainly do they believe that souls converse with one another in the other world.

"So when these men have heard all such commands that were to be given them, they deliver their body to the fire, and in order to their getting their soul a separation from the body in the greatest purity, they die in the midst of hymns of commendation made to them."²

This speech had the desired effect, and the proposed plan of self-destruction was instantly car-

¹ It will be seen that the soul of Eleazer is not the immaterial soul of modern times, which is said to be incapable of coming in contact with matter.

² Wars, b. 7, c. 8.

ried into execution. These passages from Jewish history are instructive, as showing that in the first century many of the Jews relied more upon the teachings of heathen philosophy than upon the Hebrew Scriptures.

Of the belief of the Pharisees, Josephus says :

“They believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but the former shall have power to revive and live again.”¹

Also :

“The Pharisees say that all souls are incorruptible; but the souls of good men are only removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment.”²

From this testimony of Josephus, it appears that the Pharisees denied the resurrection of the wicked dead; while the resurrection of the just was only a transmigration of the soul into other bodies. It will also be noticed that they believed the power to revive again was inherent in the good soul; as they believed it to be a divine being, so they ascribed to it divine powers. The phrase “that *under the earth* there will be rewards and punishments,” sufficiently shows the heathen origin of the doctrine.

The question is sometimes asked, “If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be a false and pernicious

¹ Ant., b. 8, c. 1, s. 3.

² Wars, b. 2, c. 8.

cious heresy, why did not our Savior rebuke the Pharisees for entertaining it?" The objection implied in the question may be stated thus: The Pharisees believed in the immortality of the soul. Jesus knew of this belief, but did not rebuke them for entertaining it. Therefore he approved of the doctrine.

This kind of reasoning is often indulged in, but it is exceedingly faulty and inconclusive. For if the argument thus adduced proves that our Lord indorsed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, it can as easily be proved, and by exactly the same process of reasoning, that he indorsed the doctrines of the pre-existence and transmigration of souls, the non-resurrection of the wicked, and absolute predestination, all of which were tenets of Pharisaic doctrine.

When his disciples asked him, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" he did not rebuke them for believing in the pre-existence of souls. Are we to understand from this silence on the part of the Great Teacher that he approved of the doctrine? Christ dealt not so much with the theories of men as with their conduct. The doctrine of the Pharisees regarding the soul was well calculated to make them proud, intolerant, self-reliant, and hypocritical. Their false doctrines and hypocritical conduct subjected them to the scathing but merited rebuke of the Master: "*Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophecy of you,*

saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouths and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*" (Matt. 15 : 7, 8.)

Again he said, "Beware ye of the leaven [doctrine] of the Pharisees, *which is hypocrisy.*" (Luke 12 : 1.)

The *fact* that our Savior bade his disciples to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees is sufficient proof that he indorsed the distinctive views of neither sect.

TESTIMONY OF THE APOCRYPHA.

The Jewish books of the Apocrypha were written before the Christian Era, but not until after the return of the Jews from Babylon. The apocryphal books of the Old Testament are in general received as canonical by the Church of Rome; and even the Church of England orders them to be read for instruction, though it does not apply them to establish any doctrine. The following extracts will serve to show the belief entertained by the writers concerning the nature and destiny of man :

"Why disquietest thou thyself, seeing *thou art but a corruptible man?* And why art thou moved, whereas *thou art but mortal?*" (See 2 Esd. 7 : 15.)

This passage is in agreement with Job 4 : 17, and Rom. 1 : 23.

"And after seven days, the world that yet awaketh not shall be

raised up, and *that shall die that is corrupt.*" "And the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment, and *misery shall pass away, and the long-suffering shall have an end.*" (2 Esd. 7 : 31, 33.)

It is evident that the writer of this passage did not believe in endless misery, and consequently did not believe that all men are immortal.

"After death shall the judgment come, *when we shall live again* : and *then* shall the names of the righteous be manifest, and the works of the ungodly shall be declared." (2 Esd. 14 : 35.)

"*Seek not death in the error of your life* : and pull not upon yourselves destruction with the works of your hands. For God made not death : neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. For he created all things, that they might have their being : and the generations of the world were healthful, and there is no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth : (*for RIGHTEOUSNESS IS IMMORTAL* :) but *ungodly men* with their *works* and *words* called it to them : for when they thought to have it their friend *they WERE CONSUMED to NAUGHT*, and *made a covenant with it, because they are worthy to take part with it.*" (Wis. 1 : 12-16.)

This passage agrees with Deut. 30 : 19, 20 ; Ezek. 18 : 32.

"God created man to BE IMMORTAL, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world : and THEY THAT DO HOLD OF HIS SIDE DO FIND IT." (Wis. 2 : 23, 24.)

The first three chapters of Genesis, and the fifth of Romans, teach the same doctrine.

"*I myself also am a mortal man*, like to all, and the offspring of *him that was first made of the earth.*" (Wis. 7 : 1.)

See also as agreeing with this, Gen. 2 : 7 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 47, 48.

“Who shall praise the Most High *in the grave*, instead of them which live and give thanks? *Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead, as from ONE THAT IS NOT*: the living and the sound in heart shall praise the Lord. *For all things cannot be in men, because THE SON OF MAN IS NOT IMMORTAL. . . .* “*All men are but earth and ashes.*” (Eccles. 17 : 27-32.)

The writer of this passage expresses therein the same sentiments that were held by Job, David, Solomon, and Isaiah. See Job 10 : 19 ; 14 : 12 ; 30 : 23 ; Ps. 6 : 5 ; 30 : 9 ; Eccl. 9 : 5, 6, 10 ; Is. 38 : 18, 19.

Speaking of the idolater, the author of the book of Wisdom says :

“He maketh a vain god of the same clay, even *he* which a little before *was made of earth himself*, and within a little while after returneth to the same, *out of the which he was taken*, when his life which was lent him shall be demanded. . . . *For being MORTAL*, he worketh a dead thing with wicked hands: for he himself is better than the things which he worshipeth: whereas he lived once, but they never.” (Wis. 15 : 8, 16, 17.)

From these extracts it will be seen that the writers, unlike Josephus, never appeal to the example of the heathen as a support for the doctrines which they advocate. The absence of Platonic philosophy in their writings, and the remarkable concurrence of their sentiments with those of the inspired writers, would lead us to suppose that they faithfully repre-

sent the belief of the better class of their countrymen.

SUMMARY OF JEWISH BELIEF.

What has been written in this chapter may be summed up thus:

1. Prior to the Babylonish captivity, B. C. 558, there is no authority for saying that the Jews believed in the natural immortality of all men.¹

2. The sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees arose after the return of the Jews from Babylon.

3. The Jewish doctrine became corrupted by heathen philosophy, and some of the people embraced, among other errors, the doctrine of the pre-existence, transmigration, and immortality of souls.

4. That the Savior bade his disciples beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

5. That the modern doctrine of immaterial human souls finds no countenance in the history of Jewish belief.

6. That the doctrine of man's mortality is clearly and explicitly taught in the most valuable books of the Jewish Apocrypha.

¹ Dr. Temple, the newly-appointed Bishop of Exeter, Eng., himself a believer in immaterialist doctrine, declares (in *Essays and Reviews*) of "the immortality of the soul," that whatever "may be said of the early notions on this subject, it is unquestionable that in Babylon the Jews first attained the clearness and certainty in regard to it which we find in the teachings of the Pharisees."

CHAPTER III.

EARLY CHRISTIAN AND MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE.

The popular doctrine of the soul's immortality finds no support in the writings of any Christian of the first century. Such phrases as "immortal soul," "immaterial soul," "deathless soul," "undying soul," "never-dying soul," "disembodied soul," "deathless spirit," "immortal spirit," "eternal torment," "endless misery," "unending torment," "endless wo," "eternal conscious suffering," and kindred expressions that so often disfigure the writings of modern theologians, find no place in the Christian literature of the Apostolic age.

The primitive Christians never allude to a state of consciousness between death and the resurrection, but place their hopes of future life in the resurrection of the dead. They never promise the saint that the moment he is dead he will be alive in heaven; and they never threaten the sinner with endless tortures in a fiery hell. They never speak of the dead as being alive, nor of those asleep as being awake. They never allude to a disembodied condition of existence, but speak joyfully and hopefully of the time when the Lord should descend from heaven to

change their mortal bodies and to fashion them like unto his glorious body.

TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The Apostolic Fathers, so-called, were Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas. Clement, bishop of Rome, A. D. 78-86, in his epistle to the Corinthians thus writes :

“All the ages of the world, from Adam even unto this day, are passed away, but they who have been made perfect in love have, by the grace of God, obtained a place among the righteous, and *shall be made manifest in the judgment of the kingdom of Christ.* For it is written, ‘Enter into thy chambers for a little space, till my anger and indignation shall pass away: and *I will remember the GOOD DAY, and will RAISE YOU UP OUT OF YOUR GRAVES.*’ ”

Ignatius of Antioch was martyred about A. D. 115. In his epistle to Polycarp he says :

“Be vigilant, as God’s athlete. *The meed is incorruptibility, and life eternal.*”

To the Trallians thus :

“Jesus Christ was truly raised from the dead by his Father *after the manner as he will also raise us up who believe in him, by Christ Jesus, WITHOUT WHOM WE HAVE NO TRUE LIFE.*”

Polycarp suffered martyrdom about A. D. 169, at the age of eighty-six. This venerable Christian, who had heard the Apostle John, displayed the greatest fortitude during his terrible sufferings, and died with the fullest assurance that he whom he loved would raise him up at the last day. His

prayer at the stake, as reported by Eusebius, shows very clearly what were his hopes of a future life, and upon what they were based :

“ But he [Polycarp], closing his hands behind him, and bound to the stake as a *noble victim*, selected from the great flock, an acceptable *sacrifice* to Almighty God, said: ‘ Father of thy well-beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the knowledge of thee. The God of angels and powers, and of all creation, and of all the family of the righteous that live before thee, I bless thee that thou hast thought me worthy of the present *day and hour*, to have a *share* in the *number of the martyrs* and in the cup of Christ, *unto the RESURRECTION OF ETERNAL LIFE, BOTH OF THE SOUL AND BODY*, in the incorruptible felicity of the Holy Spirit. Among whom *may I be received in thy sight* this day, as a rich and *acceptable sacrifice*, as thou the faithful and true God hast prepared, hast revealed and fulfilled. Wherefore,’ ” etc.¹

It will be noticed that Polycarp did not ask to be received into heaven among the saints that day, but to be *received in God's sight* among other martyrs, as a rich and acceptable *sacrifice*, that he might attain unto *the resurrection of eternal LIFE, BOTH OF SOUL AND BODY*.

Passages from the writings of Barnabas and the Pastor of Hermas might be adduced to show that they were not believers in the natural immortality of man, but that they expected with Paul to receive their reward at the second coming of the Lord.

¹ Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.*, b. 6, c. 15.

TESTIMONY OF EARLY CHRISTIANS.

The testimony of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who flourished A. D. 196, is of the most interesting character, and exhibits in the clearest manner the faith of the early Christians. He said :

“ In Asia great lights have FALLEN ASLEEP, *which shall rise again* IN THE DAY OF OUR LORD'S APPEARING, in which he will come with glory from heaven, and *will raise up all the saints* ; Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who *sleeps* in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters. His other daughter, also, who having lived under the influence of the Holy Spirit, *now likewise RESTS in Ephesus* [not in heaven]. Moreover, John, who rested upon the bosom of our Lord; who also was a priest, and bore the sacerdotal plate, both a martyr and teacher: he also is BURIED in Ephesus; also Polycarp of Smyrna, both bishop and martyr. Thraseas, also, bishop and martyr of Eumenia, who is BURIED at Smyrna. Why should I mention Sagaris, bishop and martyr, who RESTS at Laodicea? Moreover, the blessed Papius, and Melito the eunuch, whose walk and conversation were altogether under the influence of the Holy Spirit, *who now RESTS* at Sarais, awaiting the episcopate from heaven, *when he shall rise from the dead.*”¹

Here we find this ancient bishop of the church which Paul had planted and Timothy watered writing from Ephesus—where the apostle John had ended his well-spent life—a loving and hopeful account of apostles and martyrs deceased, in which he bears faithful witness to those great cardinal doctrines, the second coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead. His language how unlike that

¹ Euseb., b. 5, c. 2.

of most modern obituaries! Instead of saying that those eminent saints and blessed martyrs were then as disembodied souls crowned and happy *in* heaven, he represents them as *asleep*, and as *awaiting* the episcopate [or visitation] *from* heaven, when they would rise from the dead.

Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp, and bishop of Lyons, was martyred A. D. 202. He thus clearly writes on the subject of immortality:

"Life is not of ourselves, nor of our own nature, but a gift of God's favor. And, therefore, he who preserves the grant of life, and renders thanks to him who bestows it, shall receive length of days forever and ever. But he who rejects it, and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity. And, therefore, the Lord speaks thus to such ungrateful persons: 'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much unto you?' signifying that they who are unthankful to him for this short temporal life, which is his gift, shall justly fail to receive from him length of days forever and ever."

The language of Lactantius, who has been called "the Christian Cicero," is equally explicit:

"Man stands erect and looks upward, because immortality is offered him, though it comes not unless given from God. For there would be no difference between the just and the unjust, if every man that is born were made immortal. Immortality, therefore, is not a law of our nature, but the wages and reward of virtue. . . . For this reason God seeks to be worshiped and honored by man as Father, that he may attain virtue and wisdom, which alone impart immortality."

ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The first instance in which the phrase "immortal soul" occurs in a Christian work is in the epistle to Diognetus, written about A. D. 135, by whom is not certainly known.¹

Tertullian of Carthage, who flourished in the beginning of the third century, was the first Christian writer, so far as we know, who affirmed the doctrine of endless torments, or that the misery of the wicked would be of equal duration with the happiness of the good.²

These historical facts are worthy of very special attention. More than one hundred years had elapsed after the death and resurrection of him who brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel before even the conditional sense of the phrase "immortal soul" received the indorsement of any Christian writer. Nearly two centuries had passed since the apostle Paul had written that the wages of sin is death, when Tertullian originated in the Christian Church the hideous and repulsive doctrine that the wages of sin is endless misery. It has been well said by a very able writer that, "it would be wiser

¹The passage in which the phrase occurs is as follows: "The immortal soul dwelleth in a mortal tabernacle; and so do Christians dwell by the side of that which is perishable, while they wait for IMMORTALITY FROM heaven." (*Ep. to Diognetus*, c. 6. The authorship is generally ascribed to Justin Martyr.)

²*Hist. of Univ.*, p. 591.

for Christianity, retreating upon its genuine records in the New Testament, to disclaim this fierce African, than to identify itself with his furious invectives, by unsatisfactory apologies for their unchristian fanaticism."¹

The controversy which began in the second century concerning human immortality was characterized by an appeal to the variable teachings of philosophy, rather than to the authority of the Holy Scriptures. The learning and culture of the world were in the circles of philosophy, and principally at Athens and Rome. In this state of affairs, Christianity was accepted rather as a system of philosophy, than as a revelation from God.

PLATONISM VS. CHRISTIANITY.

It was during this controversy, that the speculations of philosophy concerning the soul as a separate substance were received into the Christian Church. The question discussed was not whether *man* as an indivisible being was immortal, but whether his *soul* was immortal. Thus from the outset the inquiry assumed a philosophical rather than a religious form.²

The unhallowed union of Platonism with Christianity, which took place in the second century, was

¹ Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, c. 15, note 72.

² "As the Christian religion was received at first by many from the convictions of its truth from external evidence, and without a due examination of its doctrines, it was not surprising that many who called themselves Christians should retain the doctrines of a prevailing philosophy to which they

rendered comparatively easy by favoring circumstances. In one important particular the Platonist and the Christian were agreed. The Platonist taught that the practice of virtue in this world would be suitably rewarded in another state of existence. The Christian believed the same. The Platonist believed that this future state of existence would be entered upon at death, by means of the survivance of the human soul or personality, which in its nature was immortal. The Christian believed that the future life was to be obtained only through a resurrection of the dead. Though the Platonist and the Christian differed thus widely as to *how* and when the future life was to be obtained, the *fact* that the popular doctrines of Plato when honestly entertained had a tendency to promote virtue and discourage vice, furnishes a very plausible reason why the early Christians, glad to receive proselytes to their faith,

had been accustomed, and endeavor to accommodate these to the systems of revelation which they found in the sacred volumes. From this confusion of the Pagan philosophy with the plain and simple doctrines of the Christian religion, the Church, in this period of its infant state, suffered in a most essential manner. The Christian doctors now began to introduce that subtle and obscure erudition which tends to perplex and bewilder, instead of enlightening the understanding. The effect of this in involving religion in all the perplexity of the scholastic philosophy, and thus removing its doctrines beyond the comprehension of the mass of mankind, was, with great justice, condemned by many of the wisest fathers of the Church; and hence sprung those inveterate and endless controversies between faith and reason, religion and philosophy, which began at that early period, and have, unfortunately, continued to the present day." (Tyler's *Univ. Hist.*, vol. II., b. 5, c. 4.)

made little or no examination into the merits of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which the Platonists who were converted to Christianity brought with them into the Church.

As every religious notion that seemed to have a tendency to make men better was eagerly received by the primitive Christians, so they almost insensibly slid into the use of terms known in philosophy, but unknown in Scripture. Thus in the second century was the doctrine of the soul's immortality first introduced into the Church.

When the piety of the primitive Christians began to be corrupted by secular interest, the Church dignitaries required to be supported in grandeur and magnificence, and any who felt like retiring to the simplicity of the faith and practice of apostolic times were made to feel the coercive power of that Church, which through many centuries has been so unsparingly used to make its proselytes acknowledge its infallibility.

A Council of the Lateran, held A. D. 1513, under Pope Leo X., pronounced the immortality of the soul to be an orthodox article of Christian faith. The following is a translation of the rule which was adopted by this Council, as given by Caranza: ¹

"Whereas, some have *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

¹ Caranza, p. 412. 1681.

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 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."

By this infamous decree of the self-styled "infallible Church," Plato triumphed over Aristotle; and the heathen dogma of the soul's immortality was installed as an orthodox tenet of Mediæval Christianity.

Speaking of this despotic act of Pope Leo and the Lateran Council, a recent writer says:

"The pontificate of Leo was an epoch in the history of the doctrine of the soul's immortality. It was then that the successful effort was made to establish and give permanence to this doctrine; but it was made by a usurper of the right of private judgment, and accomplished by an act of sacerdotal despotism. The advocates of the doctrine of the soul's immortality need to be reminded of this suspicious passage in its historic progress. The seal of authority was annexed to it by a Roman Pontiff, in the dawn of the sixteenth century, a man, the worthy counterpart of England's Charles II., fond of fashion and field-sports, and mixing up in all the dissipated excesses of the sacred metropolis. Such was his extravagance, that 'the charge has been laid at his door,' says Ranke, 'that he ran through the wealth of three Pontificates—that of his predecessor, from whom he inherited a considerable treasure; his own, and that of his successor, to whom he bequeathed a mass of debt.' 'At court,' proceeds Ranke, 'they spoke of the institutions of the Catholic Church, and of passages in the Holy Scriptures, only in a tone of jesting; the mysteries of faith were held in derision.' Such was Pope Leo

the Tenth, and such the circle of sanctified society of which he was the animating center!

"Behold, ye asserters of your own inherent immortality, the worthy 'nursing father' of your faith! the hero of a hey-day heterodoxy! the jolly jester with the solemn sanctities of Scripture! the mocker of the sacred mysteries!

"Worthy patron of a Pagan progeny! Let it be registered as the genuine genealogy of a fundamental doctrine of modern British Christendom, that the Pagan Plato was its father, and the profligate Pope Leo its foster-father. Born and bred by the Pagan philosophy and the *protege* of Popery, this notion of the soul's immortality has become a pet dogma of popular Protestantism, which, with a strange forgetfulness of its low lineage, openly declares it to be the honorable offspring of a true orthodoxy!"¹

Martin Luther visited Rome during the reign of Leo X., and the profligacy, corruption, and licentiousness that he witnessed at the Papal Court destroyed forever his former reverence for the sacred authority of Popes and Councils. For the decree of the Lateran Council, he seems to have entertained a special contempt. In his *Defense*, prop. 27, published in 1520, he said:

"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful—such as 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."

These words show that Luther was not a believer in the immortality of the soul. He held what is sometimes called the intermediate nature of man, or

¹ J. Panton Ham.

that the soul was a substance distinct from the body, though not immortal. He did not believe in an intermediate state of consciousness, but embraced and taught the doctrine of the *sleep of the soul* between death and the resurrection.¹

These doctrines of the great German reformer, concerning the soul and its unconsciousness in death, met with a vigorous resistance on the part of the papists, both on the Continent and in England. Sir Thomas More published a work in reply, in which he assailed the psychological doctrines of Luther, and advocated those of the Church of Rome. This work of the Platonist More called forth the famous reply of William Tyndale, the translator and martyr:

“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 putteth 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 joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ and the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together—*things so contrary that they cannot agree.* And because the fleshly-minded Pope consenteth unto heathen doctrine, therefore he **CORRUPTETH THE SCRIPTURES TO ESTABLISH IT.** If the souls

¹ We understand full well that certain passages from Luther's works will be adduced as favoring orthodox views: nevertheless his plain utterances against the dogma of natural immortality cannot be evaded or set aside. It is incontrovertible that he did deny the immortality of the soul and the conscious intermediate state.

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?"

Sir Thomas More asked, "What shall he care how long he live in sin, that believeth Luther, that he shall after this life feel neither good nor evil in body nor soul, until the day of doom?"

To this Tyndale replied, "Christ and his apostles taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's coming again every hour; *which coming again, because ye believe will never be, therefore have ye feigned that other merchandize.*"¹

No man in the sixteenth century uttered more pertinent truths than these uttered by Tyndale, but truth was just what the Romish hierarchy feared. The man who had the temerity, in defiance of Popish law, to translate the Bible from a dead language to a living tongue, and who dared to tell the exact truth, was deemed too dangerous an enemy of Popish institutions to live. Tyndale became a mar-

¹ In support of the assertion that the early Christian doctrine of immortality became corrupted by the reception into the church of the Platonic philosophy, we adduce the following remarkable admission of an orthodox writer: "We would express our conviction that the idea of the immortality of the soul *has no source in the Gospel*; that it comes, on the contrary, from the *Platonists*, and that it was just *when the coming of Christ was denied* in the Church, or at least began to be lost sight of, that *the doctrine of the immortality of the soul came in to replace that of the resurrection.* This was about the time of Origen. . . . It is hardly needful to say that we do not doubt the immortality of the soul; we only assert that this doctrine has taken the place of the doctrine of the resurrection of the Church, as the epoch of its joy and glory." (Darby's *Hopes of the Church.*) Here honesty and inconsistency are most beautifully blended.

tyr, but his words still live. The truth they embody is eternal.

Sixteen years after Leo the Tenth had issued his infamous edict making a belief in the mortality of the soul a punishable heresy, the Lutherans or German Reformers were nick-named Protestants, because they protested against a decree of the Emperor Charles V. and the Diet of Spires. Although the Protestants started out with the noble motto that the Bible and the Bible alone should be the rule of their faith and practice, thirty years had not elapsed before they became as intolerant, though not so cruel or vindictive, as the Roman Catholics themselves.

“Among the Protestants,” says Archdeacon Blackburn, “the honor of condemning such as dissented from Plato and Socrates was reserved for our English Reformers in 1552; whilst on the Continent, when, four years afterwards, the second Helvetic Confession was published, supposed to have been drawn up by Beza, under the article entitled, *The Creation of all Things: of Angels, the Devil, and Man*, it is solemnly announced, after a description of the qualities of the soul, as well as those of the body, *that we condemn all who scoff at the immortality of the soul, or bring it into doubt by subtle disputation.*”

The quotations from Luther and Tyndale prove that the present popular doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and intermediate state of consciousness,

were not held by the first Reformers. Luther plainly calls them "*monstrous opinions*;" while Tyndall expressly declares them to be "heathen" and "fleshly doctrines," and destructive of "the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection."

John Calvin, a French Reformer of great ability, but possessing an arbitrary and vindictive disposition, having established a school of theology at Geneva, took part in the controversy by writing a furious and abusive work against the doctrine of the mortality of the soul. He gave the whole weight of his powerful influence to the support and propagation in the reformed Church of the Romish doctrine of immortality. The fame of his school attracted students from all parts of Europe, and the doctrine of immortality as taught at Geneva gradually came to be considered the orthodox doctrine of the various Protestant Churches.

We have thus brought the historical inquiry down to the time when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was generally adopted as an article of Protestant faith. At the present time no Protestant Church is popularly esteemed orthodox or evangelical that does not accept this heathen heresy as a fundamental doctrine of revealed religion.

DEPENDENT DOCTRINES.

Let us now briefly glance at some of the dependent doctrines that owe their existence and support

to this so-called "*fundamental doctrine*," which, as has been proved, was originated by the Pagans, nursed by the Papists, and adopted by the Protestants.

Purgatory, according to the Roman Catholic fable, is a place in which the souls of those persons who have not merited the endless torments of hell are supposed to expiate their sins committed in this life. After this purifying process has been completed, the souls are said to be received into heaven. The Council of Trent, at its twenty-fifth session, in 1563, when Roman Catholic doctrine was fixed and defined, thus proclaimed the belief of the "infallible Church" on the subject of purgatory:

"The Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit from the sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the fathers, hath taught in holy councils, and lastly in this Ecumenical Council, that *there is a purgatory*; and that *the souls detained there are assisted by the sufferings of the faithful, but ESPECIALLY by the acceptable sacrifice of the MASS.*"

This statement is indorsed by the Catechism of the Council of Trent:

"*In the fire of purgatory the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment in order to be admitted into their eternal country, 'into which nothing defiled entereth.'* The truth of this doctrine founded, *as holy councils declare*, on Scripture, and confirmed by apostolical tradition, demands diligent and frequent exposition."¹

This popish fiction of purgatory gave rise to the

¹ Donovan's Trans., p. 59.

lucrative traffic in *indulgences*, which has justly been termed a scheme for raising money under false pretenses. Wealthy persons were induced to will their property to the Church to pay for praying their souls out of purgatory. The sale of *indulgences* furnished the money for building, the Church of St. Peter at Rome, one of the most magnificent specimens of architecture that the world has ever seen. "For the construction of this noble edifice, and to supply the luxuries of his court, Leo X. had recourse (to use an expression of Voltaire) to one of the keys of St. Peter, to open the coffers of Christians. Under the pretense of a crusade against the Turks, he instituted through all Christendom a sale of indulgences or releases from the pains of purgatory, which a pious man might purchase for a small sum of money either for himself or for his friends. Public offices were appointed for the sale of them in every town, and they were farmed or leased out to the keepers of taverns and bagnios. Their efficacy was proclaimed by all the preachers, who maintained that the most atrocious offences against religion might be expiated and forgiven by the purchase of a remission. A Dominican friar of the name of Tetzel, a principal agent in this extraordinary and most abominable merchandise, was wont to repeat in his public orations this blasphemous assertion, "that he himself had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences than St. Peter had converted

to Christianity by his preaching."¹ The form of the absolution issued by Tetzel was as follows:

"I absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, and from all thy sins, how enormous soever: and by this plenary indulgence I remit thee all manner of punishment which thou oughtest to suffer in *purgatory*: and I restore thee to the sacraments of the Church, and to that innocence and purity which thou hadst at thy baptism; so as, at death, the gates of hell shall be shut against thee, and the gates of paradise shall be laid open to receive thee. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen."²

Thus it will be seen that the repulsive doctrine of purgatory, and the impious farce of granting indulgences, are built upon the popular notion of the soul's immortality and consequent consciousness after death.

Another notion, founded upon the popular belief in the immortality of the soul, and entertained alike by Pagans, Papists, and Protestants, is the God-dishonoring doctrine of eternal torments. This hideous doctrine is mentioned as an excuse for some of the most barbarous deeds of cruelty to be found in the history of human persecution. "Certain it is, that the Court of Inquisition, as established in many countries, as far as it differs from civil courts of judicature, is declared, by the authors and maintainers of it to be *the nearest imitation of the Divine Tribunal*; and it is avowedly founded upon

¹ Tytler's *Hist.*, vol. II., p. 291.

² Keith's *Hist. of Scotland*. Introd., p. 4.

and *justified* by the doctrine of reprobation *and of eternal torments.*"¹

Burnet tells us what was the apology of bloody Queen Mary. "As the souls of heretics are hereafter to be eternally burning in hell, there can be nothing more proper than for me to imitate the divine vengeance, by burning them on earth."²

¹ Goadby's Bible. App., p. 1005.

² See Tytler's *Univ. Hist.*, vol. II., p. 303.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ARGUMENT FROM REASON.

When one cause is sufficient to account for an effect, no more are to be admitted. Similar effects should, as far as possible, be assigned to similar causes.—*Sir Isaac Newton.*

The metaphysical arguments usually adduced in support of the popular doctrine of immortality are principally founded upon what are called the essential properties of the human soul, as embraced in the following definition:

“The soul is an active, thinking, and immaterial substance; it is un compounded, indivisible, incorruptible, indestructible, and intangible; without exterior or interior surface, is not extended, and can never come in contact with matter.”

It is further affirmed that “the soul is a simple spiritual essence,” and immortal in its own nature; that it is not an *attribute* of man, but the *real man himself*. These definitions of the soul lead to endless contradictions. The terms chosen to define a soul indicate a negation of all being—a nonentity. Mr. Charles Buck, in his *Theological Dictionary*, gives the following definitions:

“MAN, a being consisting of a rational soul and organic body.” “The constituent and *essential* parts of man created by God are two; body and soul.”

"DEATH is generally defined to be the separation of the soul from the body."

If we accept these definitions two things necessarily follow. First, neither the soul nor the body separately considered constitutes man. Secondly, at the moment of death, or when the soul and body separate, the being man no longer exists. The proper immortality of man, as an abstract truth, can never be established from such definitions.

The real question to be determined is not whether the *soul* as a *part* of man may be considered immortal, but whether *man* himself is immortal. The former is a philosophical question, the latter a religious inquiry. The ancient philosophers taught that the soul was immortal rather as a substance than as an individual being. They believed that the soul emanated from God as a spark of divinity, and at death was rejoined to the Divine Essence.

In all expressed law, human as well as divine, the man as a unit, and not the soul as a part of man, is regarded as the responsible agent. It would be absurd to talk about arraigning an immaterial soul before the bar of justice.

The double substance theory of human nature embodies a bundle of absurdities. It supposes that man is composed of two antagonistic substances, matter and spirit, or body and soul; that the body is mortal; that the soul is immortal; that death causes a separation of soul and body; that during life the soul is imprisoned in the body; that death sets the

captive free; that while one "essential and constituent part of man," the body, is crumbling back to dust, the other essential part of man, the soul, with enlarged capacities and nobler powers flourishes in immortal youth.

It further supposes that the body is but the involuntary instrument of the soul; that matter, however organized and refined, is incapable of thought; that the body, though essentially unintelligent, is a fit subject of future rewards and punishments; that the body is but the house in which the soul dwells; that the eyes are the windows through which the soul looks at external objects; that the soul is an individual and has a locality; that it is strictly immaterial and does not occupy space; that fire cannot burn it, frost freeze it, or knives cut it; that it can dwell alike in the sun or in the polar regions; that its vitality is so great, and its essence so indestructible, that even the *quenchless fires of gehenna*, though causing it to suffer the most exquisite and unceasing torments, will ever be unable to efface a single thought, or to destroy or change the least iota of any one of its essential properties; and finally, that God himself cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it.¹

It is said that the soul is immortal *because* it is indestructible. The inconclusiveness of such reason-

¹ "If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it."—*Luther Lee, on the soul.*

ing becomes apparent when the argument assumes a syllogistic form.

That which is indestructible is immortal;

But the soul is indestructible;

Therefore the soul is immortal.

The major premise contains a very obvious fallacy. Immortality is one thing and indestructibility is another and very different thing. The elements of the human body are indestructible, yet the body is not immortal, but dies and returns to dust. The proposition would be true if the terms were reversed; for it is certain that whatever is immortal must be indestructible, but it does not necessarily follow that whatever is indestructible is therefore immortal. If the human body, possessing elements that are indestructible, be subject to death and decay, why may not the human soul, possessing elements that cannot be *more* than indestructible, be likewise considered mortal and perishable? If, however, it be replied that the soul, being a simple and immaterial substance, is without elements or parts, we cheerfully concede its indestructibility, since *nothing* can never be made *less than nothing*. This leads us to consider the fundamental proposition upon which modern immaterialism rests its shadowy doctrines.

MATTER CANNOT THINK.

It is said that matter, however organized and refined, is incapable of producing thought; therefore the soul or mind of man must be immaterial. It is

easy to say that matter cannot think ; but the assertion can never be proved true. We know nothing of the essence of matter, or of its ultimate capacities. In the language of another :

“The existence of matter must be conceded, in an argument which has for its object the proof that *there is something besides*, and when that is admitted, the proof rests with the skeptic, who conceives that the intervention of some other principle is necessary to account for the phenomena presented to our experience. The hidden qualities of this substance must be detected, and its whole attributes known, before we can be warranted in *assuming the existence of something else* as necessary to the production of what is presented to our consciousness. And when such a principle as that of galvanism or electricity, confessedly a property of matter, can be present in or absent from a body, attract, repel, and move, without adding to or subtracting from the weight, heat, size, color, or any other quality of a corpuscle, it will require some better species of logic than any hitherto presented to establish the impossibility of mind being a certain form, quality, or accessory of matter, inherent in and never separated from it. We do not argue thus because we are confident that there exists nothing but matter ; for, in truth, our feeling is that the question is involved in too much mystery to entitle us to speak with the boldness of settled conviction on either side. But we assume this position, because we think the burden of proof falls on the spiritualists, and that they have not established the necessity of inferring the existence of another entity besides matter to account for all the phenomena of mind, by having failed to exhaust all the possible qualities or probable capacities of that substance which they labor so assiduously to degrade and despise.

“But while they have altogether failed to establish this necessity, whereon depends their entire proposition, they have

recourse to the usual expedients of unsuccessful logicians, by exciting the ignorant prejudices of bigotry and intolerance, against all that is dignified with the name of dispassionate philosophy.

"The truth is, it is time that all this fudge and cant about the doctrine of materialism, which affects the theory of immortality in no shape whatever—as the God who appointed the end could as easily ordain that the means might be either through the medium of matter or spirit—should be fairly put down by men of common sense and metaphysical discrimination."¹

Let us first ascertain all that matter *can do*, before we positively assert what it *cannot do*. Says W. G. Moncrieff:

"Often do we hear the words, 'matter cannot think,' and the trumpet of orthodoxy summons us to attend. In our simplicity we have been led to reason thus: matter cannot think—God made man of the dust of the ground—then of course man cannot think! He may grow like a palm tree, but can reason no more than it. Now this argumentation seems really valid, and yet every human being in his senses laughs it to scorn. *I do think* is the protest of each child of humanity. Then if you do, we respond, in your case matter must perform the function of reflection and kindred operations. More than living organization you are not, and if you declare living organized matter incapable of thought, we are bound to infer that you have no thought at all. Accepting your premises, we must hand you the conclusion. The logic is good, but we are generous enough to allow that we cannot subscribe to it. It has often occurred to us as a fair procedure, just for the sake of bringing orthodoxy to a stand, to assert that spirit cannot think; of course, we are only referring to created beings, on this occasion. We have often tried to understand the popular

¹ Sidney Smith's *Principles of Phrenology*. 1838.

idea of a spirit; and we must confess that it defies our apprehension. It is something, nothing; a substance, an essence; everything by turns, and nothing long. To believe that such a production could evolve thought, is an inordinate demand on human credulity. How the expedient was resorted to we cannot tell: was it because thought is invisible, that this invisible parent was sought for it? Then why not trace heat beyond the fire, perfume beyond the rose, attraction beyond the sun, and vitality beyond the branchy oak? Of all insane fancies, this popular idea of the human spirit is the most complete; we have no wish to give offence, but the truth must be spoken."

All that God has made, of which we can form any adequate conception, is material; man, the last and noblest work of creation, forms no exception to this rule. Of immateriality we know nothing, because it is nothing. The soul is said to be an *immaterial substance*. This definition is unintelligible. It embodies a contradiction of terms. What is the difference in meaning between the words "substance" and "matter?" "Matter is the general name of everything that occupies space, or has figure, form, or extension."¹ An *immaterial substance* cannot occupy space, for everything that occupies space is material. An atom is a particle of matter so minute as to admit of no division; yet an atom may be said to occupy space in just as intelligible a sense as a cubic foot of lead or any other aggregation of atoms. Although an atom is the least of conceivable things, yet we must suppose it to have an exterior and an interior surface. But the soul is said to be an

¹ Parker's *Philosophy*, p. 18.

immaterial substance, without surface, extension, or size. We cannot, therefore, have any conception of the soul, as defined by immaterialists.

It is said that the soul dwells within the body, and has its seat in the brain. But this is to assign locality to that which does not occupy space. Thought can have no locality; and to speak of a mental atom is to use an unmeaning expression. We cannot divide a mental attribute; to speak of the top or bottom of a sentiment, would be as absurd as to say that it weighed a pound, or was an inch in length.

In like manner, one might as well say of an immaterial soul that it is hard or heavy, or a cubic foot in size, as to say that it is here or there. If we define the locality of the soul, we must allow that it has extension; or, in other words, that it is *something* and exists *somewhere*.

Among immaterialists, the mind is considered to be an entity, and equivalent in meaning to the rational soul. Mr. Buck defines the mind to be "a thinking and intelligent being; otherwise called *spirit*, or *soul*." Standard orthodox authorities thus concisely state the argument for the immortality of the soul. "This [the soul or mind] must be spiritual, because it thinks; it must be immortal, because it is spiritual."¹

Here the broad ground is taken that whatever

¹Robinson's *Calmet*; Art., Soul. *Bible Dict.*, Am. Tract Society. 1868.

thinks is necessarily immortal. Of course, those who take this position deny that brutes think; but this denial of so obvious a fact very justly creates a suspicion that the whole argument is untenable. Mr. Luther Lee and other immaterialists, in order to support their theory, find it very convenient to deny or ignore the fact that the lower animals possess reason, memory, will, or consciousness. Prest. Dwight, in the course of an elaborate argument in support of immaterialism, says: "Besides ourselves, we have no knowledge of any thinking beings, except God and angels."¹ This statement is founded upon the assumption that matter cannot think, and that all thought must therefore emanate from an immaterial soul or being. The same high orthodox authority says, "Man is an *immaterial substance*."² Both of these assertions are untrue. Brutes *do* think; and man is *not* an "immaterial substance."

Immaterialists sometimes say that brutes have instinct, but that reason is a prerogative of man. It is very obvious, however, that brutes possess something more than instinct, which is a property of all living animals, including man. "Instinct is a power of the mind, by which, independent of all instruction or experience, without deliberation, and without having any end in view, animals are unerringly directed to do spontaneously whatever is

¹ *Theology*, vol. I., p. 358.

² *Theology*, vol. I., p. 348.

necessary for the preservation of the individual or the continuation of the kind." But the proofs are abundant that brutes possess the ability of learning by experience and profiting by instruction. In order to do this they must exercise memory; and in order to exercise memory they must think. And the well-known fact that dogs, horses, monkeys, and even elephants have been taught to dance the same dance over and over again, to the music of the violin or other instrument, shows that they possess memory and are capable of receiving instruction. Such acts when performed by man are said to infer consciousness, memory, will, reason, and judgment. Why not then ascribe these qualities to the more sagacious of the lower animals?

The faithfulness of the St. Bernard dog, in rescuing benighted and half-frozen travelers from certain death in Alpine passes; the wonderful skill of the mule in traversing the defiles and craggy heights of the Andes; the mechanical skill of the beaver and the bee; the cunning of the fox; the docility of the ape; the intelligence of the horse; and the sagacity of the elephant, prove that the exercise of mental powers, of memory, of reflection, of reason, and of judgment is not confined to man. Mr. James Hogg, the Ettrick shepherd, speaking of the sagacity of one of his dogs, says:

"He had never turned sheep in his life; but as soon as he discovered that it was his duty to do so, and that it obliged me, I can never forget with what anxiety and eagerness he *learned*

his different evolutions; he would try every way, deliberately, till he found out what I wanted him to do; and when once I made him *understand* a direction, he never mistook or forgot it. Well as I knew him, he often astonished me, for when hard pressed, in accomplishing the task which was set him, he had expedients of the moment, that bespoke a *great share of the reasoning faculty.*"

The testimony of so distinguished a metaphysician as Mr. John Locke is very much in point:

"Birds learning of tunes, and the endeavors one may observe in them to hit the notes right, put it past doubt with me that they have perception, and retain ideas in their *memories*, and use them for patterns. . . . It seems as evident to me that they [brutes] *do reason as that they have sense.*"¹

Says Dr. Pritchard:

"Sensation is an attribute of mind, and the possession of mind certainly extends as far as its phenomena. Whatever beings have conscious feeling have, unless the preceding arguments amount to nothing, souls, or immaterial minds, distinct from the substance of which they appear to us to be composed. *If all animals feel, all animals have souls.*"²

And "Dr. Brown, according to his biographer, Dr. Welsh, believed that many of the lower animals have the sense of right and wrong; and that the metaphysical argument which proves the immortality of man extends with equal force to the other orders of earthly existence? And it is not the closest observer who will be the most startled by Coleridge's remark, about 'the dawning of a moral nature' which he observed in the dog, of which he says, 'We not only value the faithful brute: we attribute *worth* to him.'"³

¹ *Essays*, b. 2.

² *On the Vital Principle.*

³ H. H. Dobney. *Future Punishment*, p. 101.

"The possession of this kind of intelligence and reasoning

If, then, men have immaterial souls because they think, the lower animals must be considered to have immaterial souls for the same reason. Some distinguished immaterialists have admitted this conclusion to be just. Bp. Warburton in these words: "I think it may be strictly demonstrated *that man has an immaterial soul*; but then the same arguments which prove *that*, prove likewise that *the souls of all living animals are immaterial.*" And Isaac Taylor has well said: "As to the pretended demonstrations of immortality drawn from the assumed simplicity and indestructibility of the *soul as an immaterial substance*, they appear altogether inconclusive, or if conclusive, then such as must be admitted to apply with scarcely diminished force to all sentient orders; and it must be granted that *whatever has felt*, and

power, is not confined to the human species. We have already seen that there are many instinctive actions in man as well as in animals. It is no less true that, in the higher animals, there is often *the same exercise of reasoning power as in man.* The degree of this power is much less in them than in him, *but its nature is the same.* Whenever, in an animal, we see any action performed, with the evident intention of accomplishing a particular object, such an act is plainly the result of reasoning power, not essentially different from our own.

"The establishment of sentinels by gregarious animals to warn the herd of the approach of danger; the recollection of punishment, inflicted for a particular action, and the subsequent avoidance or concealment of that action; the teachability of many animals, and their capacity of forming new habits, or improving the old ones, are instances of the same kind of intellectual power, and are quite different from instinct, strictly speaking. It is this faculty which especially predominates over the other in the higher classes of animals, and which finally attains its maximum of development in the human species."—*Dalton's Treatise on Human Physiology*, p. 428.

has acted spontaneously, must live again and forever."¹ Richard Watson, after arguing "that the presence of an immaterial soul with the body is the source of animal life," and the cause of intelligence, says: "It is granted that, on the premises laid down, not only must an immaterial principle be allowed to man, but to all animals possessed of volition; and few, perhaps none, are found without this property. . . . It is perfectly in accordance with Scripture, which speaks of the 'soul of a beast,' as well as of 'the soul of man.' Vastly, nay, we might say infinitely different are they in the class and degree of their powers, though of the same spiritual essence, but they have both properties, which cannot be attributed to matter."²

Although the more candid immaterialists feel obliged to acknowledge that brutes, equally with men, have immaterial souls, they deny that they are therefore immortal. Thus Mr. Watson, after making the above admission, says, "It does not however follow that they are immortal, because they are immaterial. The truth is, that God only hath independent immortality, because he only is self-existent, and neither human nor brute souls are of necessity immortal."

A British reviewer says:

"Although brutes are animated by spiritual beings, yet an immaterial spirit is not, *as such*, necessarily immortal."

¹ *Physical Theory*, p. 254.

² *Institutes*, Part II., p. 179.

This is yielding the whole argument; for if the soul be not *naturally immortal*, what reason have we for supposing it will have an endless existence? If some immaterial souls are *mortal*, the doctrine of *immateriality*—which Mr. Lee thinks of vital importance—is good for nothing. Nobody supposes that because an elephant thinks, he is therefore immortal; and why should we suppose man to be immortal merely because *he* thinks? Unless, then, the immaterialist will admit that *all* souls or minds are immortal, his argument that the *human* soul is immortal *because it thinks* is of no logical value whatever.

CAPACITIES OF THE MIND.

A second argument is founded upon the capacities of the human mind. This argument, when divested of the rhetorical embellishments and flattering conceits which usually accompany its presentation, may be thus plainly stated:

Immortal beings possess great capacities;

Some men have shown great capacities;

Therefore *all men* are immortal.

If this argument were valid it would prove the immortality of the body as well as that of the soul; for even according to orthodox definitions the body constitutes an *essential part of man*; therefore, if the body is mortal the *man* is mortal, since the existence of an essential part is necessary to the integrity of the whole. Says Mr. J. Panton Ham :

“Because man has skill and ability, is he therefore immortal? We, in our ignorance and imperfection, would exalt the intellectual above the moral. The former has greater attractions for imperfect man than the latter. Had we the peopling of Paradise, we should fill it with the world’s heroes in literature, science, and the arts. The skillful are the world’s saints, and the proper candidates for heaven’s ‘many mansions.’ This argument, dispassionately considered apart from the imposing parade of human achievements, is just this: Man is *clever*, therefore he is *immortal*. Here is neither logic nor religion. The cleverness of man is surely no title to immortality, much less is it the proof of its possession. It is a silly logic which asserts human immortality from such strange premises as balloons and pyramids, electro-telegraphs and railways.”¹

We should have supposed that the possession of *moral* qualities would argue more strongly in favor of an endless existence for man than mere *intellectual* capacity, however great. For it is historical, that man may have the talents of Voltaire, the genius of Rousseau, or the learning of Hume, and still be a corrupter of morals and the enemy of religion. But as the argument adduced rests entirely upon intellectual capacity; and since there is every conceivable gradation of intelligence, it is proper to inquire: At what degree in the scale of intelligence does immortality begin? All men do not possess vast intellectual faculties, or prodigious memories. All men are not skillful, or learned, or wise. An argument for the immortality of *all* men cannot therefore be logically based upon the great

¹ *Life and Death*, Lect. II

capacity of *the few*, even if we allow that mental capacity furnishes a reason for endless life. The great mass of mankind are ignorant and degraded; their tendency seems to be downward rather than upward, more from the man to the brute, than from the man to the Deity.

Can there exist, then, any reason for claiming immortality for the ignorant, the degraded, and the vicious? Is it reasonable to suppose that evil will be perpetuated and rendered eternal, through the immortality of wicked men?¹ Are we to consider the idolatrous Hindoo, and the star-worshipping Persian immortal, on the ground of the mental capacity they possess?

The truth is, the possession of great mental capacity furnishes no good reason why man should be immortal. Patient continuance in well doing, and not the possession of brilliant talents, is the condition precedent to our attainment of eternal life. The good rather than the great; the virtuous rather than the learned; the humble rather than the

¹ We have a still vivid remembrance of the occasion, long years ago, on which the first tangible doubt regarding the popular doctrine of human immortality was injected into our mind. Not from the reading of any book, nor as the result of any train of abstract ratiocination, did this doubt arise, but while walking hastily through one of the poorest and most degraded districts of a great city. From the tolerably wide, but mean and squalid thoroughfare we traversed, numerous narrow and unsavory courts branched off, which seemed the chosen haunts of misery and crime. Disreputable and shameless girls and women passed along, brutal-looking men lounged about the low public houses, or gathered in groups with the women at the entrance of the courts, from which groups many an obscene

exalted; the *moral* rather than the *intellectual*, are to be made immortal.

THE DESIRE FOR IMMORTALITY.

A third argument is founded upon the desire for immortality. This argument has been stated thus:

“The longing after immortality which is born with us, would seem to be the prophecy and assurance of our deathlessness, the foreshadowing of the soul’s prolonged and indefinite continuance, the revelation of its triumph over the change which wears the semblance of destruction.”

This statement is rich in rhetoric, but poor in logic. The argument plainly stated is just this:

All men have what they desire;

All men desire immortality;

Therefore, all men are immortal. Or,

All men are what they desire to be;

expression and foul oath fell upon the shrinking ear: while blighted, filthy, and half-naked children crawled upon the pavement or dabbled in the gutter. A miasma of moral as well as physical pollution seemed to fill the murky air; compassion and aversion struggled together in the breast; when in a moment — by one of those lightning-flashes of thought which reveal the deepest recesses of the soul — the question suggested itself, *Are all these immortals?* Is this (excepting the small minority whom divine grace and human charity may rescue from their present condition) what, morally and spiritually, it can accord with infinite wisdom and love to perpetuate to all eternity? That thought was a seed planted in the soul which neither the traditions of the past, nor the cares and sorrows of the then present, had power to kill: it lived and grew as time passed on, it led to deeper and more earnest searching into the teaching of the Inspired Word, issuing finally in our present assured conviction, that neither from reason nor Scripture is there any sufficient evidence of the tremendous dogma of man’s natural immortality to be discovered.—*W. Maude.*

All men desire to be immortal;
Therefore, all men are immortal.

The fallacy lurks in the major premise, to which there are two objections: First, it is obvious that all men are not what they desire to be; for instance, it will not be denied that all men desire happiness, yet the fact must be admitted that all men are not happy. Other "desires" might be instanced, such as the desire for riches, health, and power, where there is no reason for supposing that the thing or quality desired was already possessed, but we will notice one desire in particular, which may well be called universal—which is cherished equally by the peasant and the philosopher, by the ignorant and the learned, by the rich and the poor—the desire for a longer continuance of life than that which is allotted to man. This desire, which is, perhaps, inherent in every human breast, has never been gratified; it has never added *one moment to the existence* of any human being.

The major premise then cannot be sustained, and the argument accordingly fails.

Secondly, the object of this general desire is not immortality or an endless continuance of being *merely*, but immortal *felicity*. Let this be admitted and the argument stands thus: All men are *immortal* because they desire endless *felicity*. But immortality is one thing, and happiness is another and very different thing. The argument should be stated thus: All men are happy because they desire

to be happy, and not that all men will live forever because they desire endless happiness.

The popular belief is that a majority of the human race are destined to endure an immortality of suffering; but if the argument as above stated be valid it proves that not only are all men independent of moral character naturally immortal, but it proves that all men are equally the heirs of endless happiness. If that only is eternal which is the object of universal desire, then most assuredly the doctrine of eternal torment is untrue; for we cannot suppose that any person ever desired so terrible a destiny.

It is granted that man has a strong desire for everlasting life; and it is quite pertinent to ask—

“Whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?”

Reason may not be able to give a satisfactory answer to this question; but if we inquire of the Divine Oracle we shall learn that our Creator has made immortality a prize attainable only by a patient continuance in well doing. The inherent desire, then, for life continued may have been implanted within our bosoms for the purpose of inciting us to seek it as the highest good, and can be properly urged only as an argument in favor of contingent immortality. It can have no weight as an argument in favor of present immortality or of a future immortality for all men.

Let us now examine some of the evidences in favor of the proposition that mind is the result of

animated organization. If this proposition can be sustained it will follow that the mind or soul is not an *entity, being, or individual*, but simply an *attribute* of the living man. And in an argument like the present, a single *fact* is worth a thousand *conjectures*.

It is a fact, then, that thought or intelligence is never manifested except in connection with living organization. An active brain seems as necessary to the production of thought as nerves are to sensation.

A stunning blow on the head renders the mind as unconscious as the weapon with which the blow was struck. Thousands of persons can testify from experience to the truth of this statement; yet according to the doctrine of immaterialism, a still more dreadful blow, one which should crush the skull and scatter the brains, would instantaneously cause the mind to become more active and vigorous than it had ever been before. This is certainly a most astonishing notion; yet if we withhold our assent to it, as something too incredible for belief, we are forthwith branded as heterodox, if not infidel.

A well-known medical authority says:

“*The brain governs all the voluntary motions of the whole physical economy, by direct volition. The decisions of the will are communicated to all parts of the system, through the agency of the nervous fluid sent through the nerves. If a ligature be applied to a nerve leading to any particular part, that part is no longer controlled by volition.*”¹

¹Cole's *Physiology*, p. 290.

The author of this extract, though a decided immaterialist, has conceded the whole question. He seems to have forgotten his notions about the mind being a "simple elementary substance," long enough to speak the truth without dissimulation.

"Volition," says Mr. Locke, "is the *actual exercise of the power* which the *mind* has of considering or forbearing to consider an idea." Thus it will be perceived that the immaterialists themselves, when they are not defending a pet theory, are quite willing to acknowledge that the brain is intelligent, or rather that it has the power, when in an active state, of producing intelligence.

Says another eminent writer: "Thought and feeling are to the brain what bodily exercise is to the muscles; they put in motion and cause increased action in its blood-vessels, and an augmented elaboration of nervous energy. In a case reported by Dr. Pierquin, observed by him in one of the hospitals of Montpellier, in 1831, he saw in a female patient, a part of whose skull had been removed, the brain motionless and lying within the cranium when she was in a dreamless sleep; in motion and protruding without the skull when she was agitated by dreams; more protruded in dreams reported by herself to be vivid; and still more so when perfectly awake, and especially if engaged in active thought or sprightly conversation. Similar cases are reported by Sir Astley Cooper and Prof. Blumenbach."¹

¹ Geo. Combe. *Constitution of Man*, p. 123.

This illustration seems to me to be particularly valuable, as it very clearly shows that in this life, at least, an active brain is necessary to the evolution of thought. And it not unfrequently happens that an injury received by the brain causes a complete suspension of the mental powers until the obstruction which caused the unconsciousness is removed. The following is a case in point.

“A man was pressed on board one of His Majesty’s ships early in the Revolutionary war. While on board this vessel, in the Mediterranean, he received a fall from the yard-arm, and when he was picked up, was found to be insensible. . . . For a period of thirteen months and some days [says Sir Astley Cooper], *his mind had remained in a state of perfect oblivion*; he had drunk, as it were, the cup of Lethe; he had suffered a COMPLETE DEATH, as far as regarded his mental, and almost all of his bodily powers; but by removing a small portion of bone with the saw, he was at once restored to all the functions of his mind, and almost all the powers of his body.”

The fact here narrated cannot be reconciled with the notion that the mind is an immortal being, and entirely independent of all material agencies. If a slight pressure on the brain causes unconsciousness as long as the pressure is retained, would it be unreasonable to infer that a complete dissolution of the whole body would have a like effect? No demonstration could more clearly prove that consciousness and the mental powers are the results of material causes.

Another fact in this connection is very noticeable. *The powers of the mind differ in different indi-*

viduals, and invariably depend upon the size, quality, and condition of the brain. It is probable that no really great man ever lived who did not have a large and active brain. The average Hottentot is inferior in intellectual capacity to the average European; and this is not because an inferior kind of soul has taken up its abode in the Hottentot's tenement of clay, but because his physical organization is less perfect.

Among the lower animals, mental power is manifested in proportion to the size and quality of the brain; thus the superior sagacity of the monkey, the dog, the horse, and the elephant is owing to the possession of superior cerebral organization. "The size of the brain," says Dr. Gray, "appears to bear a general relation to the intellectual capacity of the individual. Cuvier's brain weighed rather more than 64 ounces; that of the late Dr. Abercombie 63 ounces; and that of Dupuytren $62\frac{1}{2}$ ounces. On the other hand, the brain of an idiot seldom weighs more than 23 ounces."¹

To prevent misconception, however, it should be remarked that *size* of brain is not the *only* measure of mental power. Men who have very large heads are sometimes dull, almost stupid, because their organic quality is low. Quality is as important as quantity, and the greatest development of mental power requires a large and well-balanced brain of the highest organic quality.

¹ Gray's *Anatomy*, p. 510.

If we destroy a single organ of the brain, the faculty of the mind which was manifested through such organ is likewise destroyed. Is it not then reasonable to suppose that if all the organs of the brain were destroyed or were motionless and inactive, that the mind—made up of its several faculties, each of which was dependent upon the activity of a certain organ or part of the brain—would itself become inactive or extinct?

Immaterialists themselves allow that the brain is the organ of the mind; but then their notion is that the brain is nothing but inert and insensate matter; that an immaterial and immortal being, the soul or mind, *located in the brain, uses it as an instrument*; that in this sense and in no other can the brain be called the *organ* of the mind.

It is true that strictly speaking it is not the *brain* of man, but the *living man* himself that thinks, since the brain itself cannot evolve thought when disconnected from the human system of which it is a part, or when rendered inactive by injury, disease, or other cause. The living man it is who thinks by his brain, which in this sense is the organ of the mind, since *it is necessary to the production of thought*. The eye is necessary to vision; hence it is called the organ of vision. So it may be said that the lungs are *organs* of respiration; the nerves are *organs* of sensation; and the ears are *organs* of hearing.

Why then, in the case of the mind, must we be in-

troduced to a phantom? Why conjure up an immaterial ghost, and say that it directs, inspires, and controls all the operations of the brain? When a man can feel without nerves, breathe without lungs, see without eyes, and hear without ears, then, and not till then, may he think without a brain.

If, then, it is reasonable to conclude, that after death we shall no longer see, or hear, or feel, because the organs of sight, hearing, and feeling are destroyed or inactive, it is also reasonable to conclude that we shall cease to think, when the organs of thought are rendered incapable of action.

SOME ALLEGATIONS OF IMMATERIALISTS EXAMINED.

Let us now examine some of the alleged powers and attributes of the "immortal mind." It may first be observed that consciousness, or the knowledge of one's own thoughts, is an essential attribute of mind or it is not. If it is an essential attribute, then whenever one becomes unconscious from any cause whatever, the soul or mind is destroyed, since the destruction of an *essential attribute* of a thing is equivalent to the destruction of the thing itself. If consciousness be not an essential attribute of the mind or soul, then we may suppose it to become extinct from a variety of causes, without affecting the existence of the mind itself, which in such a case would be an unconscious mind, and therefore not immortal in the proper sense of the term.

Among immaterialists there seems to be a differ-

ence of opinion on this point. Mr. Watson says it cannot be proved that consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit, and that the natural immortality of the soul is contradicted by Scripture.¹

Judging from the following definitions, it would seem that the orthodox notion is that consciousness is an essential attribute of the soul or mind. Thus Prest. Dwight says: "The soul was formed a *thinking substance*."² It is variously described as "the thinking principle," "the active *thinking* substance," "the rational soul," etc. Mr. Buck defines the mind to be a "*thinking, intelligent being*." "Consciousness," said Dr. Watts, "must be an essential attribute of spirit." Fichte said: "We know nothing but by consciousness." And a recent writer has gone to the extreme of saying, "My own consciousness is not merely the test of my existence; but it actually constitutes it."³

Descartes regarded consciousness as the proof of his own existence. Nothing can be more explicit than his statement of this: "*Cogito ergo sum*"—"I think, therefore I am." If, then, we regard the soul or mind not only a *thinking* and active substance, but as an *intelligent* individual being, incorruptible and immortal, we must conclude that it can never become unconscious.

Adopting these premises, Mr. Luther Lee very

¹ See *Inst.*, Part II., p. 179.

² *Theology*, vol. I., p. 344.

³ *Enc. Brit.*; Art., *Met.*

handsomely acknowledges the inevitable conclusion in these words:

“For the soul to exist in our sense of the soul, is to be conscious, for with us *the soul is a living consciousness, and when it ceases to be conscious, it will cease to be a soul.*”¹

It can easily be shown by allusion to many well-known facts, that Mr. Lee's assertion thus boldly and confidently made, can never be reconciled with the notion of the soul's proper immortality. Chloroform and other anæsthetic agents may be used to render one insensible and unconscious without destroying the life. Are we to suppose that in such cases the “soul” ceases to exist?

A stunning blow on the head, as has already been observed, will render the mind or soul as unconscious as the weapon that inflicted the injury. It is of no use to inquire what becomes of the soul during the interval of unconsciousness; or attempt to determine whether it ceases to *be*, or merely ceases to *act*. All consciousness ceases, and reasoning from analogy we must suppose that death will likewise render us unconscious. Consciousness may be considered as the essence of individuality, and its permanent absence must be regarded as destructive of individual immortality.

Every man has experienced many hundreds of times during his life, a loss or suspension of consciousness while in deep sleep. If, as is popularly

¹ *True Wesleyan*, Aug. 18, 1849.

supposed, the body is a clog and hindrance to the free and vigorous action of the soul, we should suppose that during sleep and when undistracted by the body, it would manifest with increased energy and clearness its essential function of thought. Instead of this being the case, however, we find that nothing is more confused, irregular, and incoherent, than the thoughts of a man while dreaming. Moreover, it appears that one never dreams while in *deep* sleep; but only when the body is disturbed and while it is in a state between sleeping and waking. The fact that we never dream so much as when we pass uneasy and restless nights, proves this most conclusively.

Language scarcely affords a stronger expression for unconsciousness, than *dreamless sleep*. We may well suppose that DEATH is a DREAMLESS SLEEP, a total cessation of vital existence, a state in which animation and consciousness are wholly suspended. For, if sleep which causes but a partial suspension of vital energy, attended by no dissolution, but which on the contrary is necessary to strengthen the body and prepare it for renewed activity, can paralyze all the mental powers, is it not reasonable to suppose that death which instantly and entirely destroys all vital energy, will likewise cause the man—the *whole man*—to become insensate and unconscious?

It is popularly said that the body and not the soul is that which sleeps. Suppose for the sake of

the argument that we admit this to be true. What follows? Nothing more nor less than this:

Sleep produces a change in the body but not in the soul or mind ;

But sleep produces unconsciousness ;

Therefore, the body and not the soul is conscious.

Let the immaterialist who furnishes the premises admit the conclusion, and thus end the controversy.

There remain for our consideration another class of facts, which furnish ground for a still stronger argument; and which show that unconsciousness takes place in cases which bear a striking resemblance to death itself. In the case of a swoon or fainting fit, the bodily powers are partially suspended by a stupor which sometimes—especially when the patient has suffered a great loss of blood—ends in death; and the active powers of the mind, as far as can be judged from the absence of all signs of intelligence on the part of the sufferer, are totally suspended. As in apoplexy, the blood rushes to the head and causes a pressure upon the brain, which results in unconsciousness.

Blood as well as brains is necessary to the development of thought; for “the blood is the life,” and its absence from the brain produces an instant and total cessation of consciousness. The great fact that we are never unconscious when all the bodily organs are active and healthy proves almost to a demonstration that consciousness and thought are dependent upon physical organization.

These facts are so apparent and so pertinent, that immaterialists have been greatly puzzled what to do with them. As to reconciling them with their ghostly theory, it was found impossible, and some of the fairest as well as ablest and most prominent advocates of immaterialism have made admissions which subvert their entire doctrine.

Thus Mr. Luther Lee says: "The mind, in its present state, is dependent upon the bodily organs for primary ideas." This admission is a virtual surrender of the whole question; for it is plain that if the mind were essentially "intelligent," and was formed a "thinking substance," and "immortal in its own nature," and "incapable of coming in contact with matter," that it could never be dependent upon bodily organs for ideas. If the mind be dependent upon the bodily organs for *primary* ideas, we may justly conclude that it is dependent upon the body for *all* of its ideas.

Mr. Richard Watson makes an admission which covers still broader grounds. He says: "Man is to be considered in two states, that of *life* and that of *death*. In one he thinks, and in the other HE CEASES TO THINK."¹ Mr. Watson held that matter could not think, however organized or refined; but that thought was the production of an immaterial soul.

We must then understand him as saying that the *immaterial* man, the *soul*, which alone thinks in.

¹ *Inst.*, Part II., c. 2, p. 175.

life, is that which ceases to think in death. If man ceases to think in death, he must be unconscious, and therefore not immortal.

We now proceed, as a further means of proving that mind is the result of organization and dependent upon matter, to instance that terrible disease—INSANITY. Recent medical investigations have demonstrated the fact, that insanity is a mental derangement, caused by disease of the brain. Our most skillful and successful practitioners in the various insane asylums resort to vigorous medical treatment, which would certainly be most preposterous were insanity a disease of an immaterial soul. "What," it has been pertinently asked, "should we think of persons who should gravely tell us that jaundice was a disease of an immaterial mind; that asthma was an affection of a spiritual being; and that insanity was a disorder of an immortal soul?"

It is said that the mind is a "simple elementary substance," un-compounded, and immortal. But if this were true, how could different faculties be simultaneously exercised? If the mind were a single organ or substance, the whole mind would be sane or insane together, and such a thing as *monomania*, or derangement of a single faculty only, would be impossible. But all this difficulty vanishes when we consider the brain as a bundle of organs, each of which is necessary to the production of a certain faculty or power of mind.

Since mental derangement is caused only by cere-

bral disorder, if the brain were a single organ, the *whole* mind would be sane or insane at the same time; but many persons are deranged only on one or two points; a fact which conclusively proves the plurality of the organs of the brain and of the corresponding mental faculties.

The whole science of phrenology is based upon the fact that every mental faculty has its appropriate organ in the brain. "The organs of the mind," says George Combe, "can be seen and felt, and their size estimated—and the mental manifestations also that accompany them can be observed, in an unlimited number of instances."¹ "If phrenology is true," says Dr. Fowler, "to inflame Tune, for example, would create a singing disposition; Veneration, a praying desire; Cautiousness, groundless fears; and so of all the other organs. And **THUS IT IS.** Nor can this class of facts be evaded."²

In view of such facts, how very absurd are the statements that the mind is a thinking and separate substance; simple and uncompounded; moving matter, but incapable of coming into contact with it, and *located in the brain*, but entirely immaterial!

If the mind were incorruptible, it is plain it could not be the subject of derangement or disease. According to immaterialism, such a thing as mental disease is impossible. If the mind or soul were in its own nature immortal and incorruptible, all of its

¹ *Constitution of Man.*

² *Phrenology and Physiology*, p. 61.

faculties would be so too; whereas we find that every faculty of the mind, without exception, is liable to become impaired, and, in some cases, to become wholly extinct, before death. Since, therefore, all the faculties of the mind, taken separately, appear to be mortal, the mind itself must be regarded as mortal.

Let us take, for example, the faculty of memory. An incorruptible mind must have an incorruptible memory. An immortal mind must have an immortal memory. It is not to be supposed that incorruptible and immortal beings are forgetful. But nothing is more treacherous than the memory of man. The most cultivated persons cannot recall a thousandth part of the thoughts, incidents, and impressions of their short life. Man, being corruptible, has but a corruptible memory. But if the mind were immortal; if the memory were incorruptible, not a thought, incident, word, or act would ever be forgotten.

TWO OBJECTIONS

To the arguments thus advanced in favor of considering man as mortal and corruptible, two objections are commonly urged with much confidence. These objections we will now notice.

1. It is claimed that cases often occur in which the minds of dying persons are as vigorous as in the days of their health and strength; and that mind, therefore, is not dependent upon a bodily organism.

If immaterialism were true, then *every* case ought to be exactly as stated above. If *death* be an advantage to the mind, then most assuredly ought *disease* to be regarded as a proportional advantage. It is true that in some cases—which, however, are rare and exceptional—the faculties of the mind have appeared to be but little impaired during the last moments of life; but if the objection were worth anything, these cases should form not the *exception*, but the uniform and invariable *rule*.

If the soul were immortal, imprisonment in its “tenement of clay” must be exceedingly irksome and disagreeable; and the prospect of a speedy liberation from its “sluggish prison,” which hinders the free exercise of its “divine faculties,” would, we should suppose, be hailed with a delight which would manifest itself by an increase of vigor over that of any former period of its confinement.

But this is contrary to universal experience, and therefore untrue. The mind, in a great majority of cases, appears to decay with the decaying body. The exceptions themselves are easily and satisfactorily accounted for. *They never occur except in cases where the circulation of blood to and from the brain is free and unimpeded.* Their occurrence depends upon the *nature* of the disease, and its *seat*.

Again, these exceptional cases, where the mental faculties are seemingly unimpaired, no more prove the immortality of the mind, than exceptional cases of physical vigor prove the immortality of the body.

2. The second objection is known as the argument of personal identity, and is thus stated: Every particle of the human body is changed once in six or seven years; one feels assured from the evidence of his own consciousness that he is the same individual that he was ten, twenty, thirty, or forty years ago; this proves that the mind is not affected by the mutations of the body; for while the identity of the mind is ever retained, that of the body is constantly changing; therefore, mind cannot be the result of bodily organization, but is immortal in its own nature.

This argument has no force unless we suppose that the mind is *unchangeable*. This we cannot do; for, in a perfectly intelligible sense, the mind is the most *changeable* thing of which we have any knowledge. Even if we should admit — what has not and probably never can be *proved* — that *every particle* of the body is entirely changed or renewed once in seven years, it would not invalidate the fact that the identity of the body is no less perfect than that of the mind. The changes that take place in the mind between infancy and manhood are as indicative of a renovation of substance as the changes in the body during the same period are presumptive of a change of the corporeal particles. The process of waste and supply of particles is so gradual, that the organization retains its identity. The diseases of the body, its shapes and colors — whether natural, as in complexion; or artificial, as in tattooing — re-

main fixed and permanent. Mental identity, then, is no better proof of the immortality of the mind than physical identity is of the immortality of the body.

Strictly speaking, there can be no such thing in this life as either mental or physical identity. For this would be to suppose that the mind and body of the infant were as perfect, in fact *just the same*, as those of the individual adult!

It is said that consciousness is one and indivisible, and that, as a consequence, the mind must be unchangeable. But this cannot be true; for there are many instances on record of persons losing their identity, and becoming the subjects of *double consciousness*. Such persons, according to the materialist's theory, must have had *double souls*.

We have all the proof possible that the mind is constantly undergoing changes. It follows the laws of physical development and decay. It is weak in childhood, strong in manhood, and feeble in old age. Everything that affects the whole physical system affects the mind; and to this rule there are no exceptions. Sleep refreshes the body, but it also refreshes the mind; disease weakens the body, but it also weakens the mind; were there no necessary connection between the two, these things would never happen. If the mind were unchangeable, and immortal, a slight pressure upon the brain would not destroy or suspend its consciousness. It would never require rest, nor could it be diseased.

We know nothing when unconscious; and the simple and undeniable *fact*, that a total suspension of consciousness may be caused by a slight pressure on the brain is demonstrative proof that the mind is dependent upon bodily organization, and therefore mortal. To say that the mind cannot act when its instrument—the body—is injured, diseased, or in an unfavorable condition, is to yield the whole question, and to acknowledge that the mind is changeable, corruptible, and mortal.

Even if we should concede that the soul or mind is not merely an attribute of the living man, but a substance or principle entirely distinct and separate from the physical organization, even then there would be no sufficient reason for supposing that it will exist as a thinking and conscious being after the dissolution of the body.

We have already observed that during deep sleep consciousness is totally suspended. We must suppose, however, that the mental powers existed in some mode during the interval of sleep, though they were inactive. Says Dr. Butler:

“Sleep, or however a swoon, shows not only that these powers exist when they are not exercised, as the passive power of motion does in inanimate matter; but shows also that they exist when there is *no present capacity of exercising them*; or that the capacities of exercising them for the present, as well as the actual exercise of them, may be suspended, and yet the powers themselves remain undestroyed.”¹

¹ *Analogy of Religion.*

A want of attention to this distinction between the existence of mental powers and their active *exercise* has led to many false notions respecting the immortality of the mind. It matters but little whether any mental *powers* or thinking *principles* survive the dissolution of the body, if there remain no capacity to *exercise* them. Unless consciousness remain entire and unimpaired after death, nothing remains worth contending for.

A swoon can, in a moment, deprive us of this faculty; sleep produces the same effect; and we have every reason to believe that we shall suffer a deprivation no less total when we sleep the sleep of death. "There have been instances of madness and apoplexy," says Abp. Whatel.y, "in which all the ordinary operations of the mind having been completely suspended for several years, the patients, on the recovery of their senses, have been found *totally unconscious of the whole interval*, and distinctly speaking of, as having happened the day before, events which occurred before the injuries; so that they could hardly be brought to believe that whole years had since elapsed." Such instances would seem to prove that mind may exist without being active; or in other words, that consciousness is not an essential attribute of the soul. But, according to the views of Mr. Luther Lee, such cases would prove that the soul of the afflicted person *ceased to have an existence* during the interval of unconsciousness. Mr. Lee speaks thus plainly:

“ *With us to cease to think is to cease to be a soul, for we know little about the human soul more than what we gather from its thinking operations.*” Again, he speaks of the soul as a being “ *whose very existence is thought, which is never known to exist only in connection with thought, and is known to exist only FROM its thoughts.*”¹ Here the very existence of the soul is made to depend upon its ceaseless consciousness. It would follow from this absurd theory, that one would be utterly without a mind or soul for at least one-fourth of his life.

But what are the reasons for supposing that men are conscious after death? Has any one ever witnessed any effects from the active existence of the soul or mind after the destruction of the body? At the instant of death, all the bodily organs cease to act, and all sensation becomes extinct. No sign or trace of intelligence is left.

If any results had ever been certainly and undoubtedly witnessed from the activity of the human mind after death, they would furnish a legitimate reason for supposing—not, indeed, that it was immortal—but that its active existence was not supported by animalized matter. But Mr. Watson was entirely right when he said that “ *man is to be considered in two states, that of *life* and that of *death*.* In one he thinks and in the other *he ceases to think.*” Mr. John Wesley, in his sermon on the “ *Fall of Man,*” speaking of the body, says :

¹ *True Wesleyan*, Aug. 18, 1849.

"The soul cannot dispense with its service, imperfect as it is, for an embodied spirit cannot form one thought but by the mediation of its bodily organs. For thinking is not, as many suppose, the act of a pure spirit, but the act of a spirit connected with a body, and playing upon a set of material keys. It cannot possibly, therefore, make any better music than the nature and state of its instruments allow it."

If, as Mr. Wesley asserts, "an embodied spirit cannot form one thought but by the mediation of its bodily organs" — if, as he says, "thinking is not the act of a pure spirit" — if the mind "cannot possibly make any better music than the nature and state of its instruments allow," is it reasonable to suppose that it can make any "music" at all when it is disembodied, and is without instruments of any kind; or that it can *think* without the mediation of any organs whatever. If thinking is not the act of a pure spirit, then when the human spirit leaves the body at death it must be utterly incapable of thought.

Mr. Isaac Taylor is equally explicit. He says:

"The animal body is not itself the life, nor is it the cause of life; nor again is the spiritual body the life, nor the cause of it; but the one as well as the other is the instrument of the mind, and the necessary medicine of every specific and productive exercise of its faculties. . . . The union with matter, or the coining into a corporeal state, may be in fact not a degradation to mind, but the very means of its quickening — its birth into the world of knowledge and action."¹

Bp. Butler, and other prominent advocates of the

¹ *Physical Theory of Another Life*, pp. 23, 28.

soul's immortality, admit that death destroys the powers of sensation, but strangely enough conclude that the exercise of the reflective powers is not so much as suspended or interrupted by the dissolution of the body.

It is a well-known fact, however, that every kind, or nearly every kind, of bodily affection, or injury—such as sleep, a swoon, or a stunning blow—that destroys *sensation*, does as completely destroy *reflection*. It is impossible not to conclude, therefore, that organized living bodies are just as necessary to a state of *reflection* as to a state of *sensation*; or, that the embodiment of mind is essentially necessary to the exercise of its faculties.

But we must draw this chapter to a close. Reason can never prove that man is immortal. Revelation alone can give us any satisfactory light on the momentous question of a future state. Let us then build our hopes of eternal life, not upon the assumed immortality of the human soul, but upon the sure promises of the Gospel.

THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

As introductory to the Scripture argument, we offer the following

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.

In the interpretation of Scripture, the literal sense, or that which is derived from the ordinary meaning of the words used, should be adopted in all cases in which it would not involve an absurdity, or contradict other portions of Scripture, or impeach the character of the Supreme Being. Says Jeremy Taylor :

“In all the interpretations of Scripture, the *literal sense* is to be presumed and chosen unless there be evident cause to the contrary.”

Says Martin Luther :

“That which I have so often insisted on elsewhere, I here once more repeat, viz: that the Christian should direct his first efforts toward understanding the *literal sense* of Scripture, which alone is the substance of faith and of Christian theology. . . . The allegorical sense is commonly uncertain and by no means safe to build our faith upon: for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only, on which if any man lean, he will find it no better than the Egyptian reed. Therefore, Origen, Jerome, and similar of the fathers are to be avoided with the whole of that Alexandrian school which,

according to Eusebius and Jerome, formerly abounded in this species of interpretation. For later writers unhappily following their too much praised and prevailing example, it has come to pass that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the word of God to the most extravagant absurdities; and, as Jerome complains of his own times, they extract a sense from Scripture repugnant to its meaning.”¹

Says Hooker :

“I hold it for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that when a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous and delusive than that act which changes the meaning of words, as alchemy doth or would the substance of metals; making of anything what it listeth, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing.”²

Richard Watson has very judiciously said :

“The terms of the record are to be taken in their plain and commonly received sense; figures of speech are to be interpreted with reference to the local peculiarities of the country in which the agents who wrote the record resided; idioms are to be understood according to the genius of the language employed; if any allegorical or mystical discourses occur, the key to them must be sought in the book itself, and not in our own fancies; what is obscure must be interpreted by that which is plain; the scope and tenor of a discourse must be regarded, and no conclusion formed on passages detached from their context, except they are complete in their sense, or evidently intended as axioms and apothegms.”³

Metaphors, allegories, and parables are not to be

¹ *Annot. on Deut.* 1.

² *Eccles. Polity.*

³ *Inst.*, Part I., p. 51.

taken as absolute proof of any doctrine. They may be used to illustrate, or to confirm doctrines already and otherwise established, but it is not allowable to rely entirely or mainly upon their aid to prove any doctrine whatever.

CHAPTER V.

THE LESSON OF CREATION.

When we say God hath revealed anything, we must be ready to prove it, or else we say nothing. If we turn off reason here, we level the best religion in the world with the wildest and most absurd enthusiasms. And it does not alter the case much to give reason ill names, to call it *blind* and *carnal reason*. For our parts, we apprehend no manner of inconvenience in having reason on our side; nor need we desire a better evidence that any man is in the wrong than to hear him declare against reason, and thereby acknowledge that reason is against him. Some men seem to think that they oblige God mightily by believing plain contradictions; but the matter is quite otherwise. God never offers anything to man's belief that plainly contradicts the natural and essential notions of his mind; because this would be for God to destroy his own workmanship, and to impose that upon the understanding of man, which, whilst it remains what it is, it cannot possibly admit.—*Abp. Tillotson*.

All who acknowledge the inspiration and authenticity of the Scriptures must consider them as the highest authority on the subjects of man's nature and destiny. The early Protestants, rejoicing in their emancipation from Papal rule, proclaimed "the Bible, and the Bible alone," to be their only rule of faith and practice. The Sixth Article of the Church of England contains this noble, because charitable and truthful sentiment:

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

For all knowledge of a future state, we are depen-

dent on that blessed volume, which is given as a lamp to our feet and a light to our path. We should not, therefore, respect any doctrine, however popular or venerable, that stands opposed to the teachings of the Bible we venerate.

The question to be discussed in this chapter is:

WAS MAN CREATED IMMORTAL?

In order to answer this question correctly, and to form just conclusions in regard to the constitution of man, it will be necessary to examine with some care the Mosaic account of creation. It is recorded in Gen. 2 : 7, that "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." Regarding this as a plain and perspicuous utterance on the subject of man's organization, our attention is specially called to *three* things, viz: "the dust of the ground," "the breath of life," and "living soul." First, then, let us notice the expression, "the dust of the ground."

The inspired historian declares that "God formed man of the dust of the ground." It is commonly said that this language refers to the formation of the body; and this is undoubtedly correct. But popular theology goes much further than this, and declares that the body is but a *part* of man—in fact, *not* a part of the "real man," but only a house which the Lord built for man's temporary residence. All this, however, is not warranted by any language of Scrip-

ture. The language of Moses is plain and decisive: "God formed *man*"—not a *part* of man, not a *house* for man, but the MAN HIMSELF—"of the dust of the ground."

Hence it was, we may justly presume, that the name given to the first man by his Creator was Adam, from *adamah*, the earth or ground; in order to remind him and his posterity of their true origin and constitution. His name was not derived from any consideration of the immateriality or immortality of his soul, but from that material body which is popularly said to be but a temporary tenement of clay. It is evident that Moses regarded the body as properly the man himself; for the organized form was called Adam, or man, before the reception of the breath of life.

The Mosaic account of the creation of man, though fitted to lower the pride and check the arrogance of those who imagine themselves constitutionally allied to the Divine Being, is still a most sublime and instructive history. The devout believer in inspiration may well say with Abraham, "I am but dust and ashes," and yet with true gratitude exclaim with David, "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made."

To show that Adam was regarded as a material being, "a man of dust," as well *after* he became a "living soul" as before, it will only be necessary to advert to the terms of the sentence pronounced upon him after his unsuccessful probation in Eden. "Dust

thou art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." These words indicate in the plainest manner that Adam was possessed only of a material and mortal nature. It is not said, "Dust thy *body* is," as though he were composed of *two* natures—a material and a spiritual—but the language used clearly involves the idea that to the man, to the *whole man* as an individual, were the words addressed: "Dust THOU art, and unto dust shalt THOU return."

On this point of man's mortality, based on the perishable nature of his constitution, we have the following corroborative evidence of Job 34 : 15: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and *man* shall turn again unto dust;" of Ps. 146 : 3, 4: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish;" and of 1 Cor. 15 : 47: "The *first man is of the earth, earthy.*"

Clearly recognizing from this Scripture testimony, that our origin is from dust, we may reverently exclaim with Isaiah, "O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand."

The definition of a human being as given by Moses is, "dust THOU art;" and for uninspired men to contradict this by saying that this means only a *part* of man—in fact, not a part of the "real

man," for the man of dust is said to be only the "house" in which the soul as the human personality lives — is to pervert a plain declaration of Scripture, at the bidding of a heathen dogma — is to ignore Moses and to revere Plato.

Let us next examine the scope and bearing of the expression "breath of life." After the creation of man from the dust of the ground, God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The life-giving breath of the Almighty entered not into man as a separate and conscious entity, but trembled, as it were, upon the surface of his being, significant of the frail hold he had of the life which its presence imparted and sustained. How suggestive of a precarious tenure of life is the language, "breathed into his *nostrils the breath of life!*"

That I do not over-estimate the importance, nor misapprehend the significance of these words, the following Scriptural examples of their use will show: In expressing the helplessness of man on account of the frailty of his nature, the prophet says: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils:¹ for wherein is he to be accounted of?" And yet more significant is the language of the patriarch Job:

¹Says Dr. Conant: "In whose nostrils is breath. Only breath, so frail a principle of life, and so easily extinguished!" And in a note he adds: "Not as in the common English version, 'whose breath is in his nostrils;' *for where else should it be?* The objection is not to its place in the body, which is the proper one for it, but to its *frail and perishable nature.*"

"All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils." (Job 27 : 3.)

But it is commonly said by the advocates of the doctrine of man's immortality, that "the breath of life" which God breathed into Adam's nostrils was an immortal soul; and that this phrase marks an important distinction between man and the lower animals. Thus Richard Watson says:

"That human nature has two essential constituent parts is manifest from the history of Moses: the BODY formed out of pre-existent matter, the earth; and a LIVING SOUL, *breathed into the body, by an inspiration from God.*"¹

Thomas Scott on Gen. 2 : 7 says:

"The Lord not only gave man life in common with the other animals which had bodies formed of the same materials; but immediately communicated from himself the *rational soul*, here denoted by the *expression of breathing into his nostrils the breath of life.*"

Adam Clarke on Gen. 2 : 7 says:

"In the most distinct manner God shows us that man is a compound being, having a body and soul distinctly and separately created; the body out of the dust of the earth, *the soul immediately breathed from God himself.*"

Prof. Bartlett quotes Hengstenberg as saying:

"*The tenant of the human body was from the special breathing of God.* Two elements are united in man—an earthly and a divine; which latter no other creature shares with him."²

Let us try these teachings of men by the unerring

¹ *Inst.*, Part II., c. 18.

² *Life and Death Eternal*, p. 149.

word of inspiration, and see whether Moses uses the phrase "breath of life" in a different sense when applied to man than when applied to the lower animals. In the seventh chapter of Genesis we read:

"And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of *all flesh* wherein is *the breath of life*. And they that went in, went in male and female of *all flesh*, wherein is the *breath of life*. . . . And *all flesh died* that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and *every MAN*. All in whose *nostrils was the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land died."

This language of the inspired historian is decisive of the point in question; and conclusively proves that the phrase "breath of life" does not mean an "immortal soul." For every reader will see at a glance that the whole animal creation, including man, is comprehended in the phrase "all flesh;" and of all alike in whose nostrils was "the breath of life," it is said they "died" and were "destroyed."

The language of Solomon when speaking of men and beasts is strongly expressive of their common mortality: "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, *they have all ONE BREATH*. . . . All go unto one place; *all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again*." (Eccl. 3: 19, 20.)

The opponent, therefore, who uses the phrase "breath of life" to prove that man is immortal,

must concede on the same basis, and for the same reason, that all living creatures are immortal. For, if the phrase "breath of life" in Gen. 2 : 7 proves that Adam was immortal, then beyond a doubt the same phrase in Gen. 7 : 15 proves that all the animals saved from the deluge were immortal. But the men and animals that were destroyed by the deluge had in their nostrils "the breath of life." The reception, then, of this life-giving breath did not carry with it immortality; for that which is immortal is indestructible.

The prevalent belief that the "breath of life" is an immaterial and rational soul finds no countenance in Scripture. The notion of immateriality is not once suggested in all the Bible; nor is there the slightest reason for supposing that the words "breath of life" are ever used by the inspired writers to denote the human personality.

The principal weight of the argument for man's immortality is placed not on the words "breath of life," but on the application and meaning of the phrase "living soul." As this phrase names the *result* or *product* of the divine act, and is expressive of what man became, it will be readily allowed to fix its true meaning is to preclude the necessity of any argument based on the process by which such consummation was reached. What then is the Scriptural meaning of the passage, "man became a living soul?" Does it mean that Adam on receiving the breath of life became an *immortal soul*? Rely-

ing entirely upon Scriptural evidence, there need be no hesitation in saying that it does not mean this. For the same writer, in this connection, applies the same phrase to "every beast of the field," and to "every fowl of the air."¹ The Hebrew words *nephesh chaiyah*, rendered "living soul" in Gen. 2 : 7, are in the first chapter of Genesis four times applied to the inferior animals. See Gen. 1 : 20, 21, 24, 30. Also, Gen. 9 : 10, 12, 16.

The intelligent reader will not fail to observe that Moses applies the phrase *nephesh chaiyah*—living soul—alike to man and to the creeping reptile, to the lowest as well as to the highest of the animal creation; and that as a necessary consequence the expression has no distinctive value in the argument for man's immortality. But that I may not be thought to argue this point as a special pleader, I will quote the admissions of some distinguished immaterialists, who have a wide reputation as Hebrew scholars. Adam Clarke, in his comments on Gen. 1 : 24, says that *nephesh chaiyah*, or "living soul," "is a general term to express all creatures endued with animal life." Prof. Stuart in his *Chrestomathy* calls *nephesh chaiyah*. "a generic term for every living creature, animal, or animated being." And Prof. Bush in his notes on Gen. 2 : 7, says :

"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 to

¹ Gen. 2 : 19.

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."

Great stress is sometimes laid upon the word "became"—"man *became* a living soul." But the word has no emphatic value whatever. For while it is true that it is written of man that he became a living soul, and of none of the lower animals is this precise language used; yet it is equally true of *all* animals to say, "they became living souls," for whatever *was* or *is* first *became* what it was or is. It is obvious, then, that this word "became" cannot be made to sustain the whole weight of the doctrine of man's immortality. Nor, indeed, has it any logical value whatever, unless the absurd principle be first admitted true that whatever *becomes* anything must remain forever what it has become.

Fortunately for all who love Gospel truth, we have an inspired commentary on Gen. 2:7 that throws a flood of light on the subject of man's constitution. The apostle Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians quotes this text for a purpose so plain and unmistakable, that if all would accept his masterly reasoning as final authority on the subject discussed, not only would all controversy about the meaning of this particular text be forever set at rest, but the doctrine of man's immortality would have no defenders among those who base their belief on the teachings of Scripture.

In the fifteenth chapter of this epistle, in reasoning against those who denied the resurrection of the dead, after pointing out some of the consequences which would inevitably follow if there were no resurrection, he proceeds to answer the question: "How are the *dead* raised up, and with what *body* do they come?"

"Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it *die*; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest 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 hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. . . . It is sown a natural body, . . . it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, *The first man Adam was made a living soul*; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. . . .

"The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy [the image of Adam] we shall also bear the image of the heavenly [the image of Christ].

"Now, this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood [or mortal man] cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth *corruption* inherit *incorruption*. For this *corruptible* must put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal* [which is our present nature] must put on *immortality*.

It will be noticed that the apostle gives no countenance to the absurd though popular notion that God breathed into Adam's nostrils an immortal soul. On the contrary, he distinctly asserts that "Adam [the man of earth] was *made* a living soul."

Moses tells us that he [Adam] became or was made a living soul by the reception of the breath of life.

A child can see the difference between putting a soul into a lifeless body, as a tenant is put into possession of his new habitation, and then pronouncing both body and soul—*both house and tenant*—a living *soul*, and the same lifeless creature by the reception of the breath of life, or power to live, becoming a living creature, or a living soul. Job says, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the *breath* of the Almighty hath given me *life*." (Job 33 : 4.)

Adam was a completely-organized creature before the reception of the breath of life, which merely caused a *lifeless* soul to become a *living* soul. The "breath of life" is not the man, nor is it any part of the man; neither is it an entity or soul of any kind. All breathing creatures are "living souls," and become such by the reception of "the breath of life."

There is nothing in the word "living" to express endless duration, so that one may be a "living soul," and yet be nothing but a mortal man. A "living soul" is simply a living creature, a living organized body. This sense of the term is seen in Milton's almost literal rendering of the Mosaic account of creation:

" And God said, 'Let the waters generate
Reptile with spawn abundant, *living soul*;
And God created the great whales, and each

Soul living—each that crept—which plenteously
The waters generated by their kinds. . . .

He formed thee, Adam—thee, O man,
Dust of the ground, and in thy nostrils breathed
The breath of life—
And *thou* becam'st a *living soul*.' " ¹

Finally, that living souls are *mortal* may be gathered from Rev. 16 : 3: "Every *living soul* died in the sea."

We have seen that Moses describes man as wholly a material being, as formed of the dust of the ground; and that the breath of life which caused all creatures to live, caused this earth-man to become a living man, or a living soul. We have seen that Moses is strikingly corroborated by the apostle Paul, who, in addition, says that this man of earth, this living soul, is *corruptible* and *mortal*. This conclusion may be further illustrated and confirmed by the account of the creation of Eve. "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his *ribs* and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the *rib* which the Lord God had taken from man, *made* he a woman, and brought her unto the man." (Gen. 2 : 21, 22.)

From this account it will be seen that Eve, like Adam, was formed of pre-existent *matter*; and, although it is nowhere said that "the breath of life" was inspired into her nostrils, or that she "became a living soul," yet nobody claims that her nature

¹ *Paradise Lost*, b. VII.

was essentially different from that of Adam, of whom this is related.

The orthodox assertion that an immortal soul was breathed into Adam's nostrils is utterly at variance with Scripture and with reason.

According to the interpretation of Watson, Scott, and Clarke, the immaterial and rational soul must reside *in the nostrils* of men and beasts; although the general belief seems to be that the *brain* is the chosen or assigned *locality* of the "rational soul." But who does not know that an *immaterial* soul can have no *locality*, either in the head, in the nose, or any where else? Whatever has locality, has extension, and is therefore material.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ADAMIC PENALTY.

Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?—*Moses.*

The doctrine which cannot stand the test of rational investigation cannot be true. We have gone too far when we have said, such and such doctrines should not be subjected to rational investigation, being doctrines of pure revelation. I know of no such doctrine in the Bible. The doctrines of this book are doctrines of eternal reason, and they are revealed because they are such.—*Adam Clarke.*

The deepest interest must ever attach to the sad history of the probation of our first parents in Eden. The scene of their trial was a beautiful garden. Drinking in its ambrosial delights, breathing its vernal airs, and wandering among its Elysian bowers were

“—— the loveliest pair,
That ever since in love’s embraces met.”

That their home was indeed a paradise may be gathered from the sacred narrative. “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 God 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 knowledge of good and evil.” In this delightful place Adam was to enter upon his momentous essay, and to secure, or lose, the prize of

immortality for himself and for his posterity. The terms of the trial are thus distinctly stated :

“And the Lord God commanded the man saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” (Gen. 2 : 16, 17.)

Here was a law of God most clearly expressed and a penalty as sharply defined. Than this, a more perspicuous passage can scarcely be found in the sacred writings. Yet strangely enough, this text, the meaning of which is comprehensible by the most ordinary intellect, has among theologians long been the source of the most bitter controversy. The prevalent opinion among immaterialists of the orthodox school makes this penalty to consist of three parts or installments.

I. The alienation of the soul from God, the love of sin and hatred of holiness, and the thorough corruption of the moral nature — called *spiritual* death.

II. The separation of soul and body, or *temporal* death.

III. The separate existence of the soul in an intermediate state of misery; the resurrection of the body and the reunion therewith of the soul, in order that the entire man may be endlessly tormented — called *eternal* death.¹

¹ “We believe that God made man upright; but he, sinning, involved himself and posterity in death, spiritual, temporal, and eternal; from all which there is no deliverance but by Christ.”—*Baptist Confession of Faith*, Art. V.

This doctrine—orthodox though it may be called—seems to be utterly opposed to all right ideas of divine justice. It is the appropriate monument which the mystic doctors of a Cabalistic theology have reared upon the basis of the immortality of the soul. Common sense and intuition alike repel it as false, and the testimony of Scripture direct and positive forbids us to believe it true.

It would not only seem inexpressibly absurd, but absolutely wicked, to represent God as saying to Adam: 'So great is my abhorrence of sin, which is the only thing in all the universe that is hateful to me, that if you sin, I will doom you to sin forever. If you dare to disobey me in this one thing, so unutterably do I loathe the least degree of wickedness, that I will exert my infinite power to cause you to grow in wickedness and in hatred of me throughout the endless ages of the future.' Yet all this would be entirely compatible with the orthodox notion that the Adamic penalty includes "death temporal," "death spiritual," and "death eternal."

It will hardly be disputed that Adam well understood the meaning of the threatened penalty. But I submit that Adam could not have understood the penalty according to the popular interpretation: for no intellect less than that of the Omniscient can fully comprehend the awful significance of those words which fall so glibly from the lips of teachers of orthodox theology. If, then, Adam could not have understood the threatened penalty according

to the interpretation of orthodoxy, without a special revelation to enable him to do so; and if such revelation does not appear in the record, it most certainly follows that we have no right to teach such interpretation to be correct, or to suppose that such revelation was given; but we ought to interpret the language of the penalty according to the literal sense of the words used. For if we suppose that the law given to Adam contained a mysterious and hidden meaning—that hatred of goodness and moral corruption, the separation of soul and body, and the eternal flames of *gehenna* were veiled in the threat, “Thou shalt surely die”—we dishonor God by charging him with duplicity and injustice, and give a negative answer to the question of inspiration, “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?”

If every human government, not excepting the semi-civilized Chinese, considers it a duty imposed by justice to print the Criminal Code in the State paper, or cause it to be publicly read, that the people may know exactly what are its threatened punishments, how does it comport with our faith in the infinite goodness of God, to charge the highest tribunal in the universe with a concealment of the true meaning of that law, under which Adam in Eden began his probation? Is it not reasonable to suppose that a penalty involving such momentous interests would be couched in language the most direct, and the least liable to be misunderstood?

Are we at liberty to suppose that the Supreme Being would use metaphors and enigmas in a threat of capital punishment?

A *promise* may be expressed in the language of metaphor, as "the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." But a *threat*, especially a threat of *death*, we might justly expect to find expressed in words the most positive and direct. This is universally the rule in Scripture. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The wages of sin is death." "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Here is no circumlocution, no metaphor, but plain and explicit language.

Many eminent men have given their unqualified adhesion to the literal interpretation of the Adamic penalty. Says John Locke :

"By reason of Adam's transgression all men are mortal and come to die. . . . Nobody can deny but that the doctrine of the Gospel is that death came on all men by Adam's sin; only that they differ about the signification of the word *death*. For some will have it to be a state of guilt, wherein not only he, but all his posterity was so involved, that every one descended of him deserved endless torment in hell-fire. It seems a strange way of understanding a law, which requires the plainest and directest words, that by *death* should be meant eternal life in misery. Could any suppose by a law that says, *For felony you shall die*, not that he should lose his life, but be kept alive in perpetual and exquisite torments? . . . I confess that by *death* here, I can understand nothing but a ceasing to be, the losing of all actions of life and sense. Such a death came on Adam and all his posterity, by his first disobedience in Paradise, under which death they

should have lain forever had it not been for the redemption by Jesus Christ." ¹

Isaac Watts, though a believer in man's immortality, very candidly says :

"There is not one place of Scripture that occurs to me, where the word death as it was first threatened in the law of innocence, necessarily signifies a certain miserable immortality of the soul either to Adam, the actual sinner, or to his posterity." ²

Dr. Taylor has well said :

"Death was to be the consequence of his [Adam's] disobedience, and the death here threatened can be opposed only to that life God gave Adam when he created him."

One of the objections commonly urged against the opinion that the Adamic penalty consisted in a total deprivation of conscious existence is, that Adam did not in that sense die the same day that he ate the forbidden fruit. It is obvious, however, that the objection lies with far greater force against the orthodox notion of a tripartite death, which makes endless misery a part of the penalty denounced against Adam. Although the immaterialist cannot fairly or safely urge this objection, yet it may seem to require a passing notice.

The Lord said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" or more literally, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, DYING thou SHALT *surely* DIE." ³ The literal sense of the

¹ *Reasonableness of Christianity*, s. 1.

² *Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*, s. 3.

³ See Adam Clarke's note on Gen. 2 : 17.

text, therefore, renders unnecessary the many explanations so often resorted to for the laudable purpose of defending the veracity of him whose word is truth. Adam truly became a *dying man* in the very day in which he ate of the forbidden fruit; and Moses has given the record of his *death* in these words: "All the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and *he died.*" (Gen. 5 : 5.) This proves that God told the truth, and that the serpent lied. But the orthodox interpretation reverses this, by saying that Adam's soul or *self* is living yet, and is destined to live forever.

"Thou shalt surely die," said the Lord; "Ye shall *not* surely die," said the serpent. These statements are directly opposed to each other; but orthodoxy goes much further by paraphrasing the announcement of the penalty thus: 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, but not literally; that is to say: Thy *body* shalt crumble back to dust; but thy soul—which I breathed into thy nostrils, and which is immortal—filled with hatred and abhorrence of its Creator, shall live forever in exquisite and unceasing misery.'

That this last statement is fairly derived from the orthodox interpretation of the Adamic penalty, may be seen from the following exposition given by Cruden, in his *Concordance*, under the word *death*:

"Death signifies the *separation of the soul from the body*—this is TEMPORAL DEATH. A *separation of soul and body from God's favor in this life*, which is the state of all unregen-

erated and unrenewed persons, who are without the light of knowledge, and the quickening power of grace — this is SPIRITUAL DEATH. *The perpetual separation of the whole man from God's heavenly presence and glory, to be tormented forever with the devil and his angels — this is the second death, OF ETERNAL DEATH. To all these kinds of death Adam made himself and his posterity liable, by transgressing the commandment of God in eating the forbidden fruit."*

This preposterous definition of the word "death" is based upon the unfounded assumption that *man* is composed of a mortal body and an immortal soul. Let us next look at some of the consequences that would inevitably follow if the orthodox interpretation were true. The apostle Paul is authority for saying that "*as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" From this passage it is evident that all who die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ. But if Christ redeems all men from death temporal, spiritual, and eternal(?), then all men will be made temporally, spiritually, and eternally alive. Thus would orthodoxy make Universalists of us all!

In this connection, it is quite pertinent to inquire whether Christ suffered the *same sort of death* as that denounced against Adam. That Christ *did* bear the curse of the law to which we are liable, seems evident from the language of Paul to the Galatians: "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree.*" (Gal. 3 : 4.) As a personally innocent

being it is unreasonable to suppose that he suffered a different kind of death from that involved in the original sentence. It would be considered little short of blasphemy to say that the sinless Jesus suffered spiritual death, or was condemned to an eternal death. The curse of the law which Christ bore, then, was literal death.

The whole doctrine of a future life is based upon the truth of the gospel declaration that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried; and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. 15 : 3, 4.) If, then, the orthodox exposition of the Adamic penalty be correct, the glorious plan of redemption can never be carried into effect. It must therefore be untrue.

Another most decisive evidence that literal death alone was the curse of the law, occurs in the epistle to the Romans, where Paul says:

"Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and DEATH by sin; and so DEATH passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless, DEATH reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that is to come.)" (Rom. 5 : 12-14.)

In the verses included in the parenthesis, the apostle shows that it was not the entrance of the Mosaic law that brought death as the penalty of sin into world for the first time; and this he does

by alluding to the fact that death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over the personally innocent. But as death entered the world by sin, and as sin is not imputed when there is no law, there must have been some law reigning from Adam to Moses, that consigned personally sinless beings to death through the imputation of Adam's transgression.

In v. 14 the apostle declares that *death* reigned from Adam to Moses over the personally guiltless; and in v. 12 he speaks of Adam's *death* as the result of sin, and of the *death* that in consequence thereof passed upon all men. The argument, then, is this: It must be admitted that by the term *death* in v. 14

the apostle intends no other than literal death, without any reference to a future state of endless misery for the soul. For if we deny that this is the meaning of the word in this place, we must accept the truly intolerable doctrine that the souls of sinless human beings, of infants and of idiots, from Adam to Moses, went at death to a state of endless misery. But if such an interpretation be repugnant alike to reason and revelation, and an outrage upon the moral character of God, it follows, that it cannot be true; and that as a consequence the term *death* in v. 12 must be likewise interpreted to mean a literal decease of the whole man. It is incredible that the apostle changed the signification of the same word, when used in the same connection; for such a principle would unsettle every doctrine of the Bible.

If this conclusion be just, it follows that the Adamic penalty was literal death and nothing else.

The fact that Christ "tasted *death* for every man," and that he suffered the same kind of death that was denounced against Adam, is a most convincing proof that the curse of the law was literal death, or a cessation of vital existence.

It is sometimes said that if Adam had but a mortal nature, he was created to die, and a threat of *death* as a *punishment* in such a case would have been but an idle menace. To this it may be replied, that if Adam had been by creation *immortal*, then *death* could not have been inflicted upon him, since he would have been a *deathless* being. It should be borne in mind that the Scriptures nowhere teach that Adam *was created to die, or that he was created to live forever*. The duration of his existence depended upon his own conduct. He was placed in the garden under a definitely expressed law, in order that he might develop a moral character by the test of obedience. Nothing could be plainer. Obedience meant *life*; disobedience meant *death*. From the moment that Adam entered the garden of Eden, he became a candidate for immortality, and was therefore raised above the condition of *absolute mortality*. Outside of Eden, Adam was a mortal creature. Inside of Eden, and before the fatal act of disobedience, he was a probationer for endless life, and therefore *conditionally immortal*.

Death, to one who *might have been forever exempt*

from its power, was, therefore, not an idle threat, but a most fearful *punishment*. This explanation appears to be consistent, and in harmony with Scripture. Let us glance at some of the inconsistencies of the popular exposition. If Adam was created immortal, what was to have been the reward of his obedience in Eden? Not *life*, certainly, for he had that in himself. Not *happiness*, surely, for he was already happy, at least we have no intimation that he was *unhappy*.

If Adam was naturally immortal, and had life in himself, of what use was the *tree of life*? To this it is generally replied that it was useful as a medicine for preserving the *mortal* part of Adam's nature from decay. But this answer begs the whole question by assuming that Adam was *partly* mortal and *partly* immortal—a most incongruous compound certainly. Search the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation, from Moses to John, and not the slightest trace of any such doctrine can be found. It has its origin and finds its support not in the Bible, but in the metaphysical refinements of a Pagan philosophy. According to the popular theory, the tree of life, instead of being a blessing, was an unmitigated curse. For its only use was to preserve what in popular language is called a "prison," a "vile tenement," etc.

The reason assigned for the expulsion of Adam from the garden of Eden is unintelligible on the hypothesis that he was already immortal. Adam,

after his transgression, was driven out of Paradise, lest he should "put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, *and live forever.*" So long as Adam was in the garden and had access to the tree of life, he was secure in an artificial immortality, and exempt from the contingencies of his mortal nature. But by incurring the penalty of the law, he forfeited his right to immortality, and of consequence to its *pledge*, the TREE OF LIFE. Adam, by transgression, became a sinner; and that he might not become an *immortal sinner*, the Lord drove him out of Paradise, and "placed at the east of the Garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." This impressive lesson can never be made to teach the doctrine of man's natural immortality.

The same conclusion is expressed in these words of Jeremy Taylor:

"Whatsoever had a beginning can also have an ending, and it shall die, unless it be daily watered from the streams flowing from the fountain of life, and refreshed with the dew of heaven, and the wells of God; and, therefore, God had prepared a tree in Paradise to have supported Adam in his artificial immortality. *Immortality was not in his nature*, but in the hands and parts, in the favor and super-additions of God."

Abp. Whately says:

"That man was originally created of an immortal nature, and that our first parents would have been exempt from death but for a change introduced into their nature at the fall, is by some persons taken for granted very hastily. The Scripture account in Genesis rather implies the contrary, namely: that

they were to be preserved from death by the continual use of a certain medicine (as it may be called) appointed for that purpose—the fruit of ‘the Tree of Life:’ for we are told that man was driven out of Eden, ‘lest he should put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.’”¹

Another most convincing proof of man’s mortality occurs in the remarkable language of the sentence pronounced upon Adam. “In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, till *thou* return unto the ground; for out of it wast *thou* taken: for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return.” (Gen. 3 : 19.) This inspired commentary, so clear and concise, renders perfectly plain the meaning of the Adamic penalty. It is obvious that the language of the sentence implies neither more nor less than this, namely: that Adam, *man of earth*, was to return to the dust, from which *he* was taken, and be thereby deprived of all vital and conscious existence.

It is incredible that these words of definite import convey the meaning so fondly placed upon them by the orthodox doctors. I appeal to the candid reader if there be anything in the language used, that would naturally suggest the idea of “death temporal, *spiritual*, and ETERNAL.”

Benson, a well-known orthodox commentator, paraphrases Gen. 3 : 19 thus: “Thy body shall be forsaken by thy soul, and become itself a lump of dust.” There could be no serious objection to this, if by the word “soul” nothing more was meant than

¹ *Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, p. 3.

“the breath or spirit of life;” for then it would agree with Solomon’s assertion, “Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” (Eccl. 12 : 7.) But there are great and insuperable objections to such a paraphrase, if by the word “soul” is meant a conscious and immortal entity; for there is not one word of Scripture to support such a monstrous construction.

The candid disputant will allow that the words, “Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return,” express both the *nature* of Adam and his *destiny*. The Mosaic record assures us that Adam died. (Gen. 5 : 5.) The conclusion then is inevitable, that our great ancestor was, as his name signified, a man of earth, a wholly material and mortal creature, who at death returned to the dust, the element from which he was taken.

Let us now go further, and expose the popular fallacy that man is partly mortal and partly immortal. What is meant by the expression “Adam died?” Was it his soul that died? “No,” says the immaterialist; “that was impossible, for his soul was deathless; and we have besides the authority of Prof. Longfellow for saying—

“Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not spoken of the soul.”

Was it his body that died? Yes. But how can that be said to die which never had any life of itself?

Again: What does the appellation Adam, or man, include? The orthodox answer is that it includes a human being composed of two *essential* constituent parts, viz: a material body and an immaterial soul.¹ Very well! then the expression "Adam died" would indicate that the whole man—as "a human being composed of two essential constituent parts, viz: a material body and an immaterial soul"—*died*, or ceased to have a vital existence.

This conclusion is inevitable, unless the immaterialist chooses to rest his position on the assertion that the expression "Adam died" had reference only to the decease of Adam's body. But this interpretation would likewise be fatal to his theory of man's natural immortality. For how unutterably absurd it would be to say that although the *material Adam died* at the age of nine hundred and thirty years, the *immaterial Adam* is living yet, and is destined to live forever!

And then to think of the orthodox definition of *eternal death*—*eternal life* in misery! Is it not incredible that the same conscious individual, who in Eden six thousand years ago listened to the words, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," is now undergoing the punishment to which that sentence consigned him, in some fearful abode of endless misery?

¹ Some immaterialists say that man is a triune being, composed of body, soul, and spirit. The "Double Substance Theory," however, is the most popular.

When we speak to a person calling him by name, or when we address him by the use of a personal pronoun, as *you* or *thou*, we invariably include in these designations the whole man as an intelligent individual. *This rule is universal, and has no exceptions.*

The Lord said to Adam: "In the sweat of thy face shalt THOU eat bread, till THOU return unto the ground; for out of it wast THOU taken: for dust THOU art, and unto dust shalt THOU return." In this passage the personal pronoun "thou" is five times used to designate the man Adam as an *intelligent individual*. As such he sinned; and as such *he died*. Nor can this conclusion be fairly avoided. It will not do to say that the word "thou" refers to the body, as an instrument of the soul. For what consistency would there be in saying that "thou" in Gen. 3 : 19 refers to the *body*, and that the *same* word in Luke 23 : 43 refers to the *soul*?

Besides, what is more evident than anything else is that the Lord did not address an unconscious *body*, but a conscious and intelligent *man*. Whoever or whatever was addressed, *the same died*. According to the popular notion the soul is the only part of man that possesses intelligence. The conclusion then is unavoidable, that it was the "soul" that was addressed as "thou" and sentenced to return to dust. Hence, the soul must not only be *mortal*, but *material*. It is further evident that whatever or whoever sinned, the same died. Was

it the whole man as a unit that sinned, or was it a fractional part of man? Was it the body that sinned, or was it the soul, or was it both? According to the prevalent belief, Adam's "rational soul" must have been the *real* and *only* sinner; and as such, ceased to have a conscious existence at the age of nine hundred and thirty years. If the body possesses no intelligence, it certainly shares no responsibility. If it be the passive instrument of the "rational soul," and therefore incapable of sinning, wherein lies the justice of punishing it?

According to the orthodox notion, when a wicked man dies, his body crumbles back to dust; but his soul enters a hell of torment, there to remain until the general resurrection, when the body will be raised to become again the residence of the tormented and immortal soul; when to use the expressive language of Charles H. Spurgeon, there will be "twin hells." For says this popular preacher, "it would be unjust to punish the soul and not the body, for the body has had as much to do with sin as ever the soul had."¹

But aside from the manifest *injustice* of punishing an irresponsible agent, I ask *how* can the *body* be punished at all? If, as Mr. Watson says, "it is the soul *only* which perceives pain or pleasure, which suffers or enjoys,"² and if, as D. D. Whedon says, "it is the soul that *hears, feels, tastes, and smells*

¹ *Sermons*, Second Series, p. 273.

² *Institutes*, p. 553.

through its sensorial organs,"¹ it follows that the body is as unconscious and as insensible as the dust of the ground, and cannot, therefore, be the subject of any reward or punishment whatever.

That Adam was wholly a material being, is conclusively proved by the descriptive words of his Creator, "*Dust thou art.*" If we accept the witness, we must accept the testimony. The only element mentioned in the account of the creation of man is "dust of the ground." It has already been proved that the "breath or spirit of life," which caused man to become a "living soul," or a living man, was not itself the man, nor any part of the man, but simply an attribute of *all living* animals. It follows, therefore, that it was Adam as an intelligent individual that was addressed, that sinned, and that died.

According to the popular theology, the decease of the body was, as compared to the impending fate of the soul, but as a drop of water to the mighty ocean, or as a grain of sand to the universe. How then are we to account for the *incontrovertible fact* that *the soul is not once mentioned, or its separate destiny alluded to, either in the announcement of the penalty, or in the sentence itself?* Is it credible that he who best knew, and indeed only knew, what an immortality in suffering involved, should pass by in utter silence that which was essentially *the penalty, and*

¹ Notes on Luke 16 : 19-31.

should direct his exclusive attention to the announcement only of *bodily decease*?

Is it to be believed that the same merciful Judge who in after ages sent his prophets to warn the people against mere temporal calamities, would, in naming the terms of this first and most momentous of human trials, have failed to express in the clearest and most impressive manner the full scope of the penalty threatened? Shall we not rather believe that the Judge of all the earth dealt fairly and justly with Adam; and that as a consequence he did not veil a threat of everlasting misery in the words "*thou shalt surely die*?"

He who truly loves God will delight to honor him. We cannot, however, be true either to ourselves or to our God, if we advocate a doctrine that contradicts not only the essential notions of our own minds, but which stands opposed to the revealed attributes of the Supreme Being.

CHAPTER VII.

TRADUCTION VS. CREATIONISM.

"That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John 3 : 6.)

An examination of the comparative merits of the doctrines of traduction and creationism may serve an important purpose in determining whether man is wholly a material and mortal being, or whether he is partly *immaterial* and *immortal*. The former doctrine supposes the whole man to be generated. The latter supposes the body to be generated and the soul to be immediately created.

The question to be discussed in this chapter may be stated thus: Is the soul transmitted from parents to children, or does it owe its existence to an immediate act of God? This is a fair and legitimate inquiry. If the soul is infinitely more precious than the body; if the invisible man has a different origin from that of the visible, it is certainly important that we should know it. If all our thoughts, affections, and desires; if all our hopes and fears; all our joys and sorrows, emanate from and center in an immaterial soul which alone constitutes our personality, then all information that relates to its origin,

constitution, and destiny must ever possess for us the most transcendent interest.

But where shall we get any satisfactory information on this most important subject? Among Christians there can be but one answer to this question. The Bible contains all we know, or can know, concerning the origin and destiny of the human race. To the teachings, then, of that blessed volume let us give our first and most careful attention, remembering that while we should not attempt to be "wise above that which is written," we *should attempt, and that most earnestly, to be wise up to that which is written.* What then says the record? "On the seventh day God *ended his work* which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." (Gen. 2 : 2.)

It is certain that if the work of creation finally ended on the seventh day of this world's history, that the doctrine of creationism cannot be true, for it supposes that God is daily creating thousands of human souls. Moses, in giving the record of the creation of man, speaks of the formation of a *material* soul, but neither he nor any other *inspired* writer ever mentions the creation of *immaterial*, intangible, or invisible souls. Does not this indisputable fact argue very strongly against the *existence* of any such entities?

It is recorded that God blessed our first parents and said unto them, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it." This passage

proves that God endowed the human race with the power of procreating its kind. Nor was this an exceptional endowment, for it was extended to the lower animals as well as to man. (Gen. 1 : 22.)

“And Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image: and called his name Seth.” (Gen. 5 : 3.)

This passage of itself proves the doctrine of traduction, for the term Seth includes the idea of personality; and if personality only resides in the soul, then the latter must have been transmitted with the body.

After the deluge “God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.” What was meant by this commandment to multiply? Multiply what? Themselves. Of what were “themselves” composed? “Of four bodies and four souls,” says the exact immaterialist. Very well! then Noah and his three sons were commanded to multiply their bodies and their souls. What then becomes of the doctrine of creationism?

The following Scripture testimony very decisively supports the doctrine of traduction:

“These be the sons of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-aram, with his daughter Dinah: *all the souls of his sons and his daughters* were thirty and three.”

“All the *souls* that came with Jacob into Egypt, *which came out of his loins, all the souls* were threescore and six.” (Gen. 46 : 15, 26.)

"All the *souls* that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls." (Ex. 1 : 5.)

The force of these passages cannot be avoided. Souls are transmitted. They are not, therefore, immediately created.

Of Levi it is written: "*He was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.*" (Heb. 7 : 10.)

To Jacob it was said: "Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and *kings shall come out of thy loins.*" (Gen. 35 : 11. See also Gen. 48 : 4; 17 : 20; 8 : 17.)

The Lord said unto Abram: "Thy name shall be called Abraham, for a *father of many nations* have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make *nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.*" (Gen. 17 : 5, 6.)

None of these passages can be reconciled with the doctrine of creationism.

The doctrine of traduction is plainly taught in the words of Jesus to Nicodemus: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." (John 3 : 6.) That this language refers to the descent of the soul as well as to that of the body is admitted by Richard Watson.¹ And this conclusion is fully supported in the remarkable language of the apostle Peter, when speaking on the same subject—the necessity of the new birth:

¹ *Institutes*, p. 362.

"Being born [begotten] again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. *For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass: the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever.*" (1 Pet. 1 : 23, 24.)

If all would but bow to the authority of Inspiration, and submit to be taught by an apostle, this passage would forever set at rest all controversy in regard to the natural immortality of man. It would be difficult to frame a stronger expression for declaring that the whole man is born of *corruptible* seed, and that he is therefore mortal and perishable. For any attempt to evade the force of this passage by asserting that only "the body," in the popular and distinctive sense of that term, is meant by the phrase "all flesh is as grass," would be defeated by the next clause of the same verse: "and *all the glory of man as the flower of grass.*" Surely the expression, "all the glory of man," must include whatever is excellent or valuable in man's nature; and if the mind or soul constitutes the glory of man, or *any part of it*, then most certainly it is mortal; for it is as the flower of grass which falleth away.

Personality is, in Scripture, frequently associated with the use of the term "flesh."

"And the Lord said: My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that *he also is flesh.*" (Gen. 6 : 3.)

"For he remembered that *they were but flesh.*" (Ps. 78 : 39.)

"I will not fear what *flesh* can do unto me." (Ps. 56 : 4.)

"My soul thirsteth for thee, my *flesh* longeth for thee." (Ps. 63 : 1.)

Here is a passage in which the expressions "my soul" and "my flesh" are used to represent the speaker, the *ego* or I.

"Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy *flesh* to sin." (Eccl. 5 : 6.)

In this sentence the word "flesh" represents an intelligent and responsible agent. For "thy *flesh*," read "thyself," thus: "Suffer not thy mouth to cause *thyself* to sin."

"By the deeds of the law there shall no *flesh* be justified." (Rom. 3 : 20.)

"That no *flesh* should glory in his presence." (1 Cor. 1 : 29.)

"The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." (John 1 : 14.)

"God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful *flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." (Rom. 8 : 3.)

"The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John 6 : 51.)

"Christ gave *himself* for our sins." (Gal. 1 : 4.)

"For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our MORTAL FLESH. *So then death worketh in us*, but life in you." (2 Cor. 4 : 11, 12.)

The word "body" is frequently used to represent the *person* or *self*.

"I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

My *substance* [margin, *body*] was not hid from thee when I was made in secret." (Ps. 139 : 14, 15.)

"Not that thy whole *body* should be cast into hell." (Matt. 5 : 29.)

"Even *we ourselves* groan within *ourselves*, waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our *body*." (Rom. 8 : 23.)

"Present your *bodies* a living sacrifice." (Rom. 12 : 1.)

"I keep under my *body*, and bring *it* into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, *I myself* should be a castaway." (1 Cor. 9 : 27.)

Does any one suppose that the word "I" in this passage represents the "rational soul" as a distinct entity from the body? If all the intellectual faculties reside exclusively in the soul, and the body is but its passive instrument, how does it happen that the soul is in danger of becoming a castaway through inability to keep the body in subjection?

"So ought men to love their wives as their own *bodies*." (Eph. 5 : 28.)

"Jonathan loved David as his own *soul*." (1 Sam. 18 : 1.)

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as *thyself*." (Matt. 19 : 19.)

The word "mortal" occurs but five times in the New Testament; and it is worthy of very special attention that in all these places it is descriptive of the nature of man.

"Let not sin therefore reign in your *mortal body*." (Rom. 6 : 12.)

"But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken [make alive] your *mortal bodies* by his Spirit that

dwelleth in you." (Rom. 8 : 11. See also 1 Cor. 15 : 53, 54; 2 Cor. 4 : 11.)

In accordance with this testimony the author of the book of Wisdom says :

"I myself am also a mortal man like to all, and the offspring of him that was first made of the earth." (Wis. 7 : 1.)

Sufficient testimony has now been adduced to conclusively prove that the whole man is *ex traduce*.

The doctrine of traduction has received the support of many eminent men both in ancient and in modern times. In the third century Tertullian, of Carthage, advocated the doctrine that the human soul was propagated, like the body, by ordinary but distinct generation—the soul being begotten by the soul, as the body by the body, of the parent. But "in the following century the Traducianism of Tertullian was opposed by the doctrine that the soul had its creation immediately from God, and was neither propagated by traduction, nor born together with the body, as Lactantius and others supposed. This new theory was denominated Creationism. Origen differed both from Tertullian and the Creationists, and gave it as his opinion that human souls had a pre-existence. By this theory he easily disposed of the objection that what had a beginning could not be inherently immortal. 'Among the primitive Christians,' says Dodwell, 'this doctrine of Origen was taken for very singular, nor did the great authority of the man recommend it to many

among them. They generally condemned it in Plato himself. They generally took it for a maxim, in arguing, that whatever had a beginning could not be necessarily or naturally immortal. On this principle they owned none immortal but God himself—no, not the angels.' ”¹

Says Gibbon:

“Four different opinions have been entertained concerning the origin of human souls: 1. That they are eternal and divine. 2. That they were created in a separate state of existence before their union with the body. 3. That they have been propagated from the original stock of Adam, who contained in himself the mental as well as corporeal seed of his posterity. 4. That each soul is occasionally created and embodied in the moment of conception. The last of these sentiments appears to have prevailed among the moderns, and our spiritual history has grown less sublime, without becoming more intelligible. The idea of pure and absolute spirit is a refinement of modern philosophy.”²

Among modern theologians, John Wesley and Richard Watson have favored traduction. The following is an extract from Wesley's *Journal*:

“I read and abridged an old work on the origin of the soul. I never before saw anything on the subject so satisfactory. I think the author proves to a demonstration that God has enabled man, as all other creatures, to propagate his whole species, consisting of soul and body.”³

The testimony of Mr. Watson is equally explicit:

“A question as to the transmission of this corruption of

¹ *Bible vs. Tradition*, App., pp. 296-7.

² Gibbon, vol. IV., pp. 493-4.

³ *Journal*, vol. V., p. 10.

nature from parents to children has been debated among those who, nevertheless, admit the fact; some contending that the soul is *ex traduce*; others, that it is by immediate creation. It is certain that, as to the metaphysical part of this question, we can come to no satisfactory conclusion. The Scriptures, however, appear to be more in favor of traduction. 'Adam begat a son in his own likeness.' 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh,' which refers certainly to the soul as well as to the body. . . . The tenet of the *soul's descent* appears to have most countenance from the language of Scripture, and it is no small confirmation of it, that when God designed to incarnate his own Son, he stepped out of the ordinary course and formed a sinless human nature immediately by the power of the Holy Ghost."¹

It is commonly objected to the doctrine of traduction, that it tends toward materialism. Before this objection has any weight it must be proved that materialism, properly defined, is untrue. For if it be true it cannot be dangerous, except to those who are enlisted in the ranks of error. The question in all minds ought to be: What is truth? If the doctrine of traduction be *true*, its *tendencies* are all right. If it be *false*, its *tendencies* are all wrong, whether toward materialism or not. The doctrine of materialism, as taught in the Bible, needs no defence or apology. Its foundation is as broad, and its principles as enduring, as the book of which it forms an essential part.

There is nothing absurd in the doctrine of traduction, nothing that is opposed to any part of

¹ *Institutes*, pp. 362-3.

Scripture, and nothing that is derogatory to the character of the Supreme Being. Let us now submit the doctrine of creationism to the same test. What is the evidence from Scripture in favor of it? The texts generally relied upon to prove the doctrine are Eccl. 12 : 7; Is. 57 : 16; and Zech. 12 : 1. But these texts no more prove that the soul is immediately created by the Deity than do certain other texts, such for instance as Job 10 : 8-11; Is. 44 : 2; 64 : 8; Jer. 1 : 5; Rom. 9 : 20, prove that the body is formed by the immediate act of God. Besides, the doctrine is opposed to all those passages of Scripture which speak of human souls as being begotten by human parents. There is not a text in the whole Bible that mentions the soul as having a distinct and separate origin from that of the body.

But in addition to the testimony of Scripture, some arguments from reason may be urged against the doctrine of creationism. If the soul be immediately created, we must suppose it to be pure, for who in such a case would dare to call it impure? And is it in accordance with the character of the Divine Being, that he should daily create pure intelligences, and shut them up in vile bodies, that were generated, perhaps in sin? To assert such a thing would be an outrage upon the moral character of God.

And since he is no respecter of persons, is it not reasonable to suppose that the Hottentot would receive just as intelligent a soul as the European?

That the mental faculties are by traduction, is demonstrated by the similarity of intellectual powers and dispositions, transmitted from parents to children.

The doctrine of creationism is absurd in itself, is contradicted by express assertions of Scripture, and is an impeachment of the character of the Supreme Being. It cannot, therefore, be true.

The doctrine entertained by some of the ancients, that the soul was a part of the Deity and therefore eternal; and the doctrine of the creation but pre-existence of souls, are attended by so many obvious and insurmountable difficulties, that we need not stop to refute them here. The doctrine of traduction is the only tenet concerning the origin of human souls that receives the support of Scripture or of reason. The necessary conclusion is that man is mortal. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. Mortality cannot transmit immortality.

"The soul's inheritance,
Its birth-place, and its death-place, is of earth,
Until God maketh earth and soul anew;
The one like heaven, the other like himself."

CHAPTER VIII.

LIFE AND DEATH.

“The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” (Rom. 6 : 23.)

Of all words, none have for the human race so transcendent an interest as those little monosyllables — life and death. They are the terms which are used in Scripture to express the respective future destinies of the righteous and the wicked. To correctly understand their meaning, therefore, is a matter of very great importance. This ought not to be a difficult task. Nor would it be were it not for the interposition of what are called “theological definitions.” There is no difference of opinion among men anywhere concerning the *literal* meaning of the words life and death.

Without attempting a scientific definition of these terms, it will suffice for the present to say, that LIFE means *vital existence*, and that its opposite, DEATH, means the *extinction of life*, or the *cessation of vital existence*.¹ These definitions will be generally ac-

¹ The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas: LIFE stands for the idea of—

1. *Vital existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of

cepted as the true meaning of the words life and death when applied to the lower animals, although they are not commonly allowed when spoken of man. But in popular theology man is regarded as an im-

vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.

2. *Activity of movement or agency*; as "living waters;" "the word of God is quick [living] and powerful;" "quicken thou me in thy way."

3. *Happy existence*; not *happiness* alone, but *happy life*. "In thy favor is life;" "wisdom is a tree of life;" "now I live, if ye stand fast in the Lord."

4. "To be alive in the Spirit" is to be living a spiritual life, in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die" (Rom. 6 : 11), and the "life of God," or godly life. (Eph. 4 : 18.)

But LIFE never seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion*; on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *life* is properly associated in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness*: but that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and, of course, the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life*. "A dead tree;" "a dead lion;" "a dead body."

2. The state of *condemnation to such literal death*. "Thou art but a dead man." (Gen. 20 : 7.)

3. *Danger of death*. "Thanks be to God who hath delivered us from so great a death." So also "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. 5 : 5, is used for a *mortal disease*.

4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies *to cease to be or to live in certain relationships to it*. "Dead to the world"—"to sin"—"to the law." But the phrase "dead to God" never occurs.

5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its *activity and power*; as when it is said "Nabal's heart became dead within him."

6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of

mortal being, and the terms life and death, when applied to him in a future state, are necessarily understood in a figurative sense. Says a distinguished English writer:

“A being who believes he has life already by original creation, in the sense of an unending or immortal existence, is necessitated to understand the promise of life as synonymous with the promise of happiness, and when death is predicated of such a being, it also must be understood in the metaphorical sense of misery, since it is presumed that this native immortality will never be alienated.

“Does not this conversion of the most commonplace terms from their familiar and natural use to a use both unfamiliar and unnatural appear, to say the least, a very singular circumstance? If the language in which the original Scriptures were written could not furnish terms to express the ideas of happiness and misery, then there might be some plausibility for the appropriation of these terms in this arbitrary sense: but the rudest language has its signs for these ideas; and, therefore, there could have been no need, and we should think, too, no reason to set aside the appropriate words, and to employ others in a sense so different from their peculiar signification. Thus employed the words life and death part with their proper and distinctive signification; and one term especially — the term death — is employed in a sense the very opposite of its original and conventional meaning: *death*, according to the popular theory, is made to signify a *life of misery!*

“Now there are grave objections to this figurative use of the *misery*, or of *sinfulness*, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death, which is the wages of sin.

7. The expression *spiritual death*, and the distinction between *temporal* and *eternal death*, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.—*Life in Christ*, by Rev. Edward White.

words life and death. In the first place, we have seen they have a very arbitrary and unnatural meaning forced upon them. And in the second place, the conversion of these words from their proper to a very violent and arbitrary meaning has no authority from nor is it demanded by the written word.

“The Bible, professing to be the teacher of mankind in religion, the most interesting and important of subjects, would, of course, not construct a terminology of its own but make use of the language which the people understood, and employ the terms of such language in their current and conventional meaning; and whenever it was necessary to employ a word different from its customary usage, either the context would make this apparent or there would be some cautionary observation to prevent the possibility of mistake.

“All language is, more or less, figurative; and of all imaginations, the Oriental is the most imaginative; and therefore, it was to be expected that words would not invariably be used in their strict primary signification: but whenever it should be necessary to employ a word in an unusual sense, there would be ample evidence of its new appropriation. Should there be any danger of misunderstanding the sense in which a word is used, especially if upon that word depended important doctrine, then we might expect such a cautionary notice of its new meaning, as is furnished, for example, in the book of Revelation (ch. 11 : 8), where the great city is called Sodom and Egypt, and we are carefully informed that it is so called ‘spiritually.’ [See another example in John 7 : 38, 39; also, Gal. 3 : 23-25.]

“But the words in question have no such admonitory notice, which is the more surprising since such a usage of them, as the Scriptures are alleged to furnish, is contrary to all custom; and being employed to teach very vital doctrines, such an admonition is the more necessary, and to be expected. The fact that the Bible has no inspired glossary or explanation of terms, renders it the more imperative that all its words should be employed according to established usage; and is in itself a tacit

proof that such *is* the sense in which every word is used. I conclude, therefore, that the words life and death, as used in the Bible, are to be understood in the same sense they obtain in ordinary language — that is, except when obvious reasons demand a figurative meaning for them — in their plain, literal, conventional signification — not respectively happiness and misery, but existence and non-existence.”¹

It is plain to all that *life* does not necessarily include the idea of *happiness*; since one may possess life and not happiness. The converse of this, however, is not true. If we possess happiness we must necessarily possess life. Life is the necessary foundation of all positive good. To borrow the language of Abp. Whately:

“It is certain that the words life, eternal life, immortality, etc., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as ‘good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joy of their Lord.’ ‘Life,’ as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean ‘happy’ life. And that theirs will be a happy life we are indeed plainly taught: but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word ‘life’ does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so, indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a ‘happy life;’ and a contradiction to speak of a ‘miserable life,’ which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all ages and countries, ‘life,’ and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied in ordinary discourse to a wretched life no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest, and of the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And

¹ *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, ch. 2.

yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If, therefore, we suppose the hearers of Jesus and his apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible, in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance: 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life.*' 'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not* life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary." ¹

Hiram Mattison, in a recently-published work, says :

"Future *happiness alone* is conditional upon faith in Christ, and *not our future being.* Consequently, the future non-existence of the wicked cannot follow for lack of a vital connection with Christ, by faith in him. He is 'our life' in that he restores the soul to spiritual life by his Spirit, raises our bodies from the dead, and finally crowns the righteous with glory in heaven. But *our immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his name.* We shall exist forever, whether in happiness through faith in Christ and a holy life, or in misery through a life of sin and the rejection of offered mercy through him, the only Savior." ²

In accordance with this statement of orthodoxy, is the assertion of a writer in *The Eclectic Review*

¹*Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, p. 228.

²*Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 63.

for August, 1845; that "the term life, when used descriptively of the future state of the righteous, does not denote existence, but happiness exclusively."¹

Let us proceed at once to try these confident assertions of orthodoxy, by an appeal to the supreme authority of the Scriptures. Fortunately, we have an inspired definition of the term "life," which furnishes the highest and most satisfactory proof that the Holy Spirit dictated the word in its literal sense:

"He asked *life* of thee, and thou gavest it him, ~~even~~ LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER." (Ps. 21 : 4.)

Here we have one of the most explicit phrases for "immortal existence," used to define 'life' [eternal life], and applied to one who asked it of God. Again we read: "His seed shall endure forever." (Ps. 89 : 36.) "With long life will I satisfy him." (Ps. 91 : 16.) It may be said that these passages refer to Christ, and that they cannot, therefore, be used as evidence to show the meaning of the word "life" when applied to the future condition of righteous *men*. This anticipated objection, however, would not prove that these passages are impertinent to the question discussed; for Jesus said to his disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14 : 19.) And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews says: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the ut-

¹ See Dobney, *Future Punishment*, p. 192.

termost that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (ch. 7 : 25.) And again Jesus says, "I give unto my sheep *eternal life*, and they shall never perish." (John 10 : 28.) Will the reader be so kind as to carefully notice the absolute conclusiveness of the above passages? The eternal life promised to the faithful follower of Christ is 'LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER.' How brightly the truth shines when contrasted with error!

Notice the significant contrasts in the following passages:

"The thief cometh not, but for to steal and to kill and to *destroy*; I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." (John 10 : 10.)

"Whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." (John 3 : 16.)

In these passages, if a metaphorical meaning be placed upon the word 'life,' then the contrasted terms 'destroy' and 'perish' must also be metaphorically explained. But where, it may be asked, is the similitude or resemblance between *destruction* and a *life* of endless misery? Life *may* include happiness; but destruction *cannot* include the idea of endless misery.

If, on the other hand, we examine the literal meaning of the words 'destroy' and 'perish,' we shall find that they are directly opposed to the idea of the continuance in being of the object to which they are applied. (The only exceptions to this rule are

found in "theological definitions.") To destroy means to demolish; to ruin; to bring to naught; to annihilate; to kill; to extirpate; to put an end to. Perish; (literally to depart wholly;) to die; to lose life in any manner; to be destroyed; to come to nothing. The apostle Peter, speaking of the final doom of wicked men, says "they shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." (2 Pet. 2:12.) The language here used is so forcible that even Prest. Dwight says: "It cannot be denied that the destruction spoken of in this passage is declared to be absolute, and must be either annihilation or eternal wo." ¹

The apostle Paul, in speaking of the wicked at the second coming of Christ, says: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1:9.) Orthodoxy interprets this passage to mean that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting misery! And when the same apostle says "the wages of sin is *death*," this "tremendous orthodoxy" says, "Not so; for the wages of sin is not literal death, but eternal life in torment!" This shocking perversion of Scripture is directly traceable to the metaphorical sense invariably given by popular theology to the words 'life' and 'death' when applied to the future state of the righteous and wicked of the human race.

Mr. Mattison has a chapter entitled, "Immortal

¹ *Theology*, vol. IV., p. 460.

existence not a result of faith in Christ.”¹ This sentiment is indorsed by the leading Protestant church of America; and not only this church, but all orthodox churches must admit the conclusion, as they accept the premises upon which it is legitimately based. The reader’s special attention is invited to the issue thus fairly joined between orthodoxy and the Bible. What then is the testimony? What saith the faithful Witness?

“If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son.* He that hath the Son HATH LIFE; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” (John 5 : 9–12.)

The phrase “immortal existence” when applied to man means the same as ‘eternal life.’ The full sense of the passage would be preserved if it were read thus: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us an immortal existence, and this existence is in his Son! He that hath the Son hath an immortal existence; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not an immortal existence.”

It is written, “The just shall live by his faith.” (Hab. 2 : 4.) This text is quoted by the apostle Paul in Rom. 1 : 17, and Gal. 3 : 11. It is also

¹ *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, ch. 6.

said, "Without faith it is impossible to please him." (Heb. 11 : 6.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3 : 25.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have *life* through his name." (John 20 : 31.) "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6 : 23.) "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." (John 3 : 36.) These passages conclusively prove that 'eternal life' or immortal existence is a result of faith in Christ.

The same conclusion is reached from considering the distinctive titles given to Christ by the writers of the New Testament. He is called "the Prince of life" (or Author of life, margin) in Acts 3 : 15; "Christ, our Life" in Col. 3 : 4; and in the Syriac version, he is frequently called the "Vivifier" and the "Life-giver."¹ There are many passages of Scripture which support his right to those titles. Jesus himself said: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life." (John 10 : 27, 28.) "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (John 17 : 2.) "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life." (John 4 : 14; see also Ps. 36 : 9.) "To him that

¹In the Syriac version of the New Testament the subject of *life* is made more prominent than in the "authorized English

overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." (Rev. 2 : 7.) Every one of these passages is directly opposed to the notion of man's natural immortality. For it is evident that eternal life is not promised to all men, but to the faithful alone. If all men have an immortal existence guaranteed to them by the deathlessness of their nature, in what sense is Christ called the Life-giver?

The tree of life in Eden was to Adam a pledge of immortality so long as he preserved his innocence. It was not the emblem of "happiness exclusively," but of life in its literal sense of continued existence. So, too, the tree of life in the Paradise of God is the version." This will be noticed in the following passages from Prof. Murdock's translation:

Acts 4 : 12: "There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live.*"

Acts 5 : 31: "Him hath God established as a Head and *Life-giver.*"

Rom. 1 : 16: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to all who believe."

John 12 : 47: "I did not come to judge the world, but to *vivify* the world."

Acts 16 : 31: "Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, *thou wilt have LIFE.*"

Phil. 3 : 20: "Our concern is from heaven; and from thence we expect our *VIVIFIER*, our Lord Jesus Messiah."

Heb. 7 : 25: "And he is able to *vivify* forever them who come to God by him."

2 Tim. 1 : 10: "The appearing of our *Life-giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the Gospel."

2 Tim. 3 : 15: "From thy childhood thou wast taught the holy books, which can make thee wise unto *life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."

2 Tim. 4 : 18: "My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom."

symbol of eternal life or immortal existence. But this magnificent inheritance is only promised "to him that overcometh." The result to Adam of being driven out from the tree of life in Eden was not merely unhappiness, but literal death. In carrying out the analogy, therefore, we cannot suppose that those who are to be excluded from the tree of life in Paradise will be immortal.

That Christ is the bestower of life, in the literal sense of that term, is further evident from his language in John 5 : 21 : "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." To this agrees the language of the apostle Paul: "The last Adam was made a quickening [that is, a life-giving] Spirit." (1 Cor. 15 : 45.) We cannot in this place substitute the metaphorical sense of the word life, by saying that Christ bestows life on whom he will, in the sense of bestowing happiness only; for the subject of both paragraphs is the resurrection or re-enlivening of dead men, and not the conferring of happiness upon those who were already in possession of eternal life.

Let me now pause to ask, In which of the recorded discourses of our Lord or of his apostles shall we find the unconditional immortality of all men affirmed?

And if, for the very best of reasons, this question cannot be answered, let me ask, Where have we any

Scriptural authority for saying that Christ is the bestower of *happiness*, but not of *life*?

No interpretation will take us through the New Testament without manifest absurdities or obvious contradictions, except that which attaches to the phrase eternal life the meaning of *immortal existence*. In support of this assertion, and as further evidence in favor of the literal sense of the word life, some additional passages from the Gospel of John may be adduced, which appear to be fatal to the popular theory. The most prominent feature in the recorded discourses of our Lord is the promise of **EVERLASTING LIFE**. The assertion of the apostle in the opening chapter is most significant. "IN HIM WAS LIFE; and THE LIFE was the light of men." (ch. 1 : 4.) This passage evidently denotes that he who is expressly designated as 'THE LIFE' had the power to impart life to others. The same meaning is seen in the parallel passage (John 5 : 26): "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here life cannot be taken to mean happiness merely, without destroying the congruous signification of the whole passage. The context would not justify the use of the word 'life' as a metaphor. For in the preceding verses our Lord ascribes to himself the power to raise up and give life to the dead; and in ch. 6 : 53, 54 he says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath

eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." How plainly do these passages teach that immortality is conditional; and that the expression 'eternal life' is to be taken in its strictly literal sense of immortal existence!

This conclusion is supported by the language of our Lord in ch. 6 : 57, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." And in ch. 5 : 28, 29 he says: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life*; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Here it is impossible to spiritualize the word 'life' without destroying the sense of the whole passage. The wicked as well as the righteous are to be raised from the graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." The frequent reference in the fifth and sixth chapters to the physical ideas of resurrection from "the graves," and to the privilege of living instead of dying, as the fathers in the wilderness died, shows very decisively that the future 'life' promised is intended in a literal and not in a metaphorical sense.

Our Lord said to the Jews: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man

eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John 6 : 49-51.) "I will raise him up at the last day." (ch. 6 : 40, 44, 54.) Why is reference made to the resurrection of the dead, if the life spoken of as the result of it means only the happiness of beings already immortal? Were there not words enough in the Greek language to properly express such a meaning had it been intended? If so, how are we justified in uniformly giving a figurative turn to words which everywhere else are taken in their literal sense?

Will it be said that the life spoken of includes the resurrection of the body, *and* the happiness of the soul already immortal? What then mean these words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you!*" (John 6 : 53.) Will our orthodox opponents say that the WICKED will not be raised to have an eternal existence in the body? An affirmative answer would end the controversy.

When our Lord represents himself as the "Bread of Life" he plainly intimates thereby that the one great object of his mission was to *give life*. A self-reliant and spiritualistic orthodoxy confidently asserts that the Lord Jesus is not the source of future life to believers; that all men are to have an immortal existence, let their conduct be what it may; that it is not as the bestower of immortality, but of everlasting happiness, that he styles himself the "Bread

of Life." Such a doctrine finds not the slightest support in Scripture, unless it be in Gen. 3 : 4, where the Serpent said to our common mother, "Ye shall not surely die."

The immediate object of the use of bread is to sustain life, not to confer happiness. There are thousands at this very hour who have an abundance of bread, and yet lead a most wretched life. It is not then as the bestower of "happiness exclusively" that Christ is called the Bread of Life, but because the Father has constituted him as the Giver of immortality to all who obey him.

Another very plain instance of the use of the word "life" in its literal sense occurs in the statement of our Lord to Martha, in John 11 : 25, 26: "I am the resurrection and the *life*; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Now the word 'resurrection' in this passage must of necessity be taken in its literal sense. It would therefore be a violation of all just principles of interpretation to say that the word 'life' in this sentence must be taken figuratively. For it is obvious that in the same sense that Christ is 'the resurrection' he is 'the life.' "I am the resurrection *and the life*." To take one of these words literally, and to convert the other into a metaphor, would be a perversion of Scripture to serve a theory. Besides, the context exhibits the sense in which the words were

used. Our Lord teaches that he would raise to life those who had believed in him, but were already dead; while of living believers he asserts they "shall never die;" that is, according to the literal rendering of the Greek, "they shall not die forever." They shall not die in the absolute sense in which the term 'second death' is used, but their death will be a falling asleep in Jesus. ¹

It will not do to spiritualize the words 'life,' and 'he shall live,' 'dead,' and 'shall not die forever;' for there is no question raised either in the text or context about spiritual death and life, nor about happiness and misery.

Once more: in ch. 12 : 25, our Lord in addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast, uses this remarkable language: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

No ingenuity of reasoning can make this passage teach the popular doctrine. It is utterly opposed to the idea that men have eternal life in themselves. For it is plain that a man cannot lose his life and have it at the same time; yet our Lord declares "he that loveth his life *shall* lose it." What is it which a man is here represented as losing? And what is it that he will keep unto life eternal if he hate it in this world? The obvious answer to these

¹ Another exposition makes this promise refer to the living saints at the second coming of Christ. See 1 Thess. 4 : 15 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 21.

questions must carry with it the conviction to every unbiased mind, that Christ is truly the *Life-giver*, in the sense that he gives the priceless boon of IMMORTALITY to all who love and obey him.

The great theme upon which Christ and his apostles delighted to dwell was life, *eternal life*. Well did Peter say unto his Lord, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6 : 68.) An inspired apostle has declared that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." (2 Tim. 1 : 10.) This revelation was brought about by the personal resurrection of Christ, who, afterwards appearing to John in Patmos, says (Rev. 1 : 18): "I am he that *liveth* and was dead; and behold I am *alive* for evermore." When we read this sublime utterance, our hearts are cheered with the hope of life, for we remember that precious promise of the Life-giver, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14 : 19.) He might just as easily have said, "Because I am happy, ye shall be happy also;" but this would not have been the full or radical idea intended. He and his apostles uniformly use the more comprehensive term "life," without which no other good is possible.

But it may be asked, Will not the future life of the redeemed be a happy one? Most assuredly it will; but we do not get this idea from the word life itself, but from those passages of Scripture in which the felicity of those who receive the gift of life is specifically mentioned.

The question at issue is not whether Christ bestows mere existence only, but whether he bestows existence at all. The orthodox position is that he is the bestower of happiness *only*; that men are not dependent upon him for future *life*, as they are naturally immortal, and consequently deathless.

The utter absence of any necessity for substituting the word 'happiness' for 'life,' when the latter term is applied to describe the future state of the righteous, is seen from the following language of Scripture:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2 : 9.) "In thy presence is FULLNESS OF JOY; at thy right hand are PLEASURES FOR EVERMORE. (Ps. 16 : 11.)

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.*" (John 14 : 2, 3.) "We shall ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4 : 17.) "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, YE BLESSED *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25 : 34.)

"*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power.*" (Rev. 20 : 6.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, *and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be NO MORE DEATH, neither*

sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21 : 3, 4.)

What a magnificent destiny awaits the faithful follower of Christ! To be forever with the Lord; to share in the pure pleasures of the angels; to be forever free from all pain and sorrow; to be assured that perfect peace will never be disturbed by the corroding cares of mortal life—all this will be inexpressibly glorious!

If a righteous man has even in this world, while fully trusting in God, a "peace which passeth all understanding," what pencil can paint, or pen portray the beatific vision which shall unfold to his enraptured gaze, when admitted to the new heavens and the new earth, he beholds the glory of his Redeemer, and is permitted to share in the perpetual pleasures of the Paradise of God? In that bright world, sickness and sorrow, disease and death, will be unknown. There will be no mourners there to weep over the sad ravages of the king of terrors, "for God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be *no more death.*"

This glorious promise made by him whose word is truth, leads to the remark that the Scriptures not only represent Christ as the giver of 'life,' but also as the destroyer of death. Coeval with the entrance of sin into the world was the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise, or *crush*, the serpent's head. And the apostle John says :

“For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.” (1 John 3 : 8.)

The language of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews is still more explicit :

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he *might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*” (ch. 2 : 14.)

“He will swallow up *death* in victory.” (Is. 25 : 8.)

“*The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*” (1 Cor. 15 : 26.)

“And death and *hadcs* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.” (Rev. 20 : 14.)

Only one question remains: What is meant by the expression ‘death shall be destroyed?’ The ‘second death’ is, in the orthodox vocabulary, called “eternal death,” and is defined to be “the death that never dies.” Hence the expression is spiritualized to read, “the last enemy that shall be endlessly preserved is death.” But how contrary would such an interpretation be to reason as well as to revelation! Who does not know that death will never be destroyed so long as he has *living victims* to prey upon? We can never understand what is meant by death being the last enemy that shall be destroyed so long as we define eternal *death* to mean eternal life in misery. When death “is swallowed up in victory,” and “*mortality* is swallowed up of LIFE,” then *will death be destroyed*. Then “the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment, and

misery shall pass away, and the long-suffering shall have an end." (2 Esd. 7 : 33.)

The orthodox interpretation of the words 'life' and 'death' is an outrage upon human reason, and a reflection upon the character of God. It deprives our glorious Redeemer of the honor of dispensing immortality to his faithful subjects; and disguises under the sentence of death a life of interminable wo. So long as men feel that they are already immortal, so long will they be unable to realize the great central fact of the Gospel, that Christ is the *Life-giver*, and that he is coming the second time to confer immortality upon all who truly love and obey him.

Why is it that the doctrine of Christ's second advent is so unpopular among modern Christians? Is it not because they fail to realize the great object of his coming? Orthodoxy confidently proclaims that "death is the Prince of peace," and the usher of the happy soul to the realms of glory. It is plain that if Christians believe that they shall go to Christ in heaven when they die, they will not expect him to come to earth again, unless it be in a spiritual manner. Christ said, "I am come that ye might have *life*." And again, "Ye will not come to ME that ye might have LIFE." But orthodoxy only seems to hear that other voice, "Ye shall not surely die;" and turns away with the virtual response: "We already have *life*, IMMORTAL LIFE. We will

accept *happiness* at thy hands, but we have all the *life* that we need."

The language of Scripture is, " *When Christ who is our life shall appear then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*" Our Lord taught his disciples that he would come to *them*, not that they should go to him.

The hour is surely coming, nor can it be far distant, when he who is the Resurrection and the Life will come to bestow the priceless pearl of immortality upon all who have sought for it by patient continuance in well doing. (Rom. 2 : 6, 7.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35 : 10.)

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE.

The light of revelation, it should be remembered, is not opposite to the light of reason; the former pre-supposes the latter; they are both emanations from the same source; and the discoveries of the Bible, however supernatural, are addressed to the understanding, the only medium of information whether human or divine. Revealed religion is not a cloud that overshadows reason: it is a superior illumination designed to perfect its exercise, and supply its deficiencies.—*Robert Hall.*

Having in the last chapter shown the Scriptural meaning of the words life and death, I purpose in this to adduce some general testimony relative to man's mortality.

In the seventh chapter of Genesis the Lord is represented as using the following language:

"I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and every living substance that I have made will I destroy [margin, *blot out*] from off the face of the earth. . . . And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the earth, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." (Gen. 7 : 4, 23.)

Here is a passage that completely overthrows the popular notion of man's immortality. No metaphysical refinement, no subtlety of logic, no ingenuity of reasoning can evade the force, or narrow

the scope of the words "EVERY LIVING SUBSTANCE WAS DESTROYED." This language is not metaphysical, allegorical, symbolical, or figurative; but forms part of a plain historical statement, and the words used must be taken in their literal sense.

There are numerous passages of Scripture that speak of the death of men, of their being 'slain,' 'killed,' or 'destroyed;' but when such texts are quoted to prove that man is mortal, the common objection is, that they prove only that the *body* is mortal, and that nothing is said of the *soul*, which is *assumed* to be immortal, and therefore deathless. Thus by the pernicious practice of *assuming* that the soul as the human personality is immortal, some of the plainest passages of Scripture are perverted from their true and obvious meaning, so as not to contradict the serpentine theology which declares to mortal man, "Ye shall *not* surely die."

But Moses has given us a passage that no ingenuity can torture into a corroboration of the serpent's assertion of man's immortality. It will not do to say that the bodies only of the antediluvians were destroyed, and that their souls as conscious entities lived on, are living yet, and are destined to live forever. The language of inspiration is, "*Every LIVING SUBSTANCE was destroyed.*" All immaterialists claim that the "rational soul" (as distinct from the body) is a 'living substance.' They must therefore — if they bow to the authority of Scripture — admit

that the "rational souls" of the antediluvians were "destroyed."

The argument would seem to be complete, so far as the authority of this passage is concerned, were it not for the disputed meaning of the word *destroyed*. When everything else fails, orthodoxy intrenches itself behind a bundle of arbitrary and *spiritualized* definitions, and brands as infidel or heterodox all who have the boldness to question the correctness of its expositions. The system of theology that invents the phrase "eternal death," and then defines it to mean *everlasting life* in torment, does not scruple to serve a purpose by saying that *destruction* means *preservation* in misery. When the Scripture says: "All the wicked will [God] *destroy*," the merciless doctors say: "All the wicked will he *preserve* in order to torment them forever."¹ But surely nobody, not even an orthodox immaterialist, would be so reckless of consequences as to place such a construction upon the word "destrcyed" in Gen. 7 : 23. For the language of Moses is, "every *living substance was destroyed, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven.*" This is a plain announcement that man shared the same fate as the cattle, the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven. We have precisely as much reason

¹ In vindication of this seemingly harsh remark, see Edwards on Future Punishment. (*Works*, vol. II., pp. 209, 880-883.) See also notes of Whedon, Clarke, Benson, Scott, Barnes, and others on Matt. 25 : 46 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 9 ; Mark 9 : 43-47 ; and Luke 16 : 19-31.

for supposing—from the language here used—that *man* literally *died*; that is, *ceased to have a vital existence*, that we have for supposing that the *cattle* literally died or ceased to have a vital existence.

But we are not left in doubt as to the meaning that the inspired writer attaches to the word “destroyed,” for, after saying that “both man and cattle were destroyed from the earth,” he adds, “*and Noah only remained ALIVE, and they that were with him in the ark.*” The twenty-second verse also expresses the meaning very clearly. “All in whose nostrils was the breath of life [margin, breath of the spirit of life], of all that was in the dry land *died.*” To *destroy a living substance*, then, means to deprive it of *life* or vital existence. Nobody, I presume, will claim that man now is constitutionally different from what he was before the flood; and so we are forced to conclude that all men are naturally mortal, and that immortality is the gift of God to those only who seek for it by patient continuance in well doing. (Rom. 2 : 7.)

The doctrine of man’s mortality is taught in Scripture by express assertions. In Job 4 : 17, the question is asked, “Shall MORTAL MAN be more just than God?” The word *enosh*, translated “mortal man” in this passage, first occurs in the Bible in Gen. 4 : 26, where it is used as a proper name. “And to Seth to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos [*Enosh*]: then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.” Here we find

that a grandson of Adam was given a name denoting the mortality of his nature; and attached to this is the significant declaration: "then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." As if men so soon as they became convinced of their mortality, felt the need of reliance upon the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality." It is natural and proper that the weak should rely upon the strong; and that the mortal should trust in the immortal; but if men were already immortal their future existence would be as endless as that of the Deity, and the numerous contrasts, expressions, and figures denoting the mortality of man would be utterly unmeaning and pointless.

When men became convinced that they were mortal, they began to call upon the name of the Lord. Our first parents, after their expulsion from Eden and its Tree of Life, knew very well that they were mortal, and destined, in accordance with the curse pronounced, to return unto the dust, from which they were taken. In accordance then with the custom of giving children names significant of the circumstances in which they lived or were surrounded, Seth named his son Enos, or *Enosh*, which signified that he was mortal.

In Job 7 : 1, 17; 9 : 2; 10 ; 4, 5; 13 : 9; and 14 : 19, the word *enosh* is simply rendered 'man,' either because the translators thought it unnecessary to prefix the word "mortal," or because such a

translation would be embarrassing to the popular doctrine of man's immortality.

This use of the term is seen in Job 9 : 2, "How should man [*enosh*] be just with God?" Still more in point is a passage in the tenth chapter, where Job, in addressing God, says: "Are thy days as the days of *man* [*enosh*]?" Here man is not only spoken of as mortal, but his mortality is contrasted with God's immortality.¹

Another express assertion of man's mortality occurs in 2 Chron. 14 : 11, where Asa, king of Judah, in imploring Divine assistance against Zerah the Ethiopian, says: "O Lord, thou art our God; let not MORTAL MAN [margin] prevail against thee."

Thus we have in our common English version of the Bible two direct and positive assertions that *man is mortal*. This ought to decide the whole controversy; for there is not the slightest authority in Scripture for saying that man, or any part of man, is *immortal*.

The evasion that is often resorted to of saying that the body only was meant by the expression "mortal man" will not answer; for what sense would there be in the question, "Shall man's *mortal body* be more just than God?" or in the adjuration: "Let not man's *mortal body* prevail against thee?" Are *justice* and *purity* qualities of the body? or of the "rational soul?" Is it not plain that to be just or unjust requires intelligence, and that it was the

¹ See Clarke's note on Job 10 : 5. Also, 1 Chron. 29 : 15.

whole man as an intelligent being that was designated as *mortal*?

The language of King David in Ps. 9 : 19, 20 is very significant: "Arise, O Lord; let not man [*enosh*] prevail; let the heathen be judged in thy sight. Put them in fear, O Lord; that the nations may know themselves to be but men [*anosheem*, plural of *enosh*]." If this were read according to the orthodox construction, the absurdity would be apparent: "Let not *immortal* man prevail;" "Put them in fear, that the nations may know themselves to be but *immortal* men." Every candid reader must admit that this is not the sense of the passage.

The writers of the Bible, moved by the Holy Spirit, have made use of the most lively images of mortality to impress upon us the great fact that we are but mortal, and can have no future life except through Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life. Well did David say:

"Lord, make me to know my end, and the measure of my days, that I may know how *frail* I am. Behold, thou hast made *my days as a hand-breadth*; and mine age is as nothing before thee; verily *every man at his best state is altogether vanity*." (Ps. 39 : 4, 5.)

"Lord, what is man that thou takest knowledge of him! or the son of man that thou makest account of him! *Man is like to vanity; his days are like a shadow that passeth away*." (Ps. 144 : 3, 4.)

It is important to notice that man in the Scriptures is never compared to anything that is perma-

ment or enduring, but on the contrary is likened to things the most perishable and transitory. How expressive is the language of Job:

"Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow and CONTINUETH NOT!" (ch. 14: 1, 2.)

Of a like import are the words of David, and of Isaiah:

"My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass." (Ps. 102: 11.)

"As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field so he flourisheth." (Ps. 103: 15.)

"What art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?" (Is. 51: 12.)

It would be difficult to frame words more strongly expressive of man's mortality; yet with popular theologians the words of Plato appear to have more weight than those of Isaiah; for notwithstanding the emphatic assertion of the prophet that man is subject to death and decay, they believe with the philosopher, that all men are immortal. Yet if man be immortal, what mean such similes as these?

"All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever." (Is. 40: 6, 8. This is similar to the language of Peter which was noticed in a preceding chapter.) *"All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass."* (1 Pet. 1: 24.)

These passages so plainly teach that man is mor-

tal, that even orthodox expositors do not feel at liberty to entirely ignore the doctrine. Albert Barnes has this note on Is. 40 : 6 :

“The words ‘all flesh’ evidently mean all men ; the expression does not refer particularly to the Jews in Babylon or to any single nation or class of people ; but to all men, in all places, and at all times. All princes, nobles, and monarchs ; all armies and magistrates are feeble, like grass, and will soon pass away. . . . The word ‘thereof’ refers to ‘all flesh,’ and the passage means *that all in man that renders him comely or vigorous is like the flower of the field. His vigor is soon gone ; his beauty fades ; his wisdom ceases ; and he falls like a flower to the dust.*”

This language is in accordance with the Psalmist, when he says :

“Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, *he returneth to his earth ; in that very day his thoughts perish.*” (Ps. 146 : 3, 4.)

This passage has occasioned orthodox commentators much trouble. If we accept Dr. Dwight’s definition of the soul as a ‘*thinking substance*’ and immortal, we must conclude that man’s thoughts do not perish in the very day that his breath goeth forth, but that they are imperishable and immortal. Adam Clarke, in his note on this passage, says :

“His existence depends, under God, on the air he breathes. When he ceases to respire *he ceases to live.* His body from that moment begins to claim its affinity to the earth ; *and all his thoughts, purposes, and projects, whether good or evil, come to nought and perish.*”

This admission amounts to a surrender of the whole claim for man's immortality. For certainly if *man's existence* depends merely on the air he breathes; and if when he ceases to respire *he ceases to live*, and all his *thoughts perish*; then most certainly *man* is but mortal.

The reason that David assigns for not trusting in man, however high his station, is that he is mortal, and that death, by depriving him of all intelligence, renders him helpless. Not less conclusive are the words of the apostle Paul. In his second letter to the Corinthians he says:

'We had the sentence of death in ourselves that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead.' (ch. 2 : 9.)

This passage is expressly fatal to the popular notion of man's immortality. The *self* or personality is under sentence of death. Death is the cessation of vital existence. We have this sentence of death in *ourselves*. It is the *self* that dies. Whatever constitutes man an individual or person ceases to have a conscious existence. Interpreted according to the popular theory, this passage would be meaningless or absurd. For if at death the *self* as a conscious entity goes to a place of happiness, and its prison-house returns to dust, why should we trust in God who will only raise our bodies for *ourselves* to be re-imprisoned in? It is because we are mortal, and because our future *existence* depends upon our being raised from the dead, that we should trust in

God, who is able to raise us up and make us immortal in the world to come.

We are now prepared to consider another assertion of orthodoxy, viz: "The immortality of the soul is a fundamental article of revealed religion"¹

The word *immortal* occurs but once in our common version, namely: 1 Tim. 1: 17, where it is applied not to man but to God:

"Now unto the King, eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever."

But more than this, it is expressly said in 1 Tim. 6: 15, 16, that the King of kings and Lord of lords *only* hath immortality. In Rom. 2: 7, eternal life is promised to them who *seek for immortality* by patient continuance in well doing. The question may be fairly asked: Why are men invited to *seek* for immortality if they are already in possession of it? Nowhere in the Bible are there any expressions denoting immortality or deathlessness applied to man in this state of existence; and the righteous alone are promised it in the world to come. If the immortality of the soul were a 'fundamental article of *revealed* religion,' the doctrine would be taught in the Bible.

Now what are the facts?

And here I may be permitted to give an extract from the pen of H. L. Hastings, who has written much and well on the subject of immortality. In

¹ Robinson's *Calmet*; Art., *Soul*.

addressing the reader, who is supposed to be an opposer of the doctrine advocated, he says:

“You may have looked long and carefully for such words as ‘immortal soul,’ ‘deathless spirit,’ and ‘never-dying soul.’ You may have sought for them in the Bible, in Hebrew, Greek, or English. You may have searched from Genesis to Revelation, and yet you have *never found such words there*. Still, you may have found something which to your mind is conclusive. If so, *let us hear it*. But remember and *be kind*. Do not call us infidels for not believing that all men have *immortality* when you cannot produce one passage that declares it in the whole Bible, and do not lay claim to Christianity on the ground of your believing in the doctrine, for many *infidels* as well as *heathen* believed and *are believing it to-day*. Do not call us evil names and thus avoid investigation. Walk up to the matter like a *man*. Prove that *all men have immortality*, when Paul says God ‘only hath’ it, and we will hear with candor what you have to say. Let your arguments be *manly and Christian* in their character, let them be *positive declarations of God’s holy word*, and you need not fear but that the truth will be manifest.

“This matter must be decided by *argument* and by *Scripture*. Quotations from *Plato* will do for *heathen*, but Christians would prefer to learn of *Paul*. Plato taught that *all souls* were possessed of *immortality*. Paul taught that God *only* had it. *Which do you believe?* For my part I prefer ‘Pauline Theology’ to ‘Platonic Philosophy.’ We do not want your reasonings and inferences aside from the word of God. We want the *facts*. *Shall we have them?*

“The Hebrew word *nephesh* [soul] occurs in the Old Testament SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THREE TIMES. The corresponding Greek word *psuche* [soul] occurs in the New Testament ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE TIMES. Add to these *two other places* in the Old Testament where the word soul occurs, and where it is translated from *other Hebrew words*, and we have

the word *soul* occurring in the original Scriptures EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY TIMES.

"Here then is the *place* to inquire about its *immortality*, and here I have inquired by examining *every one* of these passages for myself. Now I ask *you* to do the same, and if you can find anywhere in the Scriptures the expression 'immortal soul,' or 'never-dying soul' used *one SINGLE TIME*, I will give up the argument *at once*. Is *this* too much to ask? If God has written a book, giving all needful information with regard to man's *origin, history, condition, and destiny*, and if man's soul is *immortal*, and is destined to exist as long as God exists, have not we a *right to expect*, not merely a *hint*, but a *plain and positive statement* of the fact? Will you *find* such a *statement*, or will you turn away with contempt? 'Being defamed' as infidels and heretics, 'we entreat' *you* who are *learned and wise* to find for us these Scriptures which our diligent search has never enabled us to discover.

"The word *ruach* [spirit] occurs in the Old Testament THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVEN TIMES. The corresponding Greek word *pneuma* may be found in the New Testament THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIX TIMES; and yet among all these SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THREE instances, there is not *one* such phrase as 'immortal spirit,' 'undying spirit,' or 'never-dying spirit.' Here then are *the facts* in the case. The words *soul* and *spirit* occur in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures SIXTEEN HUNDRED TIMES, and the words 'immortal soul' or 'immortal spirit' occur in the Scriptures in *Hebrew, Greek, or English* NOT ONCE.

"These are facts that have a bearing on this question. They are to stand as *facts* till *disproved*. If you feel as much interest in the question as I have felt, you will examine them for yourself. And when you have done this thoroughly, I hope to see the result of your investigations in support of the grand truth that God 'only hath immortality.'

"*Are these things so?* This question may often arise in the mind of the reader. I reply, *search and see*. I would not

believe upon the testimony of others, neither do I ask *you* to. Take your Bible and search it, and under the guidance of him who is the 'way,' you may hope to arrive at the 'truth' here, and have the *life* hereafter."¹

It is a fact obvious to all who read the Bible, that it contains no direct assertion of the soul's immortality. It has therefore been found convenient to *assume* the doctrine as though it were a self-evident truth. Thus Abp. Tillotson says:

"The immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible."²

Prof. Vinet couples the doctrine with another thus:

"The doctrines of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul are everywhere taken for granted in his [Christ's] words, but never proved."³

The Presbyterian Quarterly, 1860, p. 600:

"The Bible generally assumes the immortality of the soul, as it does the existence of God."

The Boston Review, 1861, p. 446:

"We know that the soul is immortal, as we know there is a God."

If the doctrine of the soul's immortality was regarded as a truth too self-evident to need a place in Revelation, why is it asserted as a part of that Revelation, that Christ brought *life and immortality*

¹ *Pauline Theology*, pp. 68-71.

² *Sermon* 100.

³ *Char. of the Gospel*.

to *light* through the Gospel? Would a self-evident or primary truth need the attestation of such a miracle as the personal resurrection of our Redeemer, to cause it to be believed or understood? Are we at liberty to suppose that Job regarded the doctrine of man's immortality as an *axiom*, when he asked: "*If a man die, shall he live again?*" Did he *assume* that doctrine to be true when he said: "*Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he [the man, not the ghost?]*" Did David take the soul's immortality for *granted*, when in praising the Lord he said: "Thou hast delivered my SOUL from DEATH?" (Ps. 56: 13.) Did Hezekiah regard the immortality of the soul and the existence of God as equally plain and self-evident truths when he said: "Thou hast in love to *my soul* delivered it from the *pit of corruption?*" While the Scriptures plainly speak of God's existence hundreds of times, they speak of the immortality of the soul *not once*. The existence of God may well be called a "fundamental article of revealed religion."

"*He that cometh to God must believe that he is.*" (Heb. 11: 6.) The Bible has no dispute with the atheist. It is only the fool that says in his heart, "There is no God." But where in the Bible is it said "he that would be a Christian must believe that the soul is immortal?"

If we strike from the Bible all those passages that speak of the existence of God, we sadly mar the record, and make it a book without sense or mean-

ing. But if we expunge from the same book all those passages that speak of the immortality of the soul, we leave the book uninjured; with not a single word, syllable, or letter erased therefrom.

So far our argument concerning the soul's immortality has been negative. Let us advance a step by considering the affirmative teachings of Scripture.

"Whatsoever *soul* it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same *soul* will I *destroy* from among his people." (Lev. 23 : 30.)

"The *soul* that doeth ought presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth the Lord; and that *soul* shall be *cut off* from among his people. Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment, *that soul shall utterly be cut off.*" (Num. 15 : 30, 31. See also Gen. 19 : 20.)

"And he took Hazor and smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword *utterly destroying them*; there was not any left to breathe. . . . Every *man* they smote with the edge of the sword, until they had destroyed them, neither left they any to breathe." (Josh. 11 : 11, 14. See ch. 10 : 28, 30, 35.)

"A man is risen to pursue *thee*, and to seek thy *soul*; but the *soul* of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God; and the *souls* of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as out of the middle of a sling. (1 Sam. 25 : 29. See also ch. 24 : 11.)

"He keepeth back his *soul from the pit*. . . . His *soul draweth near unto the grave.*" (Job 33 : 18, 22.)

"Let me [margin, my *soul*] *die the death* of the righteous." (Num. 23 : 10.)

"And Samson said, Let me [margin, my *soul*] *die* with the Philistines." (Judg. 16 : 30.)

"Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in hell." (Ps. 16 : 10; Acts 2 : 27.)

"All they that go down to the dust shall bow before him ; and *none can KEEP ALIVE HIS OWN SOUL.*" (Ps. 22 : 29.)

"Thou hast *brought up my SOUL FROM THE GRAVE* ; thou hast kept *me alive*, that *I* should not go down to the pit." (Ps. 30 : 3.)

"*God will redeem my SOUL from the power of the GRAVE.*" (Ps. 49 : 15.)

"*Thou hast delivered my SOUL FROM DEATH.*" (Ps. 56 : 13.)

"He spared not their *soul from death.*" (Ps. 78 : 50.)

"Thou has delivered my *soul* from the lowest hell [margin, *grave*]." (Ps. 86 : 13.)

"*What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?*" (Ps. 89 : 48.)

"Thou shalt beat him with a rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell [*sheol, the grave*]." (Prov. 23 : 14.)

"And shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, *BOTH SOUL AND BODY.*" (Is. 10 : 18.)

"Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered it from the *pit of corruption.*" (Is. 38 : 17.)

"Incline your ear, and come unto me ; hear, and your *soul shall live.*" (Is. 55 : 3.)

"*I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth ; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made.*" (Is. 57 : 16.)

"*THE SOUL THAT SINNETH, IT SHALL DIE.*" (Ezek. 18 : 4, 20.)

"Fear him who is able to *destroy both soul and body in hell [gehenna].*" (Matt. 10 : 28.)

"He who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall *save a soul from death.*" (Jas. 5 : 20.)

These passages need no comment. I leave the reader to harmonize them if he can with the notion that the soul is a *deathless* being.

CHAPTER X.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

"Man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost,¹ and where is he?" (Job 14: 10.)

To the Christian, indeed, all this doubt would be instantly removed, if he found that *the immortality of the soul, as a disembodied spirit*, were revealed in the Word of God. . . . In fact however, NO SUCH DOCTRINE IS REVEALED TO US; the Christian's hope, as founded on the promises contained in the Gospel, is *the resurrection of the body*.—Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin.

There are several adverse theories entertained among Christians concerning the state of the dead between death and the resurrection. It is the object of this chapter to show which of these is in agreement with the teachings of Scripture.

The first theory is :

That when a good man dies, his soul as a conscious entity goes immediately to heaven, where in the presence of Christ, the holy angels, and spirits of just men made perfect it remains in the most blissful state until the resurrection morning, when it will descend with Christ as one of his saints, and re-enter its former body.

¹The Hebrew word signifies 'to expire,' 'to die.' Wemys translates the passage thus:

"But when man dies, he moulders into dust;

When the mortal expires—where is he?"

"To give up the ghost, is to die, to yield up the breath or spirit; to expire."—Webster.

(184)

The intermediate state of the wicked soul is very different from this. Immediately upon becoming disembodied at death, it goes to hell, where in the society of demons and fallen angels, it remains in a state of hopeless misery until summoned to rejoin its body at the resurrection.

The advocates of this theory rely chiefly for Scriptural support upon the following passages: Eccl. 12: 7; Matt. 22: 32; Luke 23: 43; Matt. 10: 28; Acts 7: 59; Phil. 1: 21-23; Heb. 12: 22, 23; 2 Cor. 5: 1-10; Luke 16: 19-31; Rom. 2: 9; Zech. 14: 5; Jude 14; Rev. 6: 9, 10, 11; 14: 13; 1 Thess. 3: 13.

The second theory is:

That all souls irrespective of character go to *hades*. This 'spirit-world' is divided into two apartments, called *paradise* and *tartarus*. All good souls go to *paradise*; all wicked souls go to *tartarus*. Neither the happiness of the one, nor the misery of the other, is, however, considered perfect, until the reunion of soul and body, when the former will "kindle higher joys in heaven," and the latter will sink to deeper misery in *gehenna*.

The supporters of this doctrine—which may be called conservative orthodox—quote for Scriptural authority the following texts: Luke 16: 19-31; 1 Pet. 3: 18-20; Acts 2: 27; Luke 23: 43.

The third theory is:

That man falls asleep in death, and remains entirely unconscious until awakened by the voice of

the Son of God at the 'last day.' The following Scriptures are usually adduced in favor of this theory: Job 14: 12; Ps. 6: 5; 17: 15; 71: 20; 89: 48; 115: 17; 146: 4; Eccl. 9: 5, 6, 10; Is. 38: 17, 18, 19; Jer. 31: 15-17; Ezek. 37: 1-14; Is. 26: 19; Dan. 12: 2; Hos. 13: 14; John 5: 28, 29; Acts 2: 29, 34; 13: 36; 1 Cor. 15; Rom. 8: 11; Phil. 3: 20, 21; Col. 3: 4; 1 Thess 4: 13-18; 2 Tim. 4: 1, 8; Heb. 11: 39, 40; Rev. 11: 18.

The first two theories are founded upon the immortality of the soul; the last is based upon the mortality of the entire man. The first renders unnecessary the resurrection of the dead; the second greatly diminishes its importance; while the third magnifies it by making it our only hope of a future life. The first theory, which allows of no detention, is by far the most popular among orthodox Protestants. That I am correct in this, as well as in the statement of the theory itself, will be seen from the following testimonies:

"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 *souls* of the righteous then being 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 into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness reserved to the judgment of the great day."¹

¹ *Prosb. Confession of Faith*, ch. 32, p. 143.

Another church subscribes to the following creed:

"We believe that immediately after death, the righteous will be present with the Lord in glory, and the wicked will sink to hell."¹

Professor Bush says:

"No article of any creed in Christendom is more universally or unhesitatingly held than that each individual enters at death upon an eternal state of retribution."²

Adam Clarke says:

"When a holy man ceases to live among his fellows, his soul becomes an inhabitant of another world, and is joined to the spirits of just men made perfect."³

The same great commentator thus paraphrases Phil. 1: 23:

"If I die I shall go immediately to glory." Again he says: "Heaven is the home of the genuine Christian, and is claimed by him as such. Yet whilst here below, the body is the proper home of the soul, but as the soul is made for eternal glory, that glory is its country, and therefore it is considered as being from its proper home, while below in the body. And it is not heaven merely that they have in view, but the Lord, *without whom, to an immortal spirit possessed of infinite desires, heaven would neither be a home nor a place of rest. . . . We see plainly that the apostle GIVES NO INTIMATION OF AN INTERMEDIATE STATE between being at home in the body and being present with the Lord.*"⁴

Says Thomas Scott:

¹ Baptist Con. of Faith, Art. 10.

² Bush, *On the Soul*, p. 276.

³ Note on Gen. 49: 33.

⁴ Note on 2 Cor. 5: 6.

“If our sins be forgiven and our hearts renewed unto holiness, heaven will be the rest of our souls, whilst our bodies will be secretly hid in the grave.”¹

The most popular of American expositors says :

“Our pious friends that have died are now happy. God is still their God. A father, or mother, or sister, or friend, that may have left us, is there—*there in perfect felicity.*”²

Benson, on Eccl. 12: 7, says:

“The soul of man, so called because of its spiritual nature, shall return unto God, into his presence and before his tribunal, *that it may there be sentenced to its everlasting habitation, either to abide with God forever if approved by him or otherwise to be eternally shut out of his presence and favor.*”

S. C. Bartlett, in a recently published work, says:

“It is taught in the New Testament, that not only the soul of the Christian might, but that it *would*, enter and enjoy the presence of Christ at death; and the continuance of its life here in the body *actually delays its enjoyment of Christ's immediate presence in glory.*”³

Hiram Mattison says:

“We talk of the death of man, because we see the ‘earthly house’ dissolve, *but it is only an illusion.*

“*There is no death; what seems such is transition.*”

The body dies, but the soul survives death. . . . The sainted dead are already before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple; and when Christ shall appear in the clouds of heaven to raise the dead, and burn the world, and judge all men and angels, these ‘saints’ shall attend him down his starry

¹ Practical observations on Job 14.

² Barnes' *Notes and Remarks* on Matt. 22: 32.

³ *Life and Death Eternal*, p. 196.

pathway, to re-enter their bodies, now made incorruptible and glorious, and for the redemption of which they have so long waited."¹

Poetry has lent its charms and endearments to sustain a theory which deifies Death, and makes the king of terrors the honored usher of disembodied souls to the joys of the celestial paradise. Thus Montgomery sings:

“Why mourn the pious dead?
 Why sorrows swell our eyes?
 Can sighs recall the spirit fled?
 Shall vain regrets arise?
 Though death has caused this altered mien,
In heaven the ransomed soul is seen.”

Charles Wesley represents the saints as receiving their crowns, and beginning their reign with Christ immediately after their death:

“When from flesh the spirit, freed,
 Hastens homeward to return,
 Mortals cry, A man is dead!
 Angels sing, A child is born!

“Born into the world above,
 They our happy brother greet,
 Bear him to the throne of love,
 Place him at the Savior's feet.

“Jesus smiles and says, *Well done!*
Good and faithful servant thou!
Enter and receive thy crown,
Reign with me triumphant now.”

Dr. Watts asks:

“Why do we mourn departing friends,
 Or shake at death's alarms?
 'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
 To call them to his arms.”

¹ *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, pp. 26, 35, 36.

Again the Doctor sings :

“Death is the gate of endless joy,
And yet we dread to enter there.”

But these poetical tributes to Death-worship are fairly *crowned* by the intensely orthodox lines of Edward Young :

“Life makes the soul dependent on the dust,
Death gives her wings to mount above the spheres.
Through chinks, styled organs, dim life peeps at light;
Death bursts the involving cloud, and all is day—
All eye, all ear, the disembodied power.”
* * * * *

“Our day of dissolution! name it right,
*'T is our great pay-day; 'tis our harvest rich
And ripe.*”
* * * * *

“DEATH is the CROWN OF LIFE!
Were death denied, poor man would live in vain,
Were death denied, to live would not be life,
Were death denied, even fools would wish to die.
Death wounds to cure; we fall—we rise—we reign!
Spring from our fetters, fasten in the skies,
Where blooming Eden withers in our sight.
DEATH gives us more than was in Eden lost;
The King of terrors is the Prince of peace.”¹

The intermediate state of wicked souls is thus sketched by Jonathan Edwards :

“As soon as ever the soul parts from the body, from that moment the case will be absolutely determined; there will then be an end forever to all hope, to everything that men hang upon in this life; the soul then shall know certainly that it is to be miserable to all eternity, without any remedy. It shall see that God is its enemy; it shall see its Judge clothed in his wrath and vengeance. Then its misery will begin, it will that moment be swallowed up in despair; the great gulf will be fixed between it and happiness, the door of mercy will be

¹ *Night Thoughts*, Night III.

forever shut up, *the irrevocable sentence will be passed*. . . . We may well suppose that when a wicked man dies, his soul is seized by wicked angels: and that they are round his bed ready to seize the miserable soul as soon as it is parted from the body. And with what fierceness and fury do those cruel spirits fly upon their prey; and the soul shall be left in their hands. There shall be no good angels to guard and defend it. God will take no care of it; there is nothing to help it against those cruel spirits that shall lay hold of it, carry it to hell, there to torment it forever! God will leave *it* wholly in their hands, and will give *it* up to their possession when *it comes to die* [?]; and it shall be carried down to hell, to the abode of devils and damned spirits. . . .

“Departed spirits of wicked men are doubtless carried to some particular place in the universe, which God has prepared to be the receptacle of his wicked, rebellious, and miserable subjects; a place where God’s avenging justice shall be glorified; a place built to be the prison where the devils and wicked men are reserved till the day of judgment. . . . And those who go to hell never can escape thence; there they remain imprisoned till the day of judgment, and their torments remain continually. Those wicked men who died many years ago, their souls went to hell, and there they are still; those who went to hell in former ages of the world have been in hell ever since, all the while suffering torment. They have nothing else to spend their time in there, but to suffer torment; *they are kept in being for no other purpose*.” [1]¹

The following lines of Dr. Watts, intended as a description of the sinner’s intermediate state, make wretched poetry, but worse theology; and though a fine specimen of the horribly ridiculous, they fairly represent a part of the orthodox theory:

¹ *Works*, vol. II., pp. 880–883.

* * * * *

"What horrors seize the guilty soul
Upon a dying bed!"

"Lingering about these mortal shores,
She makes a long delay;
Till, like a flood, with rapid force,
Death sweeps the wretch away.

"Then, swift and dreadful, she descends
Down to the fiery coast,
Among abominable fiends,
Herself a frightened ghost.

"There endless crowds of sinners lie,
And darkness makes their chains
Tortured with keen despair, they cry,
Yet wait for fiercer pains.

"Not all their anguish and their blood [!]
For their old guilt atones,
Nor the compassion of a God
Shall hearken to their groans."

From the above quotations the following proposition may be fairly deduced: Judgment is rendered at death; and the soul, if good, is awarded a crown and perfect happiness in heaven; if bad, it is sentenced to suffer endless misery in hell. This theory of the intermediate state—'orthodox' though it may be called—is directly opposed to the teachings of Scripture. The inspired writers uniformly represent judgment as being rendered, not at death, but at the second coming of Christ, "who," says the apostle Paul, "shall judge the quick *and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.*" (2 Tim. 4: 1.) God "hath appointed *a day in the which he will judge the world* in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." (Acts 17: 31.) Peter, speaking of

this day, says: "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against *the day of judgment* and perdition of ungodly men." (2 Pet. 3: 7.)

According to the orthodox theory every day is a judgment-day, in which disembodied human souls are awarded the joys of heaven or the miseries of hell. Our Lord however taught a very different doctrine when he said: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall *judge him* [not his ghost] *in the last day.*" (John 12: 48.) "I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, *they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.*" (Matt. 12: 36.) "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. . . . These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. 25: 31, 32, 46.) "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be *in the end of this world.* The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. *Then shall the*

righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. 13: 40-43.)

The testimony of Paul is in strict accordance with that of the great Teacher. "He that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore *judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come*, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and *then* shall every man have praise of God." (1 Cor. 4: 4, 5.) "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law. . . . *in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.*" (Rom. 2: 12, 16.)

The testimony of John is equally explicit: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven saying, 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever. . . . And the nations were angry and thy wrath is come, and *the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth.'" (Rev. 11: 15, 18.) "And I saw the dead, *small and great*, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which was the book of life: and *the dead were judged* out of those things which

were written in the books, according to their works." (Rev. 20: 12.)

These passages conclusively prove, (1) that there is to be a judgment-day; (2) that this day is to be at the second coming of Christ; (3) that all the living and the dead will *then* be judged. There is not the slightest authority anywhere in Scripture for asserting that the judgment takes place when a man dies, or before the second coming of Christ, or, that it *EVER* will take place upon disembodied and immaterial human beings. If the souls of good men go immediately to heaven, and the souls of the wicked to hell, what need of a general day of judgment to call men to account for their actions.

According to the popular notion the soul is the real saint or sinner, and the body is but its machine or passive instrument. How then can the body be deemed responsible or punishable? And if neither, how can it be judged? But orthodoxy proclaims that the body *is* to be judged together with the soul at the resurrection, that is, part of the man—the *most* essential part is judged at death, and then at the resurrection the "two essential and constituent parts of man" are united and the final judgment takes place! Thus the soul is judged twice and the body once!

It may be denied that the orthodox theory includes the pre-judgment of the soul. But such a denial would be equivalent to a rejection of the whole theory, which is founded upon the notion that

each individual soul enters at death upon an eternal state of retribution.

The absurdity of placing the judgment in the intermediate state is further apparent from considering the words of our Lord respecting a class that shall come to the judgment of the last day: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. 7: 22, 23.) "When once the master of the house is risen up and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are; then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." (Luke 13: 25-28.)

The argument founded on this Scripture is this: Our Lord was addressing a class among the Jews who rejected his teachings, treating both his doctrine and his person with contempt. His words seem to imply that such persons, thinking themselves embraced in the promise as the seed of Abraham,

would come to the judgment of the last day with the expectation of entering the kingdom of God, but finding the door closed, would plead with the Lord for admission, and assign as reasons that they had in his name done many wonderful works, that he had taught in their streets, and that they had eaten in his presence. There would be much disappointment and sorrow when these wicked Jews should see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom, while they themselves were denied admittance. Our Lord does not speak of these persons as disembodied souls. The scene is laid after the resurrection. His words conclusively prove that *many sinners long since dead will not know their final destiny until Christ comes*. Many false professors will appear at the judgment with the expectation of being accepted of Christ; an expectation, however, totally inconsistent with the opinion of Edwards, Benson, and others, that wicked souls *know their final destiny as soon as they are separated from the body*.

It is incredible that disembodied souls, after enduring ages of torment, should, when re-embodied, knock for admission at heaven's door with the expectation of being received therein. What better would this be than the Romish doctrine of Purgatory? "It seems strange," says Abp. Whately, "that a man should first undergo his sentence, and afterwards be brought to trial; should *first* enter upon his reward or punishment and *then*—perhaps

many centuries after—be tried and then judged, and acquitted or condemned.”¹

The Scriptures teach that the righteous will not receive their future reward or any part of it until they are raised from the dead and judged.

“Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.”
(Luke 14 : 14.)

“Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” (Rev. 22 : 12.)

“For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and *then* he shall reward every man according to his works.” (Matt : 16 : 27.)

“When Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory.” (Col. 3 : 4.)

The expressed hope of some of the most eminent of the inspired writers show that they did not expect their reward at death, but looked for it at the coming of Christ to raise the dead. Thus David says: “As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied *when I awake* with thy likeness.” (Ps. 17 : 15.) And the beloved disciple tells us *when* the saints shall have this likeness: “*WHEN he shall appear we shall be like him.*” (1 John 3 : 2.) And Paul tells us when, how, and by whom this likeness shall be wrought: “Our conversation [citizenship] is in heaven; *from whence* also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned *like* unto his glorious body.” (Phil. 3 : 20, 21.)

¹ *Rev. of a Future State*, Lect. IV.

In the beautiful and expressive language of Isaiah, "It shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, WE HAVE WAITED FOR HIM, and he will save us." (Is. 25 : 9.) What day was the prophet speaking of? It was the day of salvation, the resurrection morn, when Christ, who is our *Life*, shall awaken all his sleeping saints, and crown them with eternal life. In that day shall be brought to pass the saying that is written: "Death is swallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15 : 54; Is. 25 : 8.)

Paul did not expect to receive his crown or reward at death, but at the day when his Lord should come to crown and reward all who love his appearing. He says: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me AT THAT DAY; and not to me *only*, but unto ALL them also that love HIS APPEARING." (2 Tim. 4 : 8.) And this is in agreement with the language of Peter: "When the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

The glory that should be revealed *at the last day* was the constant theme for apostolic rejoicing. Thus Paul to the Thessalonians: "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ *at his coming*." (1 Thessa. 2 : 19.)

Notwithstanding the obvious import of such passages, the advocates of the most popular of the orthodox theories insist that at the death of good

men their souls, as conscious entities, are immediately received into heaven. Thus Charles Wesley, so widely known as a writer of religious poetry, represents Jesus as saying to a disembodied soul :

“ Well done !
Good and faithful servant thou !
Enter and receive thy crown,
Reign with me triumphant now.”

Where in the Bible are we told that saints receive their crowns and begin their reign at death? In the hymn-book, and not in the Bible, shall we find such doctrines taught.

Why were the Thessalonians taught by an inspired apostle to *wait* for their Lord *from* heaven, if *they were to go to him in heaven*, eighteen centuries before he was to *come* to them *from* heaven? ¹ Was death the ‘change’ that Job referred to when he said: “All the days of my appointed time will *I wait till my change come?*” (Job 14 : 14.) No candid person can read the context, and answer this question in the affirmative. Paul informs us *when* this change will take place, and in *what* it will consist. (See 1 Cor. 15 : 51–54 ; Phil. 3 : 21.) “The Lord is a God of judgment; blessed are all they *that wait for him.*” (Is. 30 : 18. See also Mic. 7 : 7 ; Is. 64 : 4 ; Jas. 5 : 7, 8 ; 1 John 2 : 28 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 3–8 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 14 ; Rev. 2 : 25.)

The remarkable words of our Lord, recorded in the fourteenth chapter of John, furnish the highest

¹ 1 Thess. 1 : 10 ; 2 Thess. 3 : 5.

authority for saying that the righteous will not enter upon their reward until the return of the Divine Nobleman. It was on the occasion of the last supper with his disciples, and after the traitor Judas had gone out, that our Savior addressed to the faithful eleven these words of priceless value: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. *I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go away I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also.*" (v. 3.) These words we may well suppose gladdened the hearts of the sorrowing disciples, and, though eighteen centuries have elapsed, and the promise has not yet been redeemed, they still furnish the only true foundation for the Christian's hope of future life and happiness. If he come not again, the dead will not be raised; "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

In the same conversation Jesus said: "*Because I live, ye shall live also.*" "AT THAT DAY ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." (John 14 : 19, 20.) What day was this? It was the day when he should return for his waiting saints. *Then* they should live, *because* he lived. How sharply do these words conflict with the teachings of that spiritualistic orthodoxy which declares that "immortal existence is not a result of faith in Christ."¹ Christ did not say, as some modern teach-

¹ See H. Mattison's *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, ch. 6.

ers do, "Ye shall live *because ye have immortal souls;*" but, "*Because I live, ye shall live also.*" They were to know this *at that day, and not at death.* He had said to his disciples: "Whither I go ye cannot come." He taught his disciples that he would come to them, instead of teaching them that they would go to him.

Again, it is to be noticed that the *place* for their reception was not *then* prepared, but that he was going away to *prepare* a place for them, and then he was to come again and receive them unto himself.

According to the prevalent notion, however, there is a place — although a very strange one — already prepared for the saints' reception. Thus it is said:

*"Beyond the bounds of time and space,
Look forward to that heavenly place,
The saints' secure abode."*

Surely none but a mystic doctor, or orthodox poet, would be capable of imagining a 'place' beyond the bounds of 'space.' A spaceless place is about equal to an "immaterial substance;" and would doubtless be a very consistent abode for '*immaterial souls.*'

Jesus said to the Jews: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." (John 8 : 56.) They replied: "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" This question of the Jews possesses much significance. Had they believed that their father Abraham, as a disembodied soul, was in heaven, it would have oc-

occasioned them no surprise that Christ should profess to have seen Abraham, although he were not yet fifty years old, since he had just said to them: "I am from above." "I speak that which I have seen with my Father." (John 8 : 23, 38.)

The Jews had said, "*Abraham is dead, and the prophets are dead.*" They do not seem to have entertained the modern doctrine, that dead men are alive and enjoying the pleasures of paradise, or suffering the torments of *gehenna*. They very naturally expressed their astonishment that a person not yet fifty years old should pretend to have seen Abraham, who had been dead for eighteen centuries. Had it been true that Abraham, as a disembodied soul, was a resident of heaven, our Lord would undoubtedly have answered the Jews' question, "Hast thou seen Abraham?" by assuring them he had seen him in the mansions above.

In this connection, and as bearing directly upon the question under consideration, I would invite very special attention to the triumphant refutation by our Lord of the doctrine of the Sadducees respecting the resurrection of the dead. (Luke 20.)

The Sadducees were partly right, and partly wrong. They were right in saying that Moses taught that man was mortal, but wrong in denying any future existence. The Pharisees were partly right, partly wrong. They were right in believing in the resurrection of the righteous, but wrong in their belief in the pre-existence and immortality of

souls. It does not appear that our Lord showed more favor to one sect than to the other. He bade his disciples beware of the doctrine of both sects.

Much significance attaches to the form in which the Sadducees put their carefully-prepared question. No allusion is made by them to a state intermediate between death and the resurrection; but they pass without remark over the time between the *death* of the woman of seven husbands and the *resurrection*. If our Lord had taught the doctrine that the disembodied soul existed as a conscious entity between death and the resurrection, it is highly improbable that his wily antagonists, who did not believe in the separate existence of human spirits, would have passed without remark or objection over this long interval to a future event. In such a case it would have been quite as much to their purpose to have inquired, "Whose wife is she *now*?" For if our Savior had taught the modern doctrine, this question would have been no more absurd than the one they did ask; they had quite as good reasons for supposing that the relationships of this life would be continued in *such* an intermediate state as they had for supposing that they would, exist after the resurrection.

Our Lord, having asserted that the conjugal relations of this life would not be continued in the next, proceeded to prove the doctrine of the resurrection by quoting from Moses, whose authority alone the Sadducees acknowledged as inspired :

"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 *all* live unto him." (Luke 20 : 37, 38; Ex. 3 : 6.)

Modern theology affirms that this passage proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then living as disembodied souls in heaven or *hades*. But such an affirmation is clearly a gross perversion of Christ's argument. He was not endeavoring to prove that the soul was immortal, or that people could be *dead* and at the same time *alive*, but he was endeavoring to prove, and *did* prove, the doctrine of the *resurrection of the dead*.

This was the doctrine in dispute: and his words cannot be fairly used to prove another doctrine antagonistic to this. If by the expression 'all live unto him,' he meant to teach that the patriarchs were actually alive as disembodied souls, how did he prove the doctrine in dispute? He undertook to prove that 'the *dead* are raised' [will be raised]; but if the prevalent theory be correct he failed in his argument, for he did not prove what he undertook to prove, but something entirely different.

Christ silenced the Sadducees, and proved the doctrine of the resurrection by showing the *necessity* of it, in order that the *patriarchs who were then dead* might inherit the promises made to them while they were pilgrims and strangers on the earth. As if our Lord had said: 'Although Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob *are dead*, they will not remain dead forever, as you Sadducees believe, but only for a time: they shall live again. Their resurrection to life is a necessity in order that God may be true, whose promises to them as recorded by Moses are yet unfulfilled. Thus I prove to you on the authority of Moses, that the patriarchs, though now dead, must have a resurrection in order that God's promises to them may be fulfilled.'

The proof of the doctrine 'that the dead are raised' was complete and irresistible. *The Sadducees were silenced.* "Then certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said. And after that they durst not ask him any question at all." (ch. 20 : 39, 40.) But on the supposition that the Sadducees understood our Lord as teaching that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then actually living as disembodied souls, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to account for their silent acknowledgment of defeat. For in such a case they could well have replied: 'What you say may be true, but it does not answer our question; it does not prove the *resurrection of the dead*. It rather proves that we are right; for if the patriarchs are already *alive*, they cannot be raised from the *dead*. How say you then that Moses shows *that the dead are raised?*'

But our Lord, when summoned to refute the Sadduceean heresy of "no future life," did not base his argument, as the Pharisees or the modern doctors would have done, upon the immortality of the soul;

but he founded his unanswerable reply upon the unfulfilled nature of the promises which God had made to the patriarchs, and the *necessity* resulting therefrom of a resurrection of the *dead*. He thus on a most important and favorable occasion omitted to teach the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and of an intermediate state of consciousness, under circumstances which seemed*to denote his reprobation of those tenets.

Our Lord's grand argument has, moreover, an affirmative value which ought not to be overlooked. It necessarily implies that the patriarchs were not then living as conscious beings. The words which God addressed to Moses at the bush, on any other supposition, afford no proof whatever of the resurrection. For if, while Jesus was talking to the Sadducees, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were realizing the truth of God's promises to them, their future resurrection would be not only unnecessary, but impossible. The only and exclusive point in controversy was enunciated in the proposition made by our Savior—“*That the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush.*”

In the very language of the proposition to be proved, our Lord most distinctly states that the question concerned the future condition of the *dead*, and not the present state of the *living*. There would never have been any dispute about the meaning of this “tortured text,” had not men been more anxious to serve a theory than to serve the truth.

The passage itself is decidedly hostile to the popular theory of an intermediate state of consciousness. The patriarchs may for a time be unconscious of God; but God is not unmindful of them. He has appointed a time when he will remember them. In the sight of God "who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were,"¹ with whom all the future is present, they and all the faithful dead still live. Says an able writer on the intermediate state:

"If our Lord was the God of Abraham, while he slept through one night in unconsciousness, he is the God of Abraham no less though he sleep through ten thousand years. 'O God, thou art my God,' the faithful Jew might say; '*forever* will I trust in thee! Thou wilt not leave nor forsake me. But shall thy loving-kindness be shown in the grave, thy faithfulness in destruction? Not so: for thou art not the God of the dead. Thy power, thy truth, thy faithfulness shall be manifested in redeeming my soul from the grave; and then wilt thou be indeed my God, when thou hast given this mortal immortality.'

"And wherefore did God please to declare himself Abraham's God? 'Here,' says Paul, 'we have no continuing city, but we seek that which is *to come*.' Abraham, too, 'sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' And these patriarchs, we read, died in faith, 'desiring a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called *their God*, FOR he hath prepared for them a city.'

"The admission of Abraham, and of all believers, into this

¹ Rom. 4 : 17.

city is as yet future; for God hath not built it in *hades* below, in the present dwelling-place of the dead, but prepared it in heaven above, for the blessed and merciful who shall inherit the kingdom at the last day. When the heavens and earth have passed, it shall come down out of heaven from God, who will then, and not before, have his tabernacle with men, and dwell among them. *Then*, and not while they are dead, 'God himself shall be with them, AND BE THEIR GOD.'"¹

That the righteous do not go to heaven when they die is further evident from the language used by Peter on the day of Pentecost. In his address to the multitude concerning the resurrection of Christ, after quoting the last four verses of the sixteenth Psalm to show that David prophesied not of himself but of Messiah, he said: "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." (Acts 2 : 29.) Here we have the direct assertion of an inspired apostle, that David, the patriarch David, 'is both *dead and buried*.' Centuries before Peter uttered these words, it had been recorded that "*David slept with his fathers and was buried* in the city of David." (1 Ki. 2 : 10.) The apostle Paul gives this further testimony: "*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." (Acts 13 : 36, 37.) How then does orthodoxy meet such

¹ Reginald Courtenay. *On the Intermediate State*, Part II

direct evidence as this? Simply by saying that the term 'David' in the above instances only refers to the *body* of David; that nothing is affirmed of David's *soul* or *personality*, which has never ceased to have a conscious existence. This method of getting out of a difficulty is not a very flattering commentary on a theory which forces its advocates to resort to a species of lawless exposition that outrages every principle of just interpretation.

In order to show up the deformities of this sliding scale of interpretation, and to illustrate how the 'mystic doctors' expound Scripture in the support of a pagan theory, I give Adam Clarke's note on Gen. 15 : 15 — "*Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age.*"

"This verse strongly implies the immortality of the soul, and a state of separate existence. He was to be gathered to his fathers—introduced *into the place* where separate spirits are kept, waiting for the general resurrection. Two things seem distinctly marked here: (1) *The soul* of Abraham should be introduced among the assembly of the first-born. (2) *His body* should be buried after a long life. The *body* was buried, the *soul* went to the spiritual [?] world, to dwell among the fathers and patriarchs who had lived and died in the Lord."

It would be exceedingly gratifying to know what authority Dr. Clarke had for saying that the pronoun 'thou' in the first clause of the verse refers to Abraham's *soul exclusively*, and that the same word in the same verse, addressed to the same individual, refers to Abraham's *body exclusively*. Not only is

such an exposition unfair, but it is also suicidal; for the record of the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham in Gen. : 15 : 15 reads thus:

“Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and *died* in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; *and was gathered to his people*. And his sons Isaac and Ishmael *buried him* in the cave of Machpelah.” (Gen. 25 : 8, 9.)

Here nothing is said about a different destiny of the *soul* from that of the *body*. It is simply declared that Abraham died; that Abraham was gathered to his people; and that Abraham was buried. It is said that ‘Abraham gave up the ghost.’ Does this mean that Abraham gave up an immortal soul, or in other words, that he gave up himself? This is sometimes claimed by immaterialists, but in the present instance such a claim would certainly be fatal to the entire theory. For it was not the *ghost* that was gathered to Abraham’s fathers, but *Abraham himself* after he had given up the ‘ghost.’

Another fatal objection is this: Abraham’s fathers were idolaters (see Josh. 24 : 2); and according to the popular theory they must have been in a hell of misery. How then could Abraham go to his fathers *in peace*.

If we accept of Milton’s definition¹ of man, that he is “properly one and individual, not compound or separable, *not, according to the popular opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different*

¹ *Treatise on Ch. Doctrine*, vol. I., pp. 250–1.

natures, as of soul and body, but that the whole man is soul, and the soul man, that is to say, a body, or individual substance, animated, sensitive, and rational," we get rid of all those perplexing difficulties that compel the advocates of the 'double substance theory' to violate the plainest principles of interpretation.

The true meaning of such phrases as, "thou shalt go to thy fathers," "thou shalt be gathered to thy fathers," "shalt sleep with thy fathers," etc., is very plainly shown in the Lord's promise to pious king Josiah (2 Ki. 22 : 20): "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 upon this place." This passage conclusively disproves the orthodox theory as enunciated by Clarke and others; for it will be noticed that *whoever* or *whatever* was to be gathered to the fathers was also *to be gathered into the grave*. Will any one say that immaterial souls are to be gathered into the *grave*?

The Lord told David that he must go to be with his fathers. (1 Chron. 17 : 11.) He also told him he should *sleep* with his fathers. (2 Sam. 7 : 12.) This could not mean that David's *soul* was to be wide-awake with his fathers' wide-awake souls in heaven or *hades*. For David himself said, "I shall be satisfied when I *awake* with thy likeness." (Ps. 17 : 15.) David, with Isaiah, Daniel, and other holy men, expected to sleep until awakened at the

resurrection. The pronoun 'I,' twice used by David in the sentence, "I shall be satisfied when I awake," represents the speaker as an individual, or, as orthodoxy would have it, as a 'rational soul.' The text then is a decisive proof that the 'rational soul' *sleeps* between death and resurrection.

In Gen. 3 : 19 the pronoun "thou" occurs five times, and is used each time to designate Adam as an intelligent being or 'rational soul.' But orthodoxy, seeing that such an interpretation would prove that man was mortal, pleads the "double substance" theory of Plato, and says the word 'thou' must refer to the *body* and not to the 'rational soul.' But in Luke 23 : 43 the doctors change the rule of interpretation, and say that the word 'thou,' used by our Lord to designate the penitent thief, referred to the rational and immaterial soul of the thief, and that his *body* was *not* embraced in the promise.

The same havoc is made, and the same liberties taken with proper names as with personal pronouns. Jesus said to his disciples, "Lazarus is dead." (John 11 : 14.) This, though a plain avowal of man's mortality, is said by the 'mystic doctors' to mean no more than though he had said "the *body* of Lazarus, or *body* Lazarus is dead."

Again, our Lord said to Martha (John 11 : 23), "Thy brother shall rise again." Where was Martha's brother? In the grave? No, says orthodoxy, only the *body* of her brother was in the grave; her *brother* was in heaven, or *hades*, living, conscious,

and happy. But Jesus said, "*Thy brother shall rise again.*" And then, as a demonstrative proof of his assertion that he was the *Resurrection* and the *Life*, "he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And *he that was dead* came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes." (ch. 11 : 43, 44.) Thus was Martha's brother raised, and thus did the Great Teacher show that he merited the glorious title of *Life-giver*.

The popular interpretation is fairly tested in construing the language of David, when he says, "*I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.*" (Ps. 139 : 14.) The first 'I' must mean the 'rational soul,' for it is represented as performing an act requiring intelligence. The first clause means, therefore, that David as an intelligent being would praise the Lord. In the second place, however, the word 'I,' although meaning the same person, — David — *must* refer to his *body*. For how can an uncompounded, simple, immaterial *substance* be said to be "made?" Besides, the context plainly shows that the *body* was referred to. "*My body [margin] was not hid from thee when I was made in secret.*"

Is it not plain that the personal pronoun 'I' has the same scope and meaning in each place, and that in both it refers to David as an individual human being?

Recurring now to the language used by Peter in Acts 2 : 29, let me ask, What did the apostle mean

when he declared that the *patriarch David was both dead and buried*? Orthodoxy replies that Peter here refers to the *body* of David; as if he had said, "The *body* of David is both dead and buried." Very well; then the term '*David*' means the *body of David*. Apply this interpretation to v. 34, where Peter says: "David is not ascended into the heavens," and it makes the apostle say, "The *body* of David is not ascended into the heavens!" Can any one seriously believe that Peter told his audience that David's inanimate body had not ascended into the heavens? Besides, he had just previously said, according to the popular exposition, that David's *body was both dead and buried*. Unless, therefore, David had *two* bodies, he could not be supposed to be in his "sepulchre" and in "the heavens" at the same time. Such a construction would turn the conclusive argument of the apostle into a senseless jargon, and make him utter a most ridiculous absurdity.

Peter, who was not a professor of the Cabalistic theology that disdains the obvious meaning of plain words, taught that the patriarch David was both *dead and buried*, and that as he had not ascended into the heavens, the prophecy in Ps. 110 : 1 could not refer to him, but to Christ. He reminds his astonished audience that the statement: "Thou wilt not leave my soul [me] in *hades* [the grave], neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," could not refer to David because *he was*

under *the power of the grave*, and *his body had seen corruption*. "The patriarch David is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Notwithstanding this direct assertion of an inspired apostle, orthodox spiritualists confidently claim that David, "*properly speaking*," never *died* and never was *buried*; ¹ that David's *self* or *personality* was in heaven enjoying the beatific vision of the celestial paradise when Peter on the day of Pentecost solemnly declared "*David is not ascended into the heavens*." It is plain that the orthodox interpretation is destructive of the apostle's convincing argument concerning the resurrection and ascension of Christ. For the person prophesied of in Ps. 110 : 1 was in heaven, and if *David in any sense* was in heaven the prophecy might be applied to him, and the proof of Christ's ascension would fail. As if Peter had anticipated this objection he expressly says: "DAVID IS NOT ASCENDED INTO THE HEAVENS; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto *my Lord*, Sit *thou* on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool."

If, therefore, the patriarch David has no conscious existence in the intermediate state, but is awaiting the summons of the Life-giver, when he shall awake with the likeness of his Redeemer, *never to die any more*; if this be the case of the sweet Psalmist of Israel, may we not justly conclude that the case is the same with all the righteous dead?

¹ See Whedon's *Notes on Luke 16 : 19-31*.

Thus, in reference to the First Theory, we have proved by the testimony of Scripture :

1. That the judgment takes place not at death, but at the second coming of Christ.

2. That the righteous do not receive their reward or any part of it until they are raised from the dead and judged ; or, in other words, their future *life* does not begin in the intermediate state.

Let us next examine

THE SECOND THEORY,

which embodies the following proposition :

The souls of all men will exist after death as conscious beings in *hades* ; the good in that part of it called paradise, the wicked in the part called *tar-tarus*.

The general view held by the advocates of this theory is thus concisely stated by W. W. Clayton, in his remarks on 1 Pet. 3 : 19 :

“I understand the ‘prison’ to be *hades*. But in what sense is *hades* a prison ? The spirits of both good and bad are reserved in its precincts till the resurrection and the final judgment, when all will be judged according to the deeds done in the body, and assigned their eternal destiny either in heaven or hell [*gehenna*]. In the meantime, in *hades*, they suffer torment, or enjoy comfort only in a limited degree.”¹

This conservative orthodoxy rejects the notion that the souls of good men go to heaven when their ‘earthly house is dissolved,’ and substitutes for the

¹ *Discussion with Grant*, p. 38.

bliss of heaven the *comforts of hades*. A recent writer in advocating this view, after quoting Acts 2 : 34, says :

“David, the man after God’s own heart, hath not yet ascended into heaven. We should, then, conclude that none others had. This, Christ says, is true: ‘No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man.’ (John 3 : 13.) The dead, then, are not in heaven. Our Lord said, again, to Mary: ‘Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to my Father’—that is, to heaven. (John 20 : 17.) God is in heaven. Christ had said to the penitent thief: ‘To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.’ He had been in *paradise* during those three days, but said he had not been in *heaven*. *Paradise*, then, is not *heaven*. If David hath not ascended to heaven—if no man but Christ hath ascended to heaven—if Christ had been in *paradise*, but had not been in heaven (when Mary met him at the sepulchre), then *paradise* is not heaven. The penitent thief went to *paradise*, but not to heaven. The place to which the souls of the righteous go at death is not heaven.”¹

Again, he says :

“Those who mistake *paradise* for *heaven*, and *hades* for *hell*, may be perplexed to reconcile the two expressions of our Lord, ‘To-day shalt thou be with me in *paradise*,’ and ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*.’ There is no contradiction. He was in that part of *hades* which is called *paradise*. *America* is the general name of all this Western Continent, but *United States* is the happy part of *America*. So *hades* is the name of all the spirit-world, but *paradise* is the blessed part of that spirit-world.”²

Believing, as these theorists do, that the soul is

¹ C. W. Fitch, D. D. *Intermediate State*, pp. 20, 21.

² *Intermediate State*, pp. 27, 28.

immortal, there are some very awkward texts for them to explain. For instance, Eccl. 12 : 7 is said to mean that at death the soul goes to God who gave it. But God is in heaven, and *they* say the soul does not go to heaven, but to *hades*. Again, Luke 23 : 43 is said to prove that all believers go at death to be with Christ. But Christ is in heaven, while paradise, the place of good souls, is not in heaven, but in *hades*.

It is further said that Phil. 1 : 21-23 proves that Paul desired to die, so that his disembodied soul might be with Christ. But if this interpretation were allowed, it would disprove the notion that good souls go to *hades* when they die, for Christ is not in *hades*, but in heaven. Other passages, such as Acts 7 : 59 and 2 Cor. 5 : 6, when interpreted according to the popular notion of the soul's immortality, make directly against the idea that souls go to *hades*. In order, however, to fairly test the merits of this theory, it will be necessary to examine the use that the inspired writers make of the terms *hades*, *tartarus*, and *paradise*.

HADES.

Before doing this, however, the critical remarks of some eminent scholars, explanatory of the meaning of the word *hades*, are submitted, so that the general reader may the better appreciate the Scriptural use of the term. Wakefield, on Luke 16 : 23, says :

"It must be remembered that *hades* nowhere means *hell* [*gehenna*] in any author whatever, *sacred* or *profane*; and also that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, and not a piece of *real history*. To them who regard the narration as a *reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the *papists*. The universal meaning of *hades* is *the state of death*."

Dr. Campbell says:

"As to the word *hades*, in my judgment, it ought never to be rendered *hell*; at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. In the Old Testament the corresponding word is *sheol*, which signifies the *state of the dead in general*, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. The state of the dead is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark, and silent, about which the most prying eye and listening ear can acquire no information. *To this the word hell, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded*. For at first it denoted *only what was secret or concealed*."¹

Dr. Parkhurst says:

"Our English, or rather Saxon, word *hell*, in its original signification, exactly answers to the Greek word *hades*, and denotes a concealed or unseen place; and this sense of the word is still retained in the western counties of England; to *hele* over a thing is to cover it."

"A careful examination," says Dr. Kitto, "of the passages in which these words [*sheol* and *hades*] occur, will probably lead to the conclusion that they afford *no real sanction* to the notion of an intermediate state of the kind indicated, but are used by the inspired writers to denote the *grave* — the resting-place of the *bodies* both of the righteous and the wicked."²

¹ *On the Gospels*, Dis. VI.

² *Bib. Cyclop.*; Art., *Hades*.

Prof. Stuart says:

“Before the New Testament was written, the translators of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek; *i. e.*, the “Seventy,” as they are usually called, had made very frequent use of the word *hades*, in order to translate *sheol*. They have done this in no less than sixty instances out of the sixty-three in which the word *sheol* is employed in the Hebrew original. Twice they have rendered the same Hebrew word by the Greek term for *death*, viz: 2 Sam. 22 : 6; Prov. 23 : 14; and once by the Greek term for pit, Ezek. 32 : 21. The sense which these translators affixed to it is most evidently the same as the Hebrews affixed to the word *sheol*. In the Apocrypha I find the word employed sixteen times, and in all cases in a manner that corresponds entirely with the use of *sheol*. We are prepared then to expect the like use of *hades* in the New Testament.”¹

“*Sheol* and *hades*,” says Dr. Eadie, “do not mean that narrow bed in which *one* corpse is laid, but in this relation they signify that region of darkness and *insensibility* in which all corpses repose. *One* corpse is lowered into its *keber*—all corpses lie in *sheol*.”²

Here we have the unanimous testimony of several eminent critics, that *hades* is the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew *sheol*; and that both terms are used in the Bible to denote the state of *death* or of the *dead*; *the grave* in its comprehensive and generic sense as the *general* receptacle of the *dead*; that which is concealed or unseen; a region of silence, darkness, and insensibility. But we have something better than this; we have the authority of inspiration for saying that in Scripture *hades* has the same

¹ *Essays on Future Punishment*, pp. 128–9.

² *Bib. Cyclop.*; Art., *Hell*.

meaning as *sheol*. The apostle Peter, in the second chapter of Acts, in quoting the prophecy of David respecting the early resurrection of Christ, renders the Hebrew *sheol* by the Greek *hades*. In our common version, *sheol* in Ps. 16 : 10, and *hades* in Acts 2 : 27, are translated *hell*. There could have been no objection to this translation if the word *hell* had retained its primitive signification; but when, as in modern theology, the term is used to denote a place of torment, or spirit-world, it becomes highly objectionable, as it conveys a false and odious meaning. The etymological meaning of *sheol*, *hades*, and *hell* is the same in three languages: denoting in each that which is covered or hid; that which is unseen or invisible.

“Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell [*sheol*, *hades*, or the grave], neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.” (Acts 2 : 27.)

In a very large number of places in the Bible, the possessive personal pronouns are attached to the word soul, as “my soul,” “thy soul,” “his soul,” etc. These are called Hebraisms, and are used to denote the *person* speaking, spoken to, or of. Examples: “*My soul* is weary of life” (Job 10 : 1), means, “*I* am weary of life.” “*Thy soul* shalt live” (Jer. 38 : 17), means, “*Thou* shalt live.” “*His soul* was not left in hell” (Acts 2 : 31), means, “*He* was not left in hell.” Some writers render the expression ‘my soul’ by “my life.” Thus Dr. J. Pye Smith: “Thou wilt not leave *my life* in the grave.” And

Kennicott thus: "Thou wilt not abandon 'my life' to the grave."

The remarks of Dr. Eadie on Ps. 16 : 10 are valuable as an independent exposition of the meaning of the terms *sheol* and *hades*, as well as of the scope and meaning of the text itself. He says :

"A very little attention to the laws of Hebrew grammar, and principles of Hebrew poetry and parallelisms, will at once render the meaning of this prophecy plain to the meanest capacity. The sixteenth Psalm refers to Messiah. Messiah expresses perfect confidence in his Father. Being assured of his own ability to fulfill his commission, he has no less confidence that the Father whom he served would raise him from the dead — the law being satisfied, and his work being concluded. 'My flesh shall also rest in hope,' for —

'Thou wilt not abandon me to *sheol*,
Nor permit thy Holy One to see corruption.'

The two lines form what is usually termed a parallelism — the last hemistich echoing the sentiment of the former. The words 'my soul' mean merely *myself*. . . . Nouns of this nature are used, because the Hebrew has no intensive or reflexive pronouns. *It is thus obvious that THE ARGUMENT based upon the idea that Christ's soul went to sheol, and his body to the grave, HAS NO FOUNDATION.* The Hebrew does not warrant this distinction. Christ's 'soul,' in such an idiom, *is his entire person.* Now, what is meant by *sheol*? *It is the place where corruption is seen — the region of the dead.* So the apostles understood it. Though Messiah was to die, death's power over him was to be very limited; he was not to be abandoned to his dark dominion; his body was to be so short a time in the grave as not to suffer the ordinary process of decomposition."¹

¹ *Bib. Cyclop.*; Art., *Hell*.

Having thus established the fact that *hades* is the equivalent of *sheol*, and that there is no evidence in Acts 2 : 27, 31 in favor of an intermediate state of consciousness, let us notice the use of *sheol* in the Old Testament.

1. *Sheol* is sometimes used as the equivalent of death, *e. g.*, Ps. 6 : 5 ; Is. 38 : 18 : "In death there is no remembrance of thee ; in *sheol* [the grave] who shall give thee thanks?" Death and *sheol* are here used as equivalent in meaning, and in them the Psalmist declares there is no remembrance. As consciousness cannot exist without memory, the text is a very strong expression of the unconsciousness of those in death, or in *sheol*, the state of death.

"*Sheol* cannot praise thee ; *death* cannot celebrate thee." Here by metonymy the container is put for the thing contained. Those under the dominion of *death* or *sheol* cannot praise the Lord, because they are unconscious of all things. See also Ps. 55 : 12 ; Prov. 5 : 3-5 ; 7 : 27 ; Is. 28 : 18, where *sheol* is rendered *hell*, but interchangeably used with *death*.

2. *Sheol* is represented as a place of silence, *e. g.*, Ps. 31 : 17 ; 115 : 17. "Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in *sheol*." The idea of the wicked being silent in *hell*, the equivalent of *sheol*, is in conflict with the popular notion which represents it as a *place* resounding with the groans and shrieks of those in torment. David did not pray that the wicked might be *tormented* in *sheol*, but that they might be *silent* there. He expresses the same wish

in the next verse, when he says, "Let the lying lips be put to silence." "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." This passage is expressive of the unconscious state of the dead. If the righteous were conscious and happy in the intermediate state, they would doubtless praise the Lord for his goodness and loving mercy. But 'the dead praise not the Lord,' and why do they not? Because they are unable to do it. They are unconscious.

3. *Sheol* is represented as a place of darkness and corruption. (Job 10 : 21, 22; 17 : 13, 14; Ps. 88 : 12.)

4. *Sheol* is frequently conjoined with *destruction*. (Job 26 : 6; Ps. 88 : 11; Prov. 15 : 11; 27 : 20.)

5. *Sheol* is directly contrasted with the 'way of life.' "The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from *sheol* beneath." (Prov. 15 : 24.)

6. *Sheol* is sometimes personified, and represented as an insatiable monster. (Is. 5 : 14; Prov. 27 : 20.)

7. *Sheol* is represented as a place in which there is neither wisdom nor knowledge. Eccl. 9 : 10: "There is no work, nor device, nor KNOWLEDGE, nor WISDOM in *sheol*, whither thou goest." This passage may well conclude our examination of the use and meaning of the term *sheol* in the Old Testament. It presents the crowning evidence of a long series of testimonies showing that *sheol* is represented by the inspired writers as a place or state of silence, darkness, corruption, death, and destruction. Its in-

mates are said to be destitute of knowledge and unable to praise the Lord.

If the reader will bear in mind that the most ample proof has been given that the Hebrew *sheol* is the exact equivalent of the Greek *hades*, and that it is the general receptacle of all that die, whether *buried* or *unburied*, and that not a syllable is found to express a difference in the condition of the righteous and wicked while *in sheol*, he must conclude that the Hebrew Scriptures, at least, afford not the slightest evidence of an intermediate state of consciousness.

The term *hades* is used eleven times in the New Testament, and is translated *hell* ten times and *grave* once. It is rendered *hell* in Matt. 11 : 23; 16 : 18; Luke 10 : 15; 16 : 23; Acts 2 : 27, 31; Rev. 1 : 18; 6 : 8; 20 : 13, 14.

“And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to *hades*.” (Matt. 11 : 23; Luke 10 : 15.)

There is no reference in these passages to the state of the dead. The obvious meaning is that this proud city should be humbled or brought very low. Capernaum was soon after destroyed by the Romans.

“And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter [*i. e.*, a rock], and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against it.” (Matt. 16 : 18.)

In connection with this passage and as explanatory in part of it should be quoted Rev. 1 : 18; 20 : 13, 14:

"I am he that liveth and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, amen; and have the keys of *hades* and of *death*."

"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and *hades* [margin, *grave*] delivered up the DEAD [not the living] which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works."

"And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."

The most ardent advocates of the theory that we are examining will hardly claim that there is any evidence in these passages to show that *hades* is a place inhabited by living beings. Prof. Stuart says that in these places "*hades* signifies the region of the dead, the domains of death." And Reginald Courtenay, in his work on the *Future States*, very judiciously observes:

"On the supposition that *hades* is a region of life, and not necessarily either evil or good, our Lord's promise to his church becomes without meaning. As well might it have been said, 'The power of resurrection shall not prevail against the church;' inasmuch as resurrection implies a change of state, and is not necessarily either a good or an evil: or as well might our Lord have said — if *hades* be a region of life — 'My church shall never pass into a disembodied state.' But his words plainly declare, 'An evil and destroying power shall not prevail.'"

Death and *hades* shall not always have dominion over the sleeping members of the church of Christ, for when Christ, who is the Resurrection and the Life, shall appear, then shall they also appear with him in glory. The time will surely come when death and *hades* shall deliver up the dead (not the

living) which are in them. When death shall be destroyed, *then* will the song of victory be sung, *then* will the power of *hades* be at an end. In the same sense in which men are dead in the sea, are they dead in *hades*. If dead men in the sea are unconscious, then dead men in *hades* are also unconscious.

“And I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death, and *Hades* followed with him. And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth.” (Rev. 6 : 8.)

In this passage Death and *Hades* are personified, and represented as destroying powers. Death leads and *Hades* follows with him. They are inseparable companions. Their power is co-extensive. The text has no allusion to an intermediate state; but the use of the figure is quite incompatible with the idea of life or consciousness.

“And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried; and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.” (Luke 16 : 22, 23.)

This is the text upon which the advocates of the theory that we are examining mainly rely. In offensive warfare, it is their sword; in defensive, their shield. When their position is attacked, and outwork after outwork falls, they retreat to this citadel from which they profess to be able to successfully

repel every assault. Dare to question the popular doctrine of everlasting torment, and the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is the text that is expected to meet every objection, remove every doubt, and silence every opponent. It seems to be the settled orthodox conviction, that from this text, or rather from the popular exposition of it, there can be no appeal. It is relied upon to prove that dead men are conscious, that the soul is immortal, and that the wicked are to suffer endless misery. Orthodox preachers and writers, after calling it a parable, treat it as though it were a real narrative.¹ The 'merciless doctors,' from this fancied stronghold of orthodoxy, seem to take genuine pleasure while depicting the agonies of the rich man in *hades*, which, by the way, they rarely if ever omit to say will be eternal. They are fond of indulging their warm imagination and of airing their rhetoric by vain and puerile attempts to illustrate the meaning of eternity. In order to make the sinner love God, they represent him as an implacable and vindictive tyrant. They seem to think that nothing less than the threat of endless hell-torture will be sufficient to turn the sinner from his wicked ways. But in all this they greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the infinite compassion of our merciful Creator. But let us now examine this Gibraltar of orthodoxy, and see whether it fairly belongs to our opponents or not.

¹ See Clarke, Benson, Scott, Barnes, Whedon, Whitby, and others on Luke 16 : 19-31.

The reader's attention is called to the following points:

1. The text forms part of a parable; and it is a well established principle of Scriptural interpretation that parables may be used to *illustrate* doctrines otherwise well founded, but never to prove them. Thus Trench, in his valuable work on parables, very justly observes:

"The parables may not be made first sources of doctrine. Doctrines, otherwise and already grounded, may be illustrated, or indeed further confirmed by them, but it is not allowable to constitute doctrine first by their aid. They may be the outer ornamental fringe, but not the main texture of the proof. For from the literal to the figurative, from the clearer to the more obscure, has ever been recognized as the law of Scripture interpretation. This rule, however, has been *often forgotten*, and controversialists, looking round for arguments with which to sustain some *weak position*, one for which *they can find no other support in Scripture, often invent for themselves supports in these.*"

2. The rich *man died*; and as nothing is said about the survivance of his *soul*, the assertion that *it* went to *hades* as the conscious personality of the rich man is a gratuitous affirmation, without a shadow of evidence to sustain it. Besides, such an assertion would be a flat contradiction of the record, which represents the rich *man* in *hades* with *bodily organs*, and therefore as EMBODIED. This point of itself is fatal to the popular theory, which is founded upon the assumption that the *disembodied soul*, as

the human personality, is conscious in *hades*, while the body crumbles back to dust.

3. It is first asserted that the rich *man died*; next, that *he was buried*; then follows this statement: "and in *hades he lifted up his eyes*, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." The rich *man*, then, was in *hades*, or the grave. But *hades* is equal to *sheol*, in which the wicked are silent, and in which there is neither *wisdom* nor *knowledge*. Hence, as a matter of fact, the rich man must have been *silent* and *unconscious* while in *hades*.

4. That the rich man in the parable is represented as endowed with consciousness and the power of speech argues nothing against the doctrine of the unconsciousness of the dead. It should be remembered that our Lord was addressing Hebrews who were familiar with the figurative language in which much of their Scripture was written, and who were not, therefore, likely to misunderstand him. It was not uncommon for the inspired writers of the Old Testament to represent things without life as knowing, feeling, and conversing. In the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah, there is a dramatic representation of the rejoicing in *sheol* consequent on the fall of the king of Babylon:

"Yea, the fir trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us. *Sheol* [*hades, hell, or the grave*] from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; *it stirreth up the dead* for

thee, even all the chief ones of the earth, it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. *All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols; the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee.*"

Here trees and *dead men* are alike represented as talking; and even *sheol*, the dark and silent abode of the dead, is described as moving forward to meet its illustrious victim. We have quite as good reasons for supposing the king of Babylon to be a real character, and his descent into *sheol*, and the accompanying circumstances as above related to be a veritable history, as we have for supposing that Dives was a real character, and the conversation between him and Abraham a literal occurrence.

In the thirty-first chapter of Ezekiel, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, is thus represented:

"Thus saith the Lord God; In the day when *he* went down into the grave I caused a mourning; . . . I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field fainted for him. I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast *him* down to *sheol* with them that descend into the *pit*; and all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon, all that drink water, *shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth*. They also went down into *hell*, with him unto them that be *slain* with the sword. . . . This is Pharaoh and all his multitude, saith the Lord God."

This passage admirably illustrates the similarity in meaning of the terms used in the Bible to denote the abode or resting-place of the dead. It will be

noticed that Pharaoh and his multitude are represented as all being in one place, though they were all in '*sheol*,' all in '*hades*' [Septuagint], all in 'hell,' all in 'the grave,' all in 'the pit,' and all in 'the nether parts of the earth.' *If dead men are conscious in the grave, they are conscious in hades, but not otherwise; and vice versa, if men are conscious in hades they are also conscious in the grave.* Although wicked Pharaoh and his host were in hell, nothing is said about their being *tormented* there. On the contrary, it is said of his followers that they "shall be *comforted* in the nether parts of the earth." This representation is quite in keeping with the idea of men talking while in *hades*.

In Ezek. 32: 21, the dead are represented as speaking to the king of Egypt "out of the midst of *sheol*." The figure of speech is the same as that which represents the rich man as talking to Abraham out of the midst of *hades*. Is it then to be accounted as very strange that our Lord should for once illustrate his discourse by a figure of speech that had received the sanction of Isaiah and Ezekiel, and with the use of which his auditors were perfectly familiar? Surely, in a volume where the mountains and the hills are said to sing; where all the trees of the field clap their hands; where the floods lift up their 'voice;' where trees and birds converse; where the blood of Abel finds a 'voice;' where stones cry out and beams answer; where dead men are made to rejoice over the fall of their rivals 'slain by

the sword;’ where inanimate nature is endowed with speech and consciousness—in *such* a volume, I ask, is it surprising that for once, one known as ‘the rich man,’ representing a *class* of *living* persons, should be endowed in *hades* with life and speech?

5. In this parable, the patriarch Abraham is represented as talking to the ‘rich man,’ though we have the most satisfactory evidence that he was both dead and unconscious. Outside of this parable, Abraham was a real character, an historic personage, but he had been dead eighteen centuries when our Lord made him an actor in the dramatic representation of the rich man and Lazarus. The Jews expressly acknowledged that Abraham was dead, and their language nowhere conveys the least hint that they considered him as conscious in *sheol* or anywhere else. Our Lord in his masterly refutation of the Sadduceean heresy respecting the resurrection of the dead, bases his unanswerable argument upon the *necessity of the resurrection or re-living of Abraham*, in order that he might inherit the promises. And the language of Isaiah directly conflicts with the popular theory. In addressing God, he says: “Doubtless thou art our Father, though *Abraham be ignorant of us*, and Israel [Jacob] acknowledge us not.” (ch. 63 : 16.) As Abraham is thus proved by language not parabolic to have been unconscious, by parity of reasoning we conclude that Dives was also unconscious.

6. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is

either a revelation concerning the intermediate state, or it is not. If we accept it as a revelation, we must accept every part of it in detail. We must suppose that the place where the righteous are *comforted* is within sight and speaking distance of the place where the wicked are *tormented*. We must believe that all the wicked are tormented in actual flames before the judgment-day; that they have tongues which burn with heat; and that even the smallest amount of water would afford them some relief. We must believe that Dives, although in "the land of forgetfulness," remembered his impenitent brethren, and that he retained his human and fraternal affections even amidst the torments of hell. We must believe that all the righteous dead are carried by the angels into Abraham's literal bosom. We must believe that men talk in 'a land of silence,' and see in a land of utter darkness.

The supposition that this parable contains a revelation is, moreover, *no less fatal to the orthodox theory than to our own*. Orthodoxy claims that all souls in *hades* are disembodied and immaterial. Such a claim greatly heightens the absurdity of the position, and is, as has been previously remarked, directly opposed to the language of the parable itself. Our Lord was talking about *men*, and not about disembodied souls. Let us meet this issue fairly and squarely. It will not answer to adopt half measures. Orthodoxy would have us believe that two *disembodied souls* were actually engaged in conver-

sation.¹ A strange conversation, too, for *bodiless* souls! Lazarus has a *finger* that he can dip in water, and Dives has a *tongue* that endures literal torment in a literal flame. The rich man's soul has *eyes*, and Abraham's soul has, like his body, a *bosom*. Where, I ask, is the *proof* in this parable of the separate existence of *disembodied* souls? Is it not obvious that the finger, the water, the tongue, the flame, etc., are either *wholly* imaginary, or are actually existing in *hades*?

Literally interpreted, this parable conveys no instruction whatever. We cannot suppose that the Great Teacher would utter idle words without sense or meaning. We must, therefore, adopt the only other opinion, that it is not a revelation, but an *imaginary* scene, designed to illustrate an important moral lesson. Our Lord, after uttering the parable of the unjust steward, said to his disciples: "No servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. . . . And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him. And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God."

It was to these proud and covetous Pharisees that

¹ See Whedon's *Notes on Luke 16 : 23*.

the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was delivered. They evidently supposed that as sons of Abraham their future was entirely secure, and could not be endangered by their supreme love of riches and sin of unbelief. Our Lord taught them the folly of trusting in Abraham, while they served mammon instead of serving God. To undeceive them and to exhibit the results of such a course on their part, he gave a dramatic representation of a supposed interview between a wealthy Jew and his father Abraham. To do this it was necessary that he should give speech and consciousness to the silent and unconscious dead. The scene is therefore laid, not in *gehenna*, the place of future punishment, but in *hades*, the abode of the dead. The picture contrasts the rejection and misery of the rich Jew, with the reception of the despised Lazarus into all the privileges of the Abrahamic sonship. Viewed in this light, the parable conveys a most impressive lesson. It has been supposed by some writers, and probably not without good reasons, that the rich man in this parable represents the Jews, originally God's 'peculiar people,' and Lazarus, the despised Gentiles, who are to be permitted to "sit down with *Abraham*, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven," while the unbelieving Jews are to be thrust out.

This supposition appears to be in accordance with the Gospel scheme, and to find support in the imagery of the parable itself: but it does not concern

the present question to decide this. There is only one other point that I wish briefly to notice.

When, in this imaginary discourse, the rich man asks Abraham to send Lazarus to warn his five brethren, the patriarch replies: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." But the rich man said, "Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent." To this final appeal, Abraham replied: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, *neither will they be persuaded though one ROSE FROM THE DEAD.*"

This testimony is decisive of the whole question. Lazarus could not warn the living until he was himself raised from the dead. The grave in the comprehensive and generic sense of the term *is thus proved to be equal to the term hades in the parable.* To leave *hades* is to rise from the dead; and to rise from the dead is to rise from the grave, or from a state of death.

Our Lord's prophecy was literally verified when he raised a real Lazarus from the dead. This Lazarus came from the grave; it is equally true that he came from *hades*. But did this notable miracle convince the rich man's brethren? No, indeed, it was so far from convincing those self-righteous and covetous Pharisees that they "consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death; because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus." (John 12 : 10, 11.)

- We must conclude, therefore, that the parable of

the rich man and Lazarus does not afford the least support to the popular theory concerning the intermediate state.

All the passages in the New Testament where *hades* is translated *hell* have now been examined. Let us next notice its use in 1 Cor. 15 : 55, where it is rendered "grave." The apostle is speaking of the resurrection of dead men to life. "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O *hades*, where is thy victory?" The apostle is exulting in the anticipated triumph over death and *hades*. These monsters have a present victory over the sleeping saints; but the time is coming when they shall be utterly destroyed, and their dark dominion be forever at an end. When the dead are raised, when the grave gives up its treasures, then all the saints may say with the glorious apostle, O death, where is thy sting? O *hades*, where is thy victory?

This passage is fatal to the theory under examination. For if there be an intermediate state of consciousness, and for the righteous an interval of blissful repose, then, indeed, *hades has no victory at all*.

According to the orthodox theory, death may conquer the body, but *hades*, so far from subduing the soul, actually liberates it from a heavy burden,

and gives it new powers and increased susceptibilities of enjoyment. Paul, however, exults over death and *hades* together, knowing that they should both be utterly destroyed.¹ Thus a careful examination of all the places in the New Testament where the word *hades* is used shows most conclusively that instead of teaching the doctrine of an intermediate state of happiness or misery, they most plainly declare that *hades* is the land of silence, of darkness, and of forgetfulness; the abode of the dead; the prison alike of the righteous and the wicked.

Let us next examine the use of the word

TARTARUS.

The term occurs but once in the Bible, viz: in 2 Pet. 2 : 4, where it is rendered 'hell.' "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *hell*, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." It will be noticed that wicked *angels*, and not wicked *men* are spoken of; and these not as *now* undergoing punishment, but as *reserved unto the judgment*. "The Lord knoweth how to *reserve* the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." (2 Pet. 2 : 9.) Neither wicked men nor fallen angels receive their punishment before the judgment. *Tartarus*, then, is not here

¹ There is no good reason why *hades* should not be uniformly rendered; but the translators doubtless saw that to translate *hades* in this as in other places in the New Testament would conflict with the popular theology, which does not allow the thought that any will ever obtain a victory over *hell*.

used to denote a place of torment. *Where tartarus* is we are not informed, and we should not attempt to be wise above that which is written. Many eminent critics have *supposed* that the apostle used the term to denote the ærial regions that surround the earth. The fact that the chief of these angels is called the "prince of the power of the *air*" may be thought to give some support to such a supposition. According to Bloomfield, *tartarus* is "an intensive reduplication of the very old word '*tar*,' which in the earliest dialects signified '*dark*.' The parallel text in Jude 6 seems to express the idea that *tartarus* is a region of darkness. "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains *under darkness*, unto the judgment of the great day."

In Greek mythology, *tartarus* is the name given to the infernal regions, over which Pluto or *Hades* ruled. The modern notion that *tartarus* is an apartment of *hades*, a sort of underground dungeon of torture, is based solely on heathen fables, and has not a syllable of Scripture for its support. The attempt to make a pagan of Peter will not succeed with those who prefer the authority of inspiration to that of Greek mythology.

Lastly we come to notice the use of the term

PARADISE.

This word is found but three times in the Bible, viz: in Luke 23 : 43; 2 Cor. 12 : 4; and Rev. 2 : 7.

The passage in Luke does not tell where paradise is located; and the one in Corinthians speaks of it as being in the third heavens. The paradise that Paul was caught up to in vision, was not the paradise of Josephus. It was up or away from the earth, and not *in* it.

“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” (Rev. 2 : 7.) If, now, we knew the location of the tree of life, we should know also the location of paradise—the paradise into which all the righteous shall be admitted, not at death, but when they *live again*, never to *die any more*. In Rev. 22 : 2, we learn that the tree of life was in the holy city, New Jerusalem, which John, in vision, saw coming down from God out of heaven. The paradise of God and the city New Jerusalem thus appear to be identical. How much more glorious is this heavenly city than the Elysium of the Greeks, or the subterranean paradise of Josephus!

There is not the slightest authority in Scripture for saying that *paradise* and *tartarus* are in *hades*. Paradise is a real locality; but *hades*, strictly speaking, *is no more a real place than death is a real being*. Both are occasionally personified and localized; but both are rather *states* than *places*. Thus death may be called a state of non-existence; and *hades* may be called a state of death or the state of the dead. In Scripture, the dead—good and bad—are represented as being in one place or state. It is

never once asserted in the Bible that *tartarus* is the present or future place of punishment, either of wicked men or of fallen angels. *Gehenna*, not *hades*, is the place of future punishment, and Peter tells us when its unquenchable fires are to be kindled. (2 Pet. 3 : 7.) It is too often taken for granted that the wicked at the moment of their decease are transferred to a place of torment. But the Scriptures plainly declare that the wicked are to be *reserved* unto the day of judgment to be punished.

Thus in reference to the Second Theory, we have proved (1) that *hades* is equal to *sheol*, in which there is neither wisdom nor *knowledge*; (2) that the wicked are not punished at death, but are *reserved* unto the judgment of the last day; (3) that neither *tartarus* nor paradise are in *hades*; (4) that the righteous will not obtain the victory over *hades* until the morning of the resurrection, when mortality shall be swallowed up of life, and death and *hades* shall be destroyed; and (5) that the orthodox doctrine of *hades* is essentially heathen in its origin, and unscriptural in its character.

THE THIRD THEORY EXAMINED.

In the refutation of the first two theories, much of the Scripture testimony showing that the dead are unconscious has been examined. Indeed, the argument might be safely left with the reader without adducing further testimony; for since the dead are either conscious or unconscious, if the first two

theories, based upon the *consciousness* of the dead, have been shown by the preceding arguments to be unscriptural and false, the Third Theory must inevitably be the true one. The evidence, however, has by no means been exhausted. One of the strongest passages in the Bible to prove the mortality of man, and his unconsciousness between death and the resurrection, is found in the fourteenth chapter of Job:

“There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground; yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But *man dieth*, and wasteth away; yea, *man* giveth up the ghost, and where is *he*? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so *man* lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. Oh! that thou wouldest hide *me* in the grave, that thou wouldest keep *me* secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint *me* a set time and remember *me*! If a *man die*, shall *he* live again? All the days of my appointed time will *I* wait till my change come. Thou shall call, and *I* will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands. . . . His sons come to honor, and *he knoweth it not*; and they are brought low, but *he perceiveth it not of them*.”

Comment can add nothing to the force or strength of this impressive passage of Scripture. If it does not teach the doctrine of the unconscious sleep of the dead, then no words can teach it. It is asserted that when a man dies he has no *germ*, *power*, or *principle* of life left. He must, therefore, be wholly mortal. Who that believes in an intermediate state

of consciousness can bring himself to utter the prayer of Job, "Oh! that thou wouldest *hide me in the grave?*" Would he not rather pray, 'Oh! that thou wouldest receive me into heaven when I die?'

The theory that we are now examining affirms nothing more than the sentiment contained in the language of Job — "Man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not *awake*, nor be raised out of their *sleep*." The grave was a place of rest where the afflicted patriarch desired to sleep till the resurrection — till the time appointed when he should be remembered. He had himself most beautifully and eloquently said of it: "There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and the great are there; and the servant is free from his master." (Job 3 : 17-19.)

The doctrine of the unconsciousness of the dead may be further illustrated from those passages in which the inspired writers use the metaphor of "sleep" to denote *death, or the state of death*. We have already seen the unequivocal use that Job makes of this beautiful simile. And David says: "Lighten mine eyes, lest *I sleep* the sleep of death." (Ps. 13 : 3.) And again he says, "*I shall be satisfied when I awake* with thy likeness." (Ps. 17 : 15.)

Isaiah and Daniel, when speaking of the resurrection of *dead men* to life, make use of the same figure. "AWAKE and sing, *ye that dwell in dust*."

(Is. 26 : 19.) "And many of them that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake*." (Dan. 12 : 2.) The *sleep of the dead* is thus seen to have been the faith of the Old Testament saints; and unless we shall find in the New Testament the doctrine plainly and unequivocally taught that the dead are alive, and that the sleeping saints are wide awake, we may rest satisfied with the hope of Job and of David, of Isaiah and of Daniel, that, though we may sleep in the dust of the earth for a time, yet we shall at the time appointed with them awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament forever.

But in the New Testament we find the metaphor more frequently used than in the Old. Our Lord said to the mourning friends of the deceased daughter of Jairus: "Weep not; she is not dead, but *sleepeth*. And they laughed him to scorn, *knowing that she was dead*." (Luke 8 : 52, 53.) Similarly in the case of Lazarus, he said: "Our friend *Lazarus sleepeth*; but I go that I may *wake him out of his sleep*." And when his disciples misapprehended his meaning, "then said Jesus unto them plainly, *Lazarus is dead*." (John 11 : 11, 14. See also 1 Cor. 11, 30; 15 : 6, 18, 51; 1 Thess. 4 : 13, 14, 15; 5 : 10.) These passages prove that Christ and his apostles taught the doctrine of the sleep of the dead. It is therefore a Christian doctrine, and rests upon the firm foundations of the Gospel.

The attempt is often made to avoid the force of this conclusion by saying that the *soul* is altogether

free from the dominion of sleep, and that the word is only employed in Scripture to denote the repose of the *body*. This objection, so far as it is based upon the notion that consciousness is an essential attribute of mind or soul, has been fully met in the Argument from Reason, to which the reader is referred. In addition to what is there said, it may be remarked, that in dreamless sleep, consciousness does not exist; at least we can have no proof of its existence. In point of fact, the body appears to be less affected by sleep than the mind; for while all our mental faculties are inactive during deep sleep, the lungs act, the heart beats, and the blood circulates.

A man is said to be awake when he has cognizance of his own thoughts; he is then *conscious*, though he may be lying with closed eyes in the usual posture of sleeping. To walk as a somnambulist; that is, 'in one's sleep,' is to walk in a state of unconsciousness. Both these instances prove that sleep affects the mind, and the mind principally. Again, if sleep were used to denote repose and not insensibility, we should find it employed to signify the rest of inanimate things. But trees and stones are never said to be sleeping. They have never been conscious, hence they cannot experience a *suspension of consciousness*.

The inspired writers use the word sleep in such a manner that to apply it to the *body* and not to the *man* would be to deprive their language of all congruous significance. The *personality* — call it the

'rational soul' if you will—is clearly involved in such expressions as, "*I shall sleep in the dust;*" "*Lest I sleep the sleep of death;*" "*I shall be satisfied when I awake;*" "*Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake;*" "*I will raise him up at the last day.*" What is it to "awake" but to resume life, consciousness, and activity?

If it be the "*body*" only that goes down to the grave, why are we told that "the grave [*i. e.*, those who are in the grave] cannot praise the Lord?" What is the meaning of David's prayer, "Let the wicked be silent in *the grave?*" Did David mean to ask that *dead bodies*, which never possessed any intelligence, should be silent in *sheol*? Why call the grave 'the land of forgetfulness' if there be nothing in it that ever remembered? If that which was once conscious and intelligent does not go into the grave or *sheol* after death, why did Solomon say, "There is no work, nor device, nor *knowledge*, nor wisdom in the grave whither *thou* goest?"

When Hezekiah, the pious king of Judah, had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness, he wrote these words: "I said in the cutting off of my days, *I shall go to the gates of the grave: . . .* but thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered *it* from the *pit of corruption*: for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back. For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, tho living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day."

(Is. 38.) What orthodox theologian ever thinks of praising the Lord for delivering his *soul* from the pit of corruption? "Death cannot celebrate thee;" that is, those under the dominion of death cannot celebrate or praise the Lord. Did Hezekiah mean to say that *dead bodies* cannot praise the Lord? Did he not rather mean that *dead men* are unable to praise the Lord?

"*They* that go down into the pit cannot *hope for thy truth.*" To 'hope for the truth of God' would be an exercise of the mind peculiarly adapted to the state of the righteous dead, if they were really conscious. Will it be said that Hezekiah mourned because his "*body*" could not hope for the truth of God when in the grave? Shall we not rather believe that he grieved because he *himself* could not praise God when in the grave, celebrate him when in death, or hope for his truth while in the pit of corruption?

What stronger testimony do we need to establish the Scriptural doctrine of the unconsciousness of the dead? If obvious comparisons are overlooked, if plain metaphors are misapplied, if similes are ignored, and parables perverted, what can be done with the direct and explicit assertions of Scripture? David declares that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence;" that when man's "breath goeth forth he returneth to his earth, and in that very day his *thoughts perish.*" And Solomon uses language still stronger than this, if

possible, to show the utter unconsciousness of the dead: "To him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but *the dead know not ANYTHING*, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their *love*, and their *hatred*, and their *envy* is NOW PERISHED." (Eccl. 9 : 4-6.)

To this agrees the language used in Eccles. 17 : 27, 28, 30: "Who shall praise the Most High in the grave instead of them which live and give thanks? *Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead, as from one that is not*: the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. For all things cannot be in man, because *the son of man is NOT IMMORTAL.*" Esdras expresses the doctrine in these words: "After death shall judgment come, and *then* shall we *live* again, and *then* shall the names of the righteous be made manifest, and the works of the ungodly declared." (2 Esd. 14 : 25.)

Throughout the New Testament, the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. Our Lord never speaks of a spirit-world, nor of an intermediate state of conscious existence. In reasoning with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, he speaks of "the children of *this world*," and of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that world*," but says not a word about any world *between* death and resurrection.

If the popular theory were true, what could have been more natural than that the apostles should have encouraged their Christian brethren who suffered persecution, by reminding them that, though they could not receive their final reward at death, yet an intermediate state of happiness awaited their disembodied souls? But when Paul would give encouragement to the persecuted Thessalonians, he promises them *no reward whatever* until Christ's second coming. "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled *rest with us*, WHEN the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." (2 Thess. 1 : 6, 7.) And the same doctrine is clearly taught in that noted passage wherein he beseeches them not to sorrow for the dead, even as others which have no hope. "For," says he, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [anticipate or precede] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and *the dead in Christ shall rise first*: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be

with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." (1 Thess. 4 : 13-18.)

How different is this apostolic mode of comforting mourners from that which obtains *now*! Paul calls the deceased "them which are asleep," "the dead in Christ;" and as words of consolation to the survivors, he assures them that, since Jesus died and rose again, *even* so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. That believers who should be living when Christ comes shall not precede "them which are asleep;" for says he, "the dead in Christ *shall rise first; then* we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with* them in the clouds; and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord." Paul told his bereaved brethren to "comfort one another with these words." They must have afforded to the Thessalonian mourners a very cheering prospect concerning their deceased friends; but had Paul been authorized to reveal that they were *at that very time*

"Drinking fresh draughts of endless pleasure in,"

we cannot but suppose that he would have mentioned it as an additional consolation. Instead of this, however, his words of comfort *contain no allusion to an intermediate state of happiness.* He directs the Thessalonians not to sorrow as others which have no *hope*, and assures them that their deceased friends will sleep until Christ comes to give them eternal life.

Compare this mode of comforting mourners with the orthodox method at the present day. Paul speaks of the Church meeting the Lord at one time. Orthodoxy speaks of fractional parts of that Church meeting him every day and every hour. Paul, who "kept back nothing that was profitable," bade the bereaved ones at Thessalonica think of the glorious resurrection that awaits *them which sleep* in Jesus. Orthodoxy tells us that our friends who have fallen asleep in Jesus are in the actual enjoyment of heavenly blessedness. Paul passes without remark over the intermediate state, and fixes all his hopes upon the second coming of Christ to raise the dead. The pastors of modern churches seem to have an advantage over Paul in this respect; *they* dwell with the fondest delight upon the happiness of disembodied souls; *they* can assure the bereaved that their deceased friends are in heaven, and ask—

"Why do ye mourn departing friends,
Or shake at death's alarms?
'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
To call them to his arms."

In concluding the Scriptural argument concerning the intermediate state, I desire to call the reader's special attention to the very remarkable and significant language of the apostle Paul, which occurs in the passage already quoted: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so them also which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we

which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord *shall not prevent them which are asleep.*"¹ Orthodoxy, seeing the inevitable, and, to the popular theory, fatal conclusion contained in this passage, seeks to evade it by the preposterous claim that the sleeping saints referred to are the *disembodied souls* of the righteous dead, which are to descend from heaven with the Lord when he comes to raise their *bodies.*² This would be to completely reverse and destroy the statements which Paul made to the Thessalonians. He did not tell them that their sleeping friends were actually with Jesus; that *they which were asleep would precede them which were awake; that the dead would anticipate the living.* On the contrary, he assured them that they who should live to see Christ's coming would *not anticipate them that were asleep*, but that *the dead would rise first*; and that *all the saints—living and dead—would be caught up together*, and would, *at one and the same time, meet their Lord* in the air; and so should they ever be with the Lord.

Thus Paul, who did not "shun to declare all the counsel of God," not only shunned to declare the orthodox theory of an intermediate state, but clearly and unequivocally taught the opposite doctrine of the sleep of the dead.

¹The word "prevent" in the sense in which it is used in the text is now obsolete. It is derived from *pre*, before, and *venio*, to come; and may be rendered *precede*, *go before*, or *anticipate*.

²See *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, by H. Mattison, pp. 34, 35.

Unfortunately, with many persons the question is not, "Is the doctrine true?" but, "Is it acceptable?" Unable fairly to meet the array of Scriptural evidence against the popular view, the advocates of orthodoxy, as a last resort, make an appeal to the *feelings*, and attempt to foreclose all inquiry after truth, by characterizing our view as "materialistic and gloomy."

But can orthodoxy safely challenge a comparison of views? Is the "gloom" all on one side, and the sunshine all on the other? How are the advocates of the prevalent view prepared to sustain their appeal from reason and from Scripture to the feelings and sympathies of mankind? Shall we be told that their theory deprives death of his terrors, and converts the "last enemy" into a welcome friend? Are we to understand that their accommodating theology resolves the curse of God into a blessing? Must we believe if the dead are unconscious, that the intermediate state will be "a long and dreary interval?" Is it true that those who profess to believe that death is but a transition from one condition of life to another, a mere "change of costume," a "gate to endless joy," is it true, I ask, that such persons view the approach of death with less dread than those who regard it as an enemy, and the intermediate state as one of unconsciousness? Notwithstanding their professions of friendship for the "king of terrors," do they not, like Hezekiah, consider it a greater blessing to live than to die? Do they not,

like Paul, rejoice in the recovery of their sick friends, and speak of it as an act of God's *mercy*?

Actions that speak louder than words prove, that even the *orthodox* belief concerning death is regarded as a *gloomy and repulsive* doctrine. Our natures instinctively recoil from death and the grave. But both theories recognize the necessity of dying—of enduring the pains of dissolution—and of quitting this state of existence forever. Each theory has its coffin and its grave. In these respects both are alike gloomy; but beyond this point there is a great difference in the respective theories. According to the theory that we believe receives the sanction of Scripture, man remains in a profound sleep until awakened at the resurrection. In the intermediate state he is the subject neither of hope nor despair; of pleasure nor pain; of reward nor punishment. He is in “the *land of forgetfulness*,” where there is “*no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom*,” for “*the dead know not anything*.”

It should be remembered, that to the deceased, there is no long and dreary interval, no painful experience whatever. A century is to him no longer than a moment of time. His repose in the grave is but “for a little moment.” They who sleep in Jesus are “dead under God's covenant of everlasting life.” We must trust in God, and not doubt his ability to perform what he has promised. We must believe “that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.”

Let us glance for a moment at the popular theory which represents the intermediate state to be one of consciousness and activity. It is said all men will live after death as disembodied souls. Of such a state of existence we can form no conception whatever. To have any idea of a personal being we must have both form and material. The popular notion of an apparition is that which undoubtedly prevails in regard to the soul during its alleged separate existence. It is questionable whether the perpetuation of life under *such* conditions is to be deemed an advantage. The orthodox theory holds out the prospect of an intermediate state in the society of ghosts and "shades of dead men." Our view is condemned as "gloomy;" but is the prospect of becoming a ghost any more attractive? It is natural for men to have a fear of supernatural existences. Specters, ghosts, and apparitions are popularly regarded with superstitious awe. That death should change a man into a ghost — a conscious, immaterial, and immortal ghost — is certainly inconceivable. The popular theory represents the disembodied soul as awaiting with earnest and ardent expectation its re-embodiment at the resurrection. It must therefore be in a state of imperfection. Imagine the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles groaning for the redemption of their bodies and longing for the time to come when mortality should put on immortality! Could they be happy in such a state?

Blessed it cannot be to live as a ghost or as a frac-

tional part of a man, in a state of hope deferred, of desires unsatisfied: rather, "blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," for they rest in unconscious repose "from their labors," "awaiting the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give" them "AT THAT DAY"—*the day of Christ's appearing*.

According to the theory we advocate, the moment of death is, to our apprehensions, instantly succeeded by the moment of resurrection and the immediate realization—if worthy—of the boon of immortality. The subject is further illustrated in these words of Abp. Whately:

"The long and dreary interval between death and the day of judgment—supposing the intermediate state to be a profound sleep—does not exist at all, except in the imagination. To the party concerned there is *no* interval whatever; but to each person—according to this supposition—the moment of closing his eyes in death will be instantly succeeded by the sound of the last trumpet, which shall summon the dead; even though ages shall have intervened. And in this sense the faithful Christian may be, practically, in paradise the day he dies. The promise made to the penitent thief, and the apostle Paul's wish 'to depart and be with Christ,' which, he said, 'was far better' than to remain any longer in this troublesome world, would each be fulfilled to all practical purposes, provided each shall have found himself in a state of happiness in the presence of his Lord, the very instant (according to his own perception) after having breathed his last in this world.

"Some may have found a difficulty in reconciling together the apostle Paul's expression in one place, of his wish 'to depart and be with Christ,' and his expressions in many other

places concerning the departed as 'asleep.' If—it may be said—he expected to remain in a profound sleep from death till the resurrection, why should he speak of his impatience to 'be with Christ?' since his dying sooner or later would make no difference as to the time when the last day shall arrive: if on the other hand, he believed that a faithful servant of Christ would enjoy happiness in his Master's presence immediately on dying, before the resurrection, then why did he never comfort the Thessalonians, or any other Christians, by telling them this was the case with their deceased friends? Why does he on the contrary always speak of these as sleeping, and hold out to the survivors only the hope of the final resurrection?

"Now I think these different expressions of the Apostle may be understood, so as to be reconciled together, on the supposition of a state of sleep between death and the resurrection: though I do not undertake to say that they cannot be reconciled—which however I have never seen attempted—on any other supposition. Imagine to yourself the case of a sincere Christian, who—we will suppose—is convinced that this supposition is the fact. If he were asked what he thought of the condition of some *deceased friends* who had lived and died in the faith and fear of God, he would of course reply, 'They sleep in Jesus; we must not regard them as at this moment actually enjoying their reward; but neither must we sorrow as those who have no hope; on the contrary, we must fully trust that they will be raised up to immortal happiness at the last day.'

"If again this same man were *himself* seemingly at the point of death in some lingering and painful disease, and worn down by other grievous afflictions, and were asked what he thought of *his own* prospects, he would be likely to answer, 'I long to be released from my sufferings, and "to be with Christ;" for I believe that, to my perceptions, the instant death closes my eyes, I shall be awakened by the last trump—the summons to meet my Lord. And though in relation to *you, the survivors*, my dying this hour, or a year hence, makes no difference as to

the time when that day shall arrive, to *me* it makes all the difference: *absolutely*, the interval from now to the general resurrection is the same; but relatively to me, it does to all practical purposes, come the sooner, the sooner I am released from the burden of "this earthly tabernacle."'

"You observe I have represented this man as speaking—which he naturally would do—in a very different tone when he is speaking of the deceased friends whom he survives, and when he is speaking of his own death: and this not from his supposing the conditions of the two parties to be at all different, absolutely; but from their being very different *in relation to himself*. When he considers himself as the survivor of his friends, he speaks of their remaining in a state of insensibility for an interval, perhaps a long one, before they awake to happiness, for, *relatively*, to the *survivors* there is an interval: when he considers himself, not as a survivor, but as just departing, he speaks of no interval, but of awaking to happiness immediately; because *relatively to himself* there is no interval. It is thus then that the apostle Paul, or any other sincere Christian, WOULD express himself, supposing him to have such a belief. And just thus it is that Paul *does* express himself. Whenever he is administering comfort to the survivors respecting their brethren who have departed in the Lord, *he always speaks of them as 'asleep,'* and always points to the hope of the *general resurrection*. And also when he is speaking of *himself in conjunction with others*, his language is, 'I have finished my course; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me in that day, and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing.' On the other hand, when he speaks of his eager longing to 'depart and to be with Christ,' he is speaking of himself, solely, without any reference to the perceptions and feelings of the survivors, but only to his own. Now in respect of his own perceptions, the moment of his breathing his last in this world would be, as has been said,

instantly succeeded—on the supposition of total insensibility during the interval—by that of his awaking in the presence of his Lord. . . . It is difficult, I acknowledge, for a man to reconcile it to his imagination, that though the end of the world may not perhaps come for many ages hence, yet he will himself, to his own perceptions, the very moment after his eyes are closed in death find himself summoned to stand before the judgment seat of Christ, on the last day; it is difficult, I say, to *imagine* this, but it is *impossible*—on the supposition of a total insensibility—not to *believe* it; for that, in *that* case, it would be so, is matter of *absolute demonstration*.”¹

If the intermediate state be one of unconsciousness, the righteous man who died two thousand years ago has no advantage with respect to future reward over the last Christian who shall die before the Lord comes. They will enter upon their future life at the same time. They “shall be caught up *together* to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall they ever be with Lord.”

Orthodoxy, with its ghostly theory, can offer no prospect so magnificent as this. To think of existing as real, tangible beings is certainly calculated to afford us more pleasure than the thought of becoming impalpable ghosts or immaterial souls. The hour is surely coming when “death will be swallowed up in victory,” when, at the summons of the Life-giver, those who “sleep in Jesus” shall rise with the “image of the heavenly,” and with spiritual bodies “fashioned like unto his glorious body.” “Then shall an indestructible and boundless life burn in

¹ *Scripture Revelations of a Future State.*

every countenance and move in every limb! The eye shall be opened to a keener insight, and to a wider survey of the immeasurable universe, and lighten with the fires of an undying intelligence! The ear shall be attuned for loftier harmonies, and strengthened to endure the reverberations of the music of celestial song! Then shall the voice pour forth the powerful language of angels, in tones that cannot weary, and with an eloquence that never fails! Then shall the feeble sufferer, whom Satan bound for years on earth, *leap as a hart*, spring forward, or 'fly swiftly' with resistless force, and with a spirit which no exertions can fatigue! Then shall the glory of the Lord our God be upon us in majestic lineaments, which retain their freshness through eternal ages, and in features of immortal beauty, liable to no decay: *for in his presence there is fullness of joy, and at his right hand there are pleasures for evermore.*"

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHRISTIAN REDEMPTION.

“The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” (John 5 : 28, 29.)

Among the glorious titles given to Christ is that of Redeemer. “CHRIST IS MADE UNTO US REDEMPTION.” *To redeem* is to recover, or gain back again; and the Scriptural term “redemption” comprehends the recovery of all that we have lost in Adam. The first man, as the representative of the human race, by his transgression in Eden lost for himself and posterity the prize of immortality. The grand object of Christ’s mission was to redeem all men from the curse of the law. That curse was literal death. “By one man sin, entered into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” But “as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Hence, the recovery will be co-extensive with the fall. “Christ is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*.”

One object of Christ’s mission was to enlighten men. He is called “the True Light, which lighteth

every man that cometh into the world." John says, "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an *understanding, that we may know him that is true*, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "Henceforth ye *know him and have seen him*." Thus Christ is "made unto us wisdom." The next step is the attainment of righteousness or justification. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace *through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just and the justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus." Hence, Christ is "made unto us *justification*." Christ is represented as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." He "gave himself for us, that he might *redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*." Hence, Christ is "made unto us *sanc-tification*."

Besides these great purposes of the Redeemer's mission, there remained the crowning act to be accomplished; for man, though enlightened, pardoned, and made holy, still was *mortal*, and the benefits already bestowed would be but temporary and imperfect. Christ, therefore, crowns his glorious mis-

sion by becoming the Resurrection and the Life, by which he is "*made unto us* REDEMPTION." He announces the great object of his mission in these words—"I am come that they might have *life*." And John says: "God sent his only begotten Son into the world, *that we might LIVE THROUGH HIM*." (1. John 4 : 9.)

This grand purpose of the Life-giver necessarily supposes that men are mortal, and wholly dependent upon the Christian redemption for immortal life in the world to come. The whole plan of redemption is not carried into effect in this state of existence. Men are enlightened, pardoned, justified, and sanctified in this world, but not immortalized. They put on immortality at the resurrection. "The day of redemption," then, unto which believers are sealed, is the day of resurrection. Of those only who "shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead," may it be said, "*neither can they DIE ANY MORE*: for they are equal unto the angels; *and are the children of God, BEING the children of the resurrection*." (Luke 20 : 35, 36.) Had it not been for the personal resurrection of Christ, there would have been no Gospel or glad tidings for the human race. By it he "abolished death and brought *life and immortality* [or immortal life] to light."

In commemoration of this great event, it is written in the second Psalm: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." And Paul, while preach-

ing at Antioch, used these significant words: "We declare unto you GLAD TIDINGS, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." (Acts 13 : 32, 33.) Thus was our Redeemer "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, *by the resurrection from the dead.*" (Rom. 1 : 4.) Hence, the resurrection is called the adoption, or manifestation of sonship: "waiting for the *adoption*, to wit: the *redemption* of the body." (Rom. 8 : 23.)

Hence, also, the resurrection is called *the regeneration*, or the completion of the new birth unto everlasting life. Our Lord said to his disciples: "Ye which have followed me, *in the regeneration*, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matt. 19 : 28.)

Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. *That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.* Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" When Christ "became the first-fruits of them that slept," by being raised from

the dead "with the power of an endless life," he illustrated his saying to Nicodemus by going and coming as the wind, unnoticed and unseen. He rose with a spiritual body," which, although visible and tangible, possessed powers and properties infinitely different from the natural or animal body. "The God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus," will in like manner ["*even so*" (1 Thess. 4:14)] bring from the dead "them also which sleep in Jesus." (Heb. 13:20; 1 Thess. 4.) In accordance with this precious truth are the words of Paul to the Romans: "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." To be born of the Spirit, then, is to be born from the dead with a spiritual body, "to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap *life everlasting*." The harvest is not at death, but at the end of the world. Redemption is not perfected when a good man dies, but when he is raised to immortal life, and becomes a sharer in the joys of the celestial paradise. "Who hath heard such a thing? Who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or *shall a nation be born at once?* for as soon as

Zion travailed she brought forth her children."
(Is. 66 : 8.)

THE RESURRECTION.

There are three theories concerning the resurrection which deserve our careful attention.

1. The first theory, and the one most commonly received is, that when a man dies, his disembodied soul passes at once into an intermediate state of happiness or misery, according to its character, whether good or bad. In this separate state, the soul is to continue until the end of the world, when it shall come from its abode in heaven or *hades*, to the surface of the earth, and shall recognize, glide into, and take possession of its resurrected body.

2. The second theory is, that at death the soul rises from the "earthly house of this tabernacle," and abandons it forever; but instead of leaving as a disembodied spirit, it assumes at once its final, its spiritual body. In other words, the resurrection or *anastasis* of every man takes place when he dies. One of the advocates of this theory states it thus:

"What is the resurrection? It is not a resuscitation of our natural bodies, some thousands of years hence — this would be utterly inconsistent with every development of nature — but it is a rising of our spiritual being to a new form of existence when it has done with the body."¹

3. The third theory is, that all men fall asleep in death, and remain entirely unconscious until the

¹ *Future Life and Resurrection*, by G. W. Quinby.

resurrection, when "all that are in the graves shall hear" the voice of the Son of God, "and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

THE FIRST THEORY CONSIDERED.

All of the advocates of this theory believe in the immortality of the soul. Hence, "the resurrection of the dead" is spoken of as the reunion of soul and body. This rendering of a Scriptural expression is not warranted by any language of inspiration. Such expressions as "reunion of soul and body," and "resurrection of the body," are nowhere to be found in the Bible. The Scriptures represent but two bodily states for man: the "natural body," and the "spiritual body." *He never is represented as consciously existing in a disembodied state.* He never is spoken of as a disembodied soul. The Bible nowhere supports the notion of a transmigration of souls. *That is a heathen doctrine, although it may be called "orthodox."*¹ It is true that the soul is popularly spoken of as an immaterial and disembodied entity; but "however shadowy the forms which tenant the Elysian fields of the popular theology," it is beyond dispute that each happy soul in

¹This may seem to be an unjust remark, but it is undoubtedly true; for one who believes that the soul passes through two or three bodies is a believer in the transmigration of souls in just as intelligible a sense as one who believes that it passes through thousands of bodies.

the intermediate state is conceived and spoken of as *already* possessed of a 'spiritual body.' With such theorists, how can the resurrection of *the dead* be regarded as the great central doctrine of the New Testament?

More than three centuries ago, William Tyndale, in his famous reply to Thomas More, who was a Papist, gave utterance to this great truth:

"And ye, in putting them [souls] in heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. . . . 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?"

Mr. Dobney very truthfully observes:

"There is something of awkwardness, which the Scriptures seem to avoid, in making beings who have already entered, and many ages since, on a state of happiness or misery, come from those abodes to be judged, and to receive a formal award to the very condition which has long been familiar to them. To have been in heaven with Christ for glorious ages, and then to stand at his bar for judgment, and be invited to enter heaven as their eternal home, as though they had not been there already, scarcely seems to look exactly like the Scripture account, while it would almost appear to be wanting in congruity. Nor is this all. There is another difficulty, namely: that the idea of a saint already 'with Christ,' 'present with the Lord' (who is in heaven, be it remembered, in his resurrection and glorified body, wherewith he ascended from the brow of Olivet), coming from heaven to earth to glide into a body raised simultaneously from the ground, he being in reality already possessed of a spiritual body, would seem *an invention*

*which has not one syllable in Scripture to give it countenance."*¹

THE SECOND THEORY CONSIDERED.

This theory has no disembodied state, and but two bodies for man—the present and the resurrection body. So far it seems to be in agreement with Scripture. There are, however, very serious objections against it. In the first place, it opposes the Gospel doctrine of a resurrection of THE DEAD. The advocates of this theory argue that the *body* only dies. What then is raised from *the dead*? Not the body, certainly; for they say that the resurrection "is *not* a resuscitation of our natural bodies." Is it the soul, then, that is made the subject of resurrection? This cannot be: for it is the *dead* not the *living* that are raised, and *they* affirm that the *soul* never dies, but ever preserves a conscious existence. Thus this theory is in direct conflict with the teachings of Scripture. Paul says that Christ was "the FIRST-BORN *from the dead*;" but, according to these theorists, Abel deserves to be called the first-born from the dead: for since he was the first of the human race that died, he must have been the first subject of the resurrection. Finally, it seems impossible to reconcile this theory with the many impressive refer-

¹ *Future Punishment*, pp. 139-140.

ences in Scripture to the general resurrection and judgment at the end of the world.

THE THIRD THEORY CONSIDERED.

This theory makes the second coming of Christ, and the consequent resurrection of the dead, the only hope of a future life. It recognizes the great truth that eternal life is "*the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord;*" that immortality is a prize to be sought after by "patient continuance in well doing." It magnifies the glorious plan of redemption; it honors Christ as the Life-giver; it makes the resurrection and the life attained thereby the Gospel of the New Testament. And agreeably to Scripture, it recognizes no state of disembodied existence; and but two bodies for man, the present or natural body; and the future or spiritual body.

Let us now examine the doctrine as taught in the New Testament, and see which of these theories is in accordance therewith.

The reader's attention is first called to our Lord's discourses touching the resurrection, and to his three recorded miracles of raising the dead, by which he illustrated his high prerogative as the "Author of life." In the Gospel of Luke, it is written that Jesus said to one who had invited him to eat bread on the Sabbath-day: "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsman, nor thy rich neighbors; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made

thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for THOU SHALT BE RECOMPENSED AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST." (Luke 14 : 12-14.)

This passage proves that there is to be a resurrection of the just; and establishes the fact that the just die, and are raised from the dead before they receive their reward. To prove the *first* theory, the passage should read thus: 'Thou shalt be recompensed in part at death, and fully recompensed at the resurrection of *the bodies* of the just.' To prove the *second* thus: 'Thou shall be recompensed *at* death.' To prove the *third*, thus: "Thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just.*"

In the fifth chapter of John the full scope and meaning of the resurrection is exhibited in these words: "The hour is coming, in the which *all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.*" (vv. 28, 29.) This passage teaches that those who have done good, and those who have done evil, shall come forth from the graves at the resurrection. The resurrection, then, is the rising again or *anastasis* of human beings, considered as responsible agents, and rewardable subjects. But how does this comport with the teachings of orthodoxy? We are told by Mr. Richard Watson that "rewards and punishments have their relation to the

body, not so much as it is the *subject* but the *instrument* of reward and punishment. *It is the soul ONLY which perceives pain or pleasure, which suffers or enjoys, and is, therefore, the ONLY REWARDABLE SUBJECT.*"¹ According to this statement, the object of the resurrection is to furnish the soul, as "the only rewardable subject," with an "instrument," by which its happiness—if good—or its misery—if bad—may be increased!

The text, however, clearly negatives such a position by asserting that "all that are in *the graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; *they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.*" Then those who shall come from the graves at the resurrection are rewardable subjects. This is in strict accordance with the third theory, but is expressly fatal to both the others. Why does not this self-reliant and boastful orthodoxy, that so confidently proclaims the resurrection of the dead to be a reunion of soul and body, cite us to at least *one* passage of Scripture, which directly *asserts*, or necessarily *implies* such a doctrine? ²

Search the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and

¹ *Theol. Inst.*, pp. 552-3.

² It ought perhaps to be mentioned in this connection that some orthodox theologians affirm that the body *is* a rewardable subject. Thus Spurgeon says: "It would be unjust to punish the soul and not the body; for the body has had as much to do with sin as ever the soul had." (*Sermons*, 2d Series, p. 273.) Mr. Watson was an immaterialist, and so is Mr. Spurgeon. Mr. Watson's statement, however, embodies the

not a syllable can be found to support the notion that the body is raised for the purpose of becoming the "*instrument*" of an already conscious and immortal soul. On the orthodox theory, no good reason can be given why there should be any resurrection at all. It is to suppose that the Almighty cannot suitably reward or punish the soul without using its former body as an instrument. Orthodoxy dare not say that the resurrection is on account and for the interests of the body. To affirm this would be to overthrow its whole theory. For the moment that it acknowledges that the body is a rewardable subject, it virtually surrenders the only point in controversy.

The words of our Lord in John 5 : 28, 29, if literally construed, must ever stand as an unanswerable argument against the popular theory of the resurrection. The good and the bad must come from their graves and appear at "the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *in body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Three times in quick succession did our Redeemer say of the believer: "I will raise *him* [not his body] up at the last day." (John 6 : 40, 44, 54.)

• When our Lord raised to life the daughter of Jairus, "he took her by the hand and said, Damsel,

only logical conclusion from the premises assumed: for if the body be entirely devoid of intelligence, it is not a responsible agent, and therefore not a subject of reward or punishment.

I say unto thee, Arise. And straightway the damsel arose and walked." (Mark 5 : 42, 43.) Here there was no circumstance, prayer, look, or word to lead any one to suppose that a disembodied soul was recalled from the spirit-world to reanimate the lifeless form of the ruler's daughter. So also in the miracle that Jesus wrought by restoring to life the widow's son. The Life-giver merely said, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And *he* that was dead stood up, and began to speak." (Luke 7 : 14, 15.)

The reader's attention is next called to the miracle wrought by our Lord in raising Lazarus from the dead. When Martha heard that Jesus was coming she went and met him. "Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." Jesus saith unto her, "Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Jesus said unto her, "I am the Resurrection and the Life: *he* that believeth in me, though *he* were dead, yet shall *he* live." The language of Martha gives no indication that she supposed her brother was existing somewhere as a disembodied soul. On the contrary, she expected that her *brother* would rise again in the resurrection at the last day.

Before our Lord came to the grave he asked, "Where have ye laid *him*?" thus recognizing the fact that the *personality* of Lazarus was there. Lazarus had been dead four days, and decomposition had already begun its work when Jesus summoned

him from the grave. He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth! And *he* that was dead came forth." Thus did Jesus illustrate his saying—"I am the Resurrection and the Life." Are we at liberty to suppose that the conscious soul of Lazarus came from heaven and re-entered its former tenement? Let us speak plainly on this point. On the orthodox theory we must suppose that the soul of Lazarus left its "house, eternal in the heavens," and reinhabited its "earthly house of this tabernacle." But if the latter expression mean the "natural body," the former must mean the "spiritual body." Hence, Lazarus must have had two bodies to one soul. This shows the intense absurdity of the popular theory.

The miracle wrought by Peter in raising Dorcas to life is strongly opposed to the common notion of the soul's conscious existence in a separate state. Peter "kneeled down and prayed; and turning to the body said, Tabitha, arise. And she opened her eyes: and when she saw Peter, she sat up." (Acts 9: 40.) Not the slightest intimation is here given that Tabitha's *self* or conscious soul was in heaven, while she whom Peter called Tabitha lay dead before him. Peter calls "the body" Tabitha, thus indicating that the personality was present, and not absent "beyond the bounds of time and space." Take another illustration. As the Moabites were burying a man, "they spied a band of men; and they cast the *man* into the sepulchre of Elisha; and when the *man* was let down, and touched the bones of

of Elisha, *he* revived and stood upon his feet." (2 Ki. 13 : 21.) According to the orthodox theory, this man's conscious *soul* or *self* came from heaven or hell, from a place of happiness or of misery to re-animate and re-inhabit its former "house," on the very instant that *he*—the dead man—touched the bones of Elisha.

APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE.

No one can read with care the history of the apostles' ministry as given by Luke, without being deeply impressed with the importance which those inspired men attached to the doctrine of the resurrection. Boldly did Peter, on the day of Pentecost, preach the resurrection of Christ from the dead. On the occasion of healing the lame man, Peter and John gave the glory to God who raised Jesus from the dead. Paul, with equal boldness, preached the same doctrine at Antioch and at Athens. At the former place he said: "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, *in that he hath raised up Jesus again.*" (Acts 13 : 32, 33.) When he preached the resurrection in the metropolis of Greece, the Stoics and Epicureans said, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection." (Acts 17:18.) When brought before the highest court of Athens, he continued his favorite theme; "and when they heard of the resur-

rection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, "We will hear thee again of this matter." Again, before the council he said, "of the *hope and resurrection of the dead* I am called in question." Before Felix, he said, "Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day." When brought before Festus and Agrippa, he said, "I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

These instances taken from a single book of the New Testament show the transcendent importance attached to the doctrine by the early Christians.

No resurrection, no future life, was the doctrine of the apostolic ministry. This will be rendered more apparent when we consider Paul's formal discourse to the Corinthians, wherein he asserts that if the dead rise not, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." There were some in the church at Corinth who affirmed that there was no resurrection of the dead. To controvert this heresy, the apostle prepared the celebrated argument contained in the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians.

The argument proper begins at the thirteenth verse—"If there be no resurrection of the dead,

then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." *Two* consequences are here declared to necessarily follow, if there be no resurrection of the dead. The first is, that Christ cannot have risen from the dead, and the second is, that preaching "Jesus and the resurrection" is a vain and profitless employment. "*Our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain.*" From this statement we learn what was the subject of apostolic preaching, and what was the faith of the early Christians. The resurrection of the dead was evidently the great doctrine of the apostolic ministry.

"If the dead rise not, then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Two things are here distinctly affirmed. (1) The dead in the intermediate state are "asleep." (2) If there be no resurrection of the dead, then there is no future life. The passage itself is so plain and conclusive that the mystic doctors are unable to harmonize it with their theory. Thus Adam Clarke, in his note on 1 Cor. 15: 18, 32, says:

"All those who, either by martyrdom or natural death, have departed in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ *are perished*; their hope was without foundation and their faith had not reason and truth for its object. . . . *If there be no resurrection, then there can be no judgment, no future state of rewards and punishments.*"

Albert Barnes is, if possible, still more explicit:

"They hoped to have been saved by the merits of the Lord.

Jesus; they trusted to a risen Savior, and fixed all their hopes of heaven there; but if he did not rise, of course the whole system was a delusion, and they have failed of heaven and *been destroyed*. Their bodies lie in the grave and return to their native dust without the prospect of a resurrection, and *their SOULS ARE DESTROYED.*"

At v. 22 he says:

"All mankind are subjected to temporal death, or are mortal. . . . The object of the Apostle's argument was to show that the doctrine of the resurrection by Christ was such as to meet the obvious doctrine that man became MORTAL by Adam; or that the one was adapted to counteract the other."

These extracts, which concede the whole question, are only given for the purpose of illustrating the force of a passage of Scripture which is capable of eliciting from such high orthodox authorities the confession, that man is mortal, and dependent upon the resurrection for all future life. It is well known that Adam Clarke and Albert Barnes teach the immortality of the soul and the endless misery of the wicked; and if the reader wishes to see some square-contradictions let him read their notes on 1 Cor. 15: 18, 22, 32, and on Matt. 10: 28; Luke 16: 19-31; 2 Cor. 5: 1-8; Phil. 1: 23; and Luke 23: 43.

*"Assures them they are mortals, and next line
Calls them immortals, angels, and divine;
Declares them spirits, and yet sons of clay,
Who death survive, and yet in death decay;
Exposed to anguish in the quenchless fire,
Whose flames destroy, yet leave the wretch entire.
Such contradictions are abundant here,
But God be thanked, none in the Word appear."*

Let us next inquire in what sense the righteous dead may be said to have "*perished*" if there is to be no resurrection of the dead. Will it be said that the body only is alluded to—that "if the dead rise not," the body will perish. Dead bodies are not "they which have fallen *asleep* in Christ." Besides, such an interpretation would be contrary to the *theological* sense of the word "*perished*." In such passages for instance as Ps. 37: 20, and 2 Peter 2: 12, we are told by the 'merciless doctors,' that the word *perish* must not be taken in its natural and common sense, but that it must be understood to mean everlasting suffering in the quenchless fires of *gehenna*. This is what is known as the "*theological*" sense of such words as "*perish*" and "*destroy*" when they are applied to the destiny of the wicked. Why then depart from this sense in the present instance? Why not say at once, that "if the dead rise not," "then they which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are *perished*;" that is, have gone to endure the endless torments of *gehenna*? It is true, that such an interpretation would be intolerable, but *it ought to be so esteemed in every case*.

Orthodoxy should either give to the word "*perished*" its "*theological*" sense, or abandon the controversy altogether, for this text of itself demolishes its whole theory of the soul's consciousness between death and resurrection. Paul plainly teaches that our future existence depends on a resurrection of the dead. The entire scope of the argument shows

that it is the fact of a resurrection that alone gives the Christian a well-founded hope of a future life. This is further apparent from the language used in v. 32: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." Is it conceivable that the Apostle would thus have written had he been a believer in the soul's immortality? Plainly does this passage teach the great truth—NO RESURRECTION NO FUTURE LIFE. Paul's labors, trials, and sufferings would be of no advantage to him unless there was a resurrection of the dead. Modern preachers, unlike Paul, can say, "though the dead should never rise, still it matters greatly how we live here, for though our *bodies are never raised, yet as our souls are immortal, if we live wickedly and abandon ourselves to sensual pleasures, we shall, at death, enter upon a state of endless misery.*" But Paul taught no such doctrine. He virtually declares, that if the dead do not rise, the wisest course would be to indulge the sensual appetites, and enjoy the pleasures of this world. "*What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.*" Had there been a future existence for man without a resurrection, Paul could not have used this language; for in such a case his pious labors would not have been in vain, and the Epicurean motto would not have been thought worthy of adoption.

"But some man will say, How are *the dead raised*

up? and with what *body* do they [the dead] come?" What does the Apostle mean here by "the dead?" "Not the human soul," says orthodoxy; "for that never dies." What then does he mean? Answer: "The human body; for that is the only part of man that is mortal." Very well; let us read the verse according to this exposition. 'Some man will say, How are the *dead bodies* raised up? and with what *body* do the *dead bodies* come?'

Who can believe that Paul ever put into the mouth of the skeptic such inquiries as these? If such a paraphrase be demurred to, it is only necessary to reply, that it is made in strict accordance with the orthodox theory, which supposes that only a fractional part of man is to be raised at the resurrection. If, as Mr. Watson says, "the presence of an immaterial soul with the body *is the source* of animal *life*," and if, as he further asserts, the "rational soul" is "the *only cause of life*,"¹ it follows that the "body" can in no proper sense of the word be called mortal, for in the case supposed, the soul monopolizes all the life, does all the *seeing*, all the *hearing*, and all the *feeling*; and the body is but a passive instrument, a mere machine.

Hence, according to the popular theory, *nothing* dies, and *nothing* is raised from *the dead*. But Paul replies to the skeptic's inquiry, by saying, "Thou fool, that which thou sowest *is not quickened except*

¹ *Institutes*, p. 326.

it die." Here is the statement of an obvious truth. That which never died can never be re-enlivened. If man is immortal he can never be raised from the dead, or re-enlivened, since he can never die. Nor will it do any better to say that man is partly mortal and partly immortal, partly corruptible and partly incorruptible; for even if such an absurdity were admitted, there could be no such thing as a resurrection of *dead men* to life. It will not answer, therefore, to say that a fractional part of man dies, and descends to the grave, while the other fractional part of man lives in heaven, paradise, or the "spheres." Such absurdities are nowhere taught in the Bible. Isaiah says: "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.*" (Is. 26: 19.) The prophet declares that *dead men shall live*, and that they shall *rise* together with his dead body. He evidently knew nothing about the "Double Substance Theory" of modern theology.

Believers in the popular doctrine of immortality deify the soul by making *it*, instead of Christ, the Resurrection and the Life. Thus they sing:

"Soul, rebuild thy house of clay;
Immortality, thy walls,
And eternity, thy day."

But let us return to the reasoning of Paul. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual

body." Here nothing is said about a separation or a reunion of soul and body. And that he is not speaking of the body in a distinctive sense, is seen from the language used in the next verse: "And so it is written. *The first man Adam was MADE a living soul* [Watson says "a living soul was BREATHED INTO *the body, by an inspiration of God*"¹]; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit. The first *man* is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." What language could be more explicit than this? Here the first Adam is contrasted with the second Adam, the earthy with the heavenly. But immaterialists tell us that the expression "the first man is of the earth, earthy," refers only to Adam's body as constituting but a part of the *man* Adam. If now we subject the antithetic expression to the same orthodox treatment, we make the verse read thus: 'The body of the first man is of the earth, earthy; the body of the second man is the Lord from heaven.' What shall we say of an interpretation that justifies such a preposterous reading of Scripture?

Our Redeemer rose from Joseph's tomb with a spiritual body, and with it he ascended into heaven

¹ *Institutes*, p. 326.

“and sat on the right hand of God.” Paul assures his Corinthian brethren, that at the resurrection their natural bodies shall be raised as spiritual bodies, and that as they have borne the image of the earthy, they shall also bear the image of the heavenly. John says: “We know that when he shall appear, *we shall be like him.*” (1 John 3: 2.) And Paul says: “Christ shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned *like unto his glorious body.*” (Phil. 3: 21.)

On that most memorable day in which our Lord burst the bands of death, and became “the first-fruits of them that slept,” the disciples were assembled at Jerusalem; when suddenly, “Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and *supposed* that they had seen a *spirit*. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that *it is I myself*: handle *me*, and see; for a spirit [a phantom, such as you supposed] hath not flesh and bones as ye see *me* have. And when he had thus spoken he showed them his hands and his feet.” What instruction does this interesting passage of Scripture convey to our minds? Our Lord assures his disciples that he was not a *ghost*, but a real and tangible being. His personal identity was preserved, although his natural body had been changed to a spiritual body. It is sometimes said that the use of the word spirit here is evi-

dence of the existence of disembodied human souls.

In Matt. 14: 26, and in Mark 6: 49, the word rendered spirit is in the Greek text *phantasma*. The disciples *thought* they saw a *phantom*, but they were *mistaken*, as all other persons are who think they ever saw a *ghost*. In these instances the disciples were deceived, and so they were in the case mentioned by Luke. In each instance they *supposed* they had seen a spirit. In Luke 24: 37, 39 the word rendered spirit is not *phantasma*, but *pneuma*. Griesbach, however, gives *phantasma* in the margin. It does not greatly matter which word the inspired writer, used for neither supports the popular theory.

They "*supposed* they had seen a spirit." But our Lord corrected their errors on the subject, and at the same time demonstrated the MATERIALITY OF SPIRITUAL BODIES. He further assured them that what they saw was *himself*. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is *I myself*." Here was a life-giving Spirit, with *flesh* and *bones*, *hands* and *feet*; a material Being who could be *handled* and *seen*. How absurd to suppose that the disciples thought they saw an immaterial (?) ghost! Had the inspired writer intended to convey this idea, he would have written, 'they supposed they had seen *his* spirit,' instead of a spirit.

"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, and *we* shall be chang-

ed." (v. 51.) Paul was addressing his Corinthian brethren, and the term "*we*" must therefore include himself and them as individuals. The change referred to was from mortality to *immortality*. They were then wholly mortal; for the change referred to was not a change of heart, they being already Christians. It was a radical change in their constitution, by which they were to become incorruptible and immortal. The orthodox theory cannot stand before such evidence as this. If the Bible be true, that theory is false.

"For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." (v. 53.) Now what is it that puts on immortality? Paul says "this *mortal* must put on immortality." What did he mean by the expression "this mortal?" "He meant the body," says the immaterialist; "for the soul is already immortal." Very well; let us see how this will do. For the immortal soul to put on the mortal body, would be to reverse the Apostle's statement, and make this immortal put on mortality. Or, if we suppose that the body is raised immortal, then it would be, "this immortal must put on immortality," which would be scarcely less absurd than the former statement. Nothing can be more inconsistent than to suppose that the Apostle had any refer-

ence to a reunion of soul and body. He had just said, "The dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed." "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be *changed*." This change was the putting on of immortality. All Christians who are alive when Christ comes will be *changed* from *mortal* to *immortal*. This *must* be done, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

When Christ comes to finish the work of redemption, he will be attended by the "holy angels." (Matt. 25: 31.) *These* are the "saints" that are to accompany him from heaven; although immaterialists suppose that these "saints" are the bodiless souls of human beings. The angels said to the disciples: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This *same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner*, as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) Immaterial souls would form a strange retinue for such a glorious personage as Jesus, the Redeemer.

The apostle Paul closes his admirable chapter by saying: "Therefore my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." Why would not their labor be in vain in the Lord? Was it because they had immortal souls, that would be rewarded at death? No. It was because Christ had risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept; and because *his* resurrection was the *pledge* of *theirs*.

Their labor would not be in vain in the Lord, because when the Life-giver should come to raise his sleeping saints, they would receive their reward — the gift of *eternal life*. In the closing chapter of Revelation, the glorious announcement is made: "Behold, I come quickly; and my *reward is with me*, to give every man according as his work shall be."

It was the hope of attaining to the resurrection of the dead, that enabled the apostles and early Christians to endure without complaint the grievous persecutions which as servants of Christ they were compelled to suffer. Thus Paul writes to the Philipians: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith; that *I may know him and the power of his resurrection*, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death; if by any means *I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead*." (Phil. 3: 8-11.) Here, as in 1 Cor. 15, we see he makes everything depend upon the resurrection of the dead. He was accustomed to console himself with the thought of being raised from the dead, knowing that *then* he would receive his reward.

In his second letter to the Corinthians, he says: "We would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life; but *we had the sentence of death in ourselves that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God WHO RAISETH THE DEAD.*" (ch. 1: 8, 9.) There is not a passage in the New Testament that more clearly expresses the apostolic faith than this. Paul could not trust in himself because he was mortal. He wisely chose to trust in God, not because any *happiness* was promised him as a disembodied soul, but because God was able and willing to raise *him from the dead*. This implicit trust in God, this exalted faith in his Redeemer, was what enabled him to count all things but loss, if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Amid all his trials and labors and persecutions, he never in a single instance consoles himself or his brethren by any allusion to a disembodied state of existence. Why this silence on the part of one who "kept back nothing that was profitable?" who "shunned not to declare all the counsel of God?" If going to heaven or hell at death be a gospel doctrine, why did not Paul proclaim it? He passes over the intermediate state as though it were nothing, and fixes all his hopes on the resurrection.

This remark is well illustrated by the language used in 2 Cor. 5: 1-8: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we

have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight;) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord."

In the preceding chapter the apostle says, "Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Paul had suffered almost everything but death, when he dictated these words: yet in view of the glorious hope of being "raised up by Jesus," he calls them "light afflictions," and as compared to the eternal future they were but as a moment. In a subsequent chapter he enumerates some of the sufferings and hardships that he had undergone for the cause of Christ. "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep;

in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." And these terrible sufferings, these fearful persecutions that would daunt the spirit of most men, are spoken of by this Christian hero as a "light affliction!" Would we know the secret of this sublime heroism, of this matchless composure, we need but to listen to his own words, in which he reveals it, by stating the nature of his hope, "knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus *shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.*" (2 Cor. 4: 14.)

It was his confidence in a resurrection, and the assurance that he would then be raised to immortal life, that caused him to esteem so lightly the cruel persecutions of his enemies. Had it not been for the hope of a resurrection Paul and his brethren would have been of all men the most miserable.

Let us now give our attention to the consideration of 2 Cor. 5: 1-8. The Apostle having asserted his confidence in the resurrection of the dead, proceeds further to say, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The imagery here used—for the language is obviously figurative—compares the be-

liever in the *present* state of existence to an "earthly house" which may be dissolved; and in the next, as a "building of God, a house not made with hands," which unlike the former is eternal, and cannot be dissolved. As if Paul had said—'What though our *present nature* be dissolved in death? We know that God has provided *another nature*, an incorruptible and immortal one, which he will bestow upon us, when he raises us up by Jesus at the resurrection.' He evidently is speaking of the *two bodies* to which he alludes in 1 Cor. 15—there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." In the second verse he says: "For in this [mortal state] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with [immortality] our house which is from heaven. For we that are in this tabernacle [dwelling here as mortal beings] do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon [with immortality], that *mortality* might be swallowed up of life. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body [that is, whilst we are possessed of this earthly and mortal nature] we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight;) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body [that is, from our '*natural body*,' or corruptible nature] and to be present with the Lord," when "*mortality shall be swallowed up of life.*"

In this passage the Apostle contrasts the present body with the next; the *natural body* with the

spiritual; the mortal nature with the immortal. "For," said he, "we must all appear before the *judgment-seat* of Christ; THAT every one may receive the things *in body*, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad."

This seems to be the sense of the text, and to be in strict agreement with what Paul says elsewhere. Let us glance briefly at the popular interpretation of this ill-used passage. Orthodox expositors, with their notions of the duality of man, use the phrases "clothed upon," "absent from," "at home in," as strictly literal expressions; and hence they speak of *that* which is "clothed upon," *that* which is "absent from;" *that* which is "at home in"—and this *something* they insist is the immortal soul of man. The imagery of *clothing* was in familiar use among the ancient Hebrews, and for modern expositors to use such obviously figurative expressions in a literal sense, is to violate one of the established rules of interpretation. Nor can such an interpretation be carried through this passage without contradiction or absurdity. It is popularly said, that death

"Strikes off our chains, breaks up our cell
And gives us with our God to dwell."

And the first verse in the passage under consideration is often quoted as proof. But we are not to go to heaven to be "clothed upon with our house," for this house is "FROM heaven." The object of being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven"

is, that "MORTALITY might be swallowed up of *life*." Hence it follows that our house from heaven is an expression to denote the immortality with which if faithful we shall be invested at the resurrection. If the expression "earthly house" denotes the present mortal body, the contrasted expression of "a building of God" must indicate an immortal body. But if the disembodied-soul at death takes possession of its immortal body in heaven, it follows, that at the resurrection there will be two bodies for each soul—the immortal body in heaven, and the resurrection body. This would contradict the orthodox theory, but favor that of Professor Bush and others, who assert that the resurrection of each individual takes place at death.

Once more; if it be affirmed that it is the *soul* that is "clothed upon" with an "earthly house" in this life, and that after death it is clothed upon with a "building of God," then consistency demands that the affirmant shall forthwith discard the notion of the soul's immortality; for it is written, "this mortal must *put on* immortality." That which is "clothed upon," then, '*this something within*'—call it the soul if you please—must *put on immortality*, and is *itself* called "THIS MORTAL."

This noted passage, then, so far from proving the popular doctrine of immortality, is directly opposed to it; and thus we are brought to the conclusion, that the New Testament doctrine of the resurrec-

tion of the dead is irreconcilably opposed to the immortality of the soul.

Andrew Carmichael has well said :

“It cannot be too often repeated: *If there be an immortal soul there is no resurrection; and if there be any resurrection there is no immortal soul.*”¹

Dr. Muller says :

“The Christian faith in immortality is indissolubly connected with the promise of a future resurrection of the dead.”²

Adam Clarke says :

“The doctrine of the resurrection appears to have been thought of much more consequence among the primitive Christians than it is now. . . . There is not a doctrine in the gospel on which more stress is laid; and there is not a doctrine in the present system of preaching which is treated with more neglect.”³

These words are eminently true; and it is proper for us to inquire into the cause of this marked change. We have seen that Christ and the apostles make the resurrection the most prominent doctrine of the New Testament. One eminent author⁴ declares that not less than one verse in every thirty in the New Testament has reference to this doctrine. Why then is it treated with such neglect in the popular pulpits of the present day? Is it because modern preachers are wiser than Paul and Peter and John, or is it because they neglect to preach the

¹*Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture*, vol. II., p. 315.

²*Ch. Doc. of Sin*, p. 318.

³Note on 1 Cor. 15: 32.

⁴Bickersteth.

Gospel, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men?"

The New Testament teaches that man is mortal, and that eternal life is a "gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Modern theology teaches that man is immortal, and that as a consequence he has eternal life in himself. The New Testament does not teach the immortality of the soul; but modern theology declares that "the immortality of the soul is a fundamental doctrine of revealed religion." The New Testament teaches the resurrection of *dead men*; modern theology, of *dead bodies*. These marked contrasts exhibit the reason why the doctrine of the resurrection is treated with such neglect in the present system of preaching.

Of the primitive faithful, it is written — "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 made perfect*." (Heb. 11 : 39, 40.) The time is fast approaching when this promise shall be fulfilled. Then will the patriarchs honor their Redeemer; then shall Job, with all the pure in heart, see God; then shall David awake and be satisfied; then shall Isaiah give the shout of victory over death and *hades*; then shall Daniel awake to everlasting life; then shall Paul, with all those who love the appearing of Christ, receive the gift of **ETERNAL LIFE**.

This is the doctrine of the Bible — **THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY.**