
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



{ Les Bourdaloue sur l'Éternité Malinval
- Sermons pour les Dimanches vol. 4. P. 14.

7

h *

4257 e. 7/6

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

7

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY:

THE

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE BRIEFLY CONSIDERED
IN RELATION TO THE CURRENT ERRORS

OF

ANNIHILATIONISTS.

IN THREE PARTS:—

PART I.—MAN AS HE IS.

PART II.—DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

PART III.—THE FINAL ISSUES.

By F. W. GRANT.

u

LONDON:

ROBERT L. ALLAN, 15 PATERNOSTER ROW;

AND 73 SAUCHIEHALL STREET, GLASGOW.

TORONTO: GRANT, TRACT DEPOT, 390 YONGE STREET.

BOSTON, U.S.: F. G. BROWN, 3 TREMONT ROW.

DUBLIN: TRACT DEPOT, 13 WESTLAND ROW.

EDINBURGH: TRACT DEPOT, 52 COCKBURN STREET.

1871.

This Book may also be had at the following places:—

BLACKHEATH, LONDON, S. E. : The Gospel Book Store, Tranquil Vale.

BRIGHTON : The Tract Depot, 25 Grenville Place, Western Road.

WOLVERHAMPTON : R. TUNLEY, 17 Gladstone Terrace, North Road.

NORTH SHIELDS : W. H. BROWN, 83 Tyne Street.

ABERDEEN : Tract Depot, 8 Crown Street.

GUERNSEY : J. TUNLEY, 104 Victoria Road.

MELBOURNE, VICTORIA : JOHN VANCE, 51 Post-Office Place.

MONTREAL : The Tract Depot, St. George's Hall, Great George Street.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY.

	PAGE
THE VIEWS OF ANNIHILATIONISTS,	1

Part I.

MAN AS HE IS.

CHAPTER I.—IS THE BODY ALL?	13
“ II.—MAN TRIUNE,	20
“ III.—SPIRIT,	26
“ IV.—THE SOUL,	38
“ V.—FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF SOUL AND SPIRIT,	47
“ VI.—THE FALL,	54

Part II.

DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

CHAPTER I.—DEATH,	61
“ II.—CONSCIOUSNESS AFTER DEATH,	70
“ III.—HADES AND PARADISE,	86
“ IV.—OBJECTIONS FROM OLD TESTAMENT TEACHINGS,	91

Part III.

THE FINAL ISSUES.

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.—ETERNAL LIFE,	109
“ II.—DEATH ETERNAL,	117
“ III.—THE JUDGMENT OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD,	129
“ IV.—THE GEHENNA OF FIRE,	136
“ V.—THE ABOLITION OF EVIL,	154
“ VI.—TENDENCIES AND RESULTS	157

ERRATA.

- Page 1, line 9, insert “the late” before “Dr. Thomas.”
 “ 2, “ 12, for “mind” read “minds.”
 “ 7, “ 14, “ “now of New York” read “late of New York.”
 “ 40, “ 11, “ “brute” read “brutes.”
 “ 101, “ 15, “ “knowlege” read “knowledge.”
 “ 120, “ 7, insert “is” before “what.”
 “ 125, “ 9, for “language, they used” read “language. They used.’

LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE VIEWS OF ANNIHILATIONISTS.

IN entering upon a subject like the present, it will be desirable in the first place to get as clear a view as possible of what it is proposed to answer. Annihilationism is indeed at the present moment widely spread, and there are perhaps few Christians who have not in some shape or other already met with it. It is a dish dressed up by skilful hands in a way to suit very different tastes. From Dr. Leask* of the "Rainbow," to ^{Dr. Leask} Dr. Thomas of New York, or Mr. Roberts of Birmingham, it is found in association with very distinct, and very opposite systems of doctrine, from Trinitarianism down to the lowest depths of Unitarianism and materialistic infidelity. But, on this very account, it will be well to look at it, not only in itself, but in its associations, to lead the minds of those who, meeting it in more decent form, may be in danger from its plausible sophistries, to apprehend what it naturally

* I have seen but one small paper, "Life Everlasting," by this writer, which contains nothing beyond the common arguments.

connects itself with, and prepares the way for; and, moreover, to rouse the minds of Christians to a sense of the practical bearing and results of an evil which is spreading rapidly, and lifting up its head in unlooked-for places.

This may be my justification, if I should lead my readers into the examination of points which for the Christian may be deemed unnecessary, and speak, too, of things which rightly shock his sensibilities as such. Moreover, I do it because upon any point whatever, where Scripture is appealed to, it is due to those whose minds might be injuriously affected by the mere *seeming* to decline such an appeal. My desire is, God helping me, to meet the honest need of minds unexercised in the subtleties that are presented to them, too often with a skill which, alas, shews in whose hands these poor Annihilationists are unwitting instruments. And if, in so doing, the very foundations of our faith should have to be examined (and they can sustain no harm by it), it may at least (I repeat) serve to convince my readers of what is brought in question by a false system which is helping to ripen fast the evil of the latter days.

But to come now to the point in hand. In the full developed system (if indeed it be yet fully developed) of Dr. Thomas and his followers, now styled "Christadelphian," the separate evils of Materialism, Annihilationism, Campbellism, and Unitarianism are found united into a system in which no element of real Christianity remains behind. They have rightly, therefore, given up the name of Christian. But we have a number of steps to take downward, before we reach a

level as low as that. I shall present the principal views of the different writers whose works have come before me, necessarily in a more or less fragmentary way, as I have been able to ascertain them. But I put down nothing I have not their own statements for.

All are not materialists nor Unitarians, of course. Mr. Morris of Philadelphia, for example, with whom I may perhaps begin the list, is neither. He is a Trinitarian, and admits Christ's death to be "a substitutional sacrifice." ("What is man?" p. 49.) That substitution, however, he merely makes to be of life for life. The consequence is that God can give "eternal life and embodied immortality" to men. Man has an immaterial soul naturally, but not a spirit [the word being only used, in that application, for the "motions and emotions of the soul" (p. 19)]. Even in Eccles. xii. 7, spirit (*ruach*) he thinks should be rather "breath," or if not, "it may be used to signify the *motion* of the soul in passing away, and passing into the custody of God" (p. 18.) The new nature communicated in regeneration is alone "spirit" in a proper sense. He does not deny an intermediate state, but advocates, of course, the final extinction of evil, of the devil and all unregenerate men.

Mr. C. F. Hudson ("Debt and Grace") is a step lower down. He affirms, indeed, the immateriality of the soul likewise, although he supposes it to be "dependent on embodiment for the purposes of *active* existence" (p. 250). But he denies both the transmission of sinfulness (p. 390), and "that theory of the atonement which makes the sufferings of Christ a satisfaction of

the divine justice" (p. 397). He is thus (although, I believe, a Trinitarian) upon essentially Socinian ground.

H. H. Dobney ("Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment") allows that the Scriptures represent the death of Christ as "an atonement for sin—an expiation for human guilt—a satisfaction to divine justice" (p. 54). He does not further explain his views as to this; but he affirms the *probability* of the soul being distinct in nature from the body (p. 93). He thinks there is no Scripture warrant for man's existing in a "purely disembodied condition" (p. 141).

I pass over some writers of similar views, among whom are Moncrieff of Scotland, Hastings of Boston, U.S., and J. P. Ham; the next class of writers is wholly materialistic.

Thus George Storrs ("Are the Wicked Immortal?") writes: "If it is said [of the soul] it is a spiritual substance, I ask, What kind of substance is that, if it be not matter? I cannot conceive, and I do not see how it is possible to conceive, of substance without matter, in some form, it may be, exceedingly refined" (p. 29). And again, in answer to the question, "Does the Bible teach that the creature man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, has a superadded entity called the soul?" says, "*We take the negative.*" ("Discussion between Professor H. Mattison and George Storrs.")

Jacob Blain ("Death not Life") is equally emphatic. "The great cry against us," he says, "is *Materialism!!*" A few writers of late have sounded this alarm, and repeated the old story, that man has a soul or spirit,

which is a simple substance, indivisible, immaterial, and so indestructible. I ask, Why undertake to describe what they know nothing about, and of which all other men are equally ignorant?" (p. 33.)

Says Zenas Campbell ("Age of Gospel Light," p. 16): "No Scripture or philosophy has ever yet been shown to prove the mind anything more than an attribute of the living organized dust, and, if so, it must cease with the life of the body."

Unwilling as I am to pursue these quotations, I must yet add some extracts from a book commonly held as a kind of standard among them. It is styled "The Bible *vs.* Tradition," the author's name Aaron Ellis, this 6th edition revised and enlarged by Thomas Read.

The propositions laid down by these two writers are, among others:—

"First, we shall prove from the Bible the corporeal being and mortality of the soul, and the nature of the spirit of man, which spirit, *not being a living entity*, is neither mortal nor immortal." "The true meaning of a soul is a creature that lives by breathing." "The soul is not only created, but created of the dust, for the same man that is called a living soul was made of the dust of the ground" (pp. 13, 15).

Of spirit they say: "*Ruach* is derived from *ruah* 'to blow,' and *nesme*, 'to breathe,' (!) primarily signifies 'wind, air, breath,' but it is sometimes used to signify a principle, having some relation to electricity, diffused through universal space, a principle that stimulates the organs of men and plants into activity, and which is used by the animals themselves to control their volun-

tary motions. . . . This principle, being the principle of life in all creatures, is in the hands of God, and controlled by Him; hence, in Him we live and move, and have our being; and God is the God of the spirits of all flesh. When God taketh away His Spirit and His breath—*i.e.*, God's Spirit and God's breath—then man returneth to his earth, and his thoughts perish." "But 'spirit' has numerous secondary meanings, such as intelligence, courage, the mind, the temper, the disposition, &c.; and we have the spirit of love, of fear, of bondage, and *sixty* other spirits" (pp. 84—87).

That this at least prepares the way for, if it is not meant actually to involve, the denial of the personality of the Spirit of God, is evident enough. Another writer of some notoriety, Miles Grant, editor of "The World's Crisis," an Adventist paper, published at Boston, U. S., openly urges this. He says ("Spirit in Man," p. 1), "2. The word spirit is used to denote an *influence* proceeding *from* a being. Hence we read of the Comforter or Holy Spirit, that 'it proceedeth *from* the Father.' In mesmeric operations there is a spirit proceeding from the operator to his subject, by means of which he controls him. All men and animals exert this influence more or less."

After blasphemy of that kind, which one could scarce bring oneself to repeat, did it not need to be known what the deadly poison of Annihilationism will do,—no one will be surprised to learn that the denial of any resurrection for the wicked is spreading fast among writers of this class. So much so, that from a writer

among Annihilationists themselves, has come forth a book against it. But the road is a downward one, and to go down it, alas, easy.

Yet it is not even here that we see the system we are considering in its fullest development. One step further we have yet to take before we reach its furthest attainment for the present. Dr. Thomas and his followers represent this lowest class.

Their views have been little, if at all, noticed by any who, to my knowledge, have taken in hand to reply to Annihilationist doctrine; yet there is reason to believe they are spreading, not only in the United States, but also in Britain, where, indeed, their first originator, Dr. Thomas, ^{of the} ~~now~~ of New York, had birth. The system is owned, in a title page of a book that lies before me, by a Mr. Roberts, of Birmingham, England, to be "opposed to the doctrines of all the names and denominations of Christendom." They adopt professedly an Old Testament basis, and deny almost all that is distinctive in the New: the deity of the Son, the personality of the Holy Spirit, the heavenly portion of the saints, the personality of the devil. To quote from Mr. Roberts' book, they believe that "The Father is eternal and underived; the Son has his origin in the creative fiat of the Almighty, as Adam had; the Holy Ghost is the focalization of His will-power, by means of His 'free Spirit,' which fills heaven and earth." ("Twelve Lectures," p. 130.) They believe in "a Lamb of God, guileless from his paternity, and yet inheriting the human sin-nature of his mother." (*Ibid*, p. 140.) "It was necessary that the sinning nature should suffer in Him." (*Ibid*.) But, being free from actual sin, "He

could meet all the claims of God's law upon that nature, and yet triumph over its operation by a resurrection from the dead." God "raised him from the dead to a glorious existence, even to equality with Himself" (p. 140). "When raised from the dead and glorified he was exalted to all power in heaven and earth; his human nature was swallowed up in the divine; the flesh changed to spirit" (p. 132). And now "life is deposited in him for our acceptance, on condition of allying ourselves to him, yea, on condition of our entry into him." "Baptism in water is the ceremony by which believing men and women are united with Christ, and constituted heirs of the life everlasting, which he, as one of us, has purchased" (pp. 140, 145).

In this, its suited home, annihilation flourishes. According to Dr. Thomas, "a living soul" is "a living, natural, or animal body." "Spirit" is an element of the atmosphere, existing ordinarily combined with nitrogen and oxygen. "Uncombined it is that wonderful fluid whose explosions are heard in the thunder, whose fiery bolts overthrow the loftiest towers, and rive the sturdy monarch of the woods, and in less intensity give polarity to light, the needle, and the brain. These three together, the oxygen, nitrogen, and electricity, constitute the breath and spirit of lives of all God's living souls" ("Elpis Israel," p. 30).

Mr. Roberts gives us much more in the same strain. "Thought is a power developed by brain organization, and consists of impressions made upon that delicate organ through the medium of the senses, and afterwards classified and arranged by a function pertaining

in different degrees to brain in human form, known as *reason*." ("Twelve Lectures," p. 31.)

Of spirit he says: "What is that which is not matter? It will not do to say 'spirit,' if we are to take our notions of spirit from the Bible, for the *spirit came upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost 'like a mighty rushing wind,'* and made the place shake, *showing it to be capable of mechanical momentum,* and therefore as much on the list of material forces as life, heat, and electricity. Coming upon Samson, it *energized his muscles* to the snapping of ropes like thread; and inhaled by the nostrils of man and beast, it gives physical life." (*Ibid*, p. 31.)

Of soul he says: "The word, soul, simply means a breathing creature." "The word originating in respiring existence as its primary signification, is employed to express various ideas arising out of this fundamental antecedent." "That which it describes is spoken of as capable of hunger (Prov. xix. 15); of being satisfied with God (Lam. i. 11—19); of touching a material object (Lev. v. 2); of going into the grave (Job. xxxiii. 22—28); of coming out of it (Ps. xxx. 3), &c. It is never spoken of as an immaterial, immortal, thinking entity. . . . It is not only represented as capable of death, but as naturally liable to it," &c., &c. (pp. 39, 40.)

I need scarcely multiply quotations. I may only add that for them, the resurrection of the wicked is partial; infants, idiots, and the heathen are excluded from it; and new birth is entry into the resurrection state.

I have thus far confined myself to a simple statement of the views of Annihilationists as drawn from their own writings. These men appeal to Scripture, nay quote it triumphantly in behalf of their position. We are now to answer this appeal, and see if their triumph be indeed so assured.

PART I.



MAN AS HE IS.

CHAPTER I.

IS THE BODY ALL?

IN the language of absolute materialism, the body is the whole man. It may need breath or "spirit" (in the Thomasite sense) to make it capable of fulfilling its functions, but in their language, thought, reason, mind, are properties pertaining to "brain in human form." Dr. Thomas gravely adduces Rom. viii. 6, where he translates το φρονημα της σαρκος the "thinking of the flesh," as an irrefragable proof that "*the flesh is the thinking substance, i.e., the brain; which, in another place,*" he adds, the apostle "terms the fleshy tablet of the heart"(!)* I only quote this now as evidencing how thoroughly with them the body is all. The *man*, they say, was such before the breath of life was breathed into him. "Dust thou art," expresses what he is in his whole being. Soul is simply either "life," or else "the breathing *frame*," i.e., of course, the body. Spirit is only a principle lent him for the period of his existence, a kind of vitalizing energy. The *man himself* is the body—the dust that lies in the grave. "Where," is Mr. Blain's emphatic challenge, "where does the book of nature or the book of God tell what soul or man is made of, except in the earth-wide and heaven-broad declaration, 'Dust thou art'?" †

* "Elpis Israel," p. 80. † "Death not Life," 12th ed., p. 42.

Confidence so assured ought to be well founded. The answer is easy, that if there are on the one side passages such as that just now quoted, which seem to make the body all, there are many on the other side that equally seem to make the body *nothing*. Thus we read, "The life which I now live *IN* the flesh" (Gal. ii. 20); "If I live *in the flesh*" (Phil. i. 22); "Whilst we are *at home in the body*" (2 Cor. v. 6); "Willing rather to be absent from the body" (ver. 8); "Whether *in the body* or *out of the body* I cannot tell" (ch. xii. 2); "As being yourselves also in the body" (Heb. xiii. 3); "In my flesh shall I see God" (Job xix. 26); "Knowing that I must put off this my tabernacle" (2 Pet. i. 14).

Now it is to the phraseology here I would call attention. On the materialist supposition, the language used in these passages never could have arisen. It is not a question of the interpretation of any special text, but of a use of words which contradicts at the outset the whole materialistic philosophy. Men have sought to evade it by interpreting the phrase to mean "in *this* body," as if it were in contrast with the glorious body of the resurrection. But the fact that they have to change the expression in order to make it suit them, is a clear evidence that it does not suit them as it is. For in the resurrection men will still be "in the body," though it be raised glorious, as it will; and, in point of fact, it is to the resurrection-body that in the passage quoted Job refers: "In my flesh shall I see God." They may perhaps answer to this, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," but it will not avail them; for the Lord's own expression as to His own body in resurrection is, that He had "flesh and *bones*" (Luke

xxiv. 39), though not "flesh and blood;" and it is the combination of the two that the text cited speaks of. And the Lord was raised from the dead, "the first-fruits" and pattern of our resurrection from the beginning, not raised and changed afterwards, even as they that sleep in Him are "*raised* in glory." There is no escape from the plain speaking of the passage in Job, that to that which is "raised in glory" he refers; and this alone is positive proof that "in the flesh" or "in the body" does not, as a phrase, speak of a present corruptible body in contrast with an *incorruptible* one.

And there are other texts which would still stand in the way of their establishment of this position, if the passage in Job were gone. For when the apostle says of his vision of the third heaven, that he could not tell whether he was "in the body or out of the body," no words are needed to assure us, that here there was no question of the resurrection-body. For it was not *when* he was up in the third heavens that he did not know if he were "out of the body;" had it been so, there might have been some kind of doubt as to whether he might almost have fancied, in the entrancement of the vision, that the resurrection was already come. But his words are precise, and absolutely prohibit the supposition. He could not, *at the time he wrote*, question if he had been clothed with the resurrection-body, and again lost it on his return to earth. Yet here, "in the body" and "out of the body" are just as much in contrast, as "at home in the body" and "absent from the body" in 2 Cor. v. 6—8. And as "out of the body," in this case, cannot mean "in the resurrection-state," so, "in the body," which is in con-

trast with it, cannot mean (as they would make it) "in this corruptible state."

The term abides, then, in all its simplicity, full of the meaning which from its simplicity it possesses. Nay, if the comments of Annihilationists were just, its force would be little affected. For, be it in contrast with a resurrection-body or not, still the *man himself* is looked at as "IN the body"—not the *soul* is in it, or the *spirit* is in it, but the MAN. That which lives in the body (and that is the force of the expression in 2 Cor. v. 6*) is the man. So much so, that the body is looked at as the "tabernacle" (2 Pet. 14) which the man "puts off."

We have not yet enquired how or what the inhabitant of the body is. Be it spirit or soul, or both together, the phraseology of Scripture in these texts asserts that the body has such an inhabitant. Paul sees visions, and has so little thought that the body is all, that he does not know whether he was in it or not, at the time he saw them. Plainly, therefore, he supposes that he might be a conscious, intelligent witness of unutterable things, while "out of the body."

We are prepared, then, to answer Mr. Blain's confident enquiry, if at least we may take for granted that that which Paul thought might be out of the body is not "dust." If it be, it is, at any rate, "dust" which is not the body, and which can exist consciously in separation from it.

Still, the question will be raised, What about the texts which, on their side, the Annihilationists lay stress

* The word used is ἐνδημεω, "to live at or in a place" ("Liddell and Scott").

upon? Is not "dust thou art" Scripture? And is it not equally written, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground"? and that "devout men carried *Stephen*"—not his body merely—"to his burial"?

I answer, it is just as plain that in these texts man is identified with his body, as in the former ones with his spirit or his soul. It would be wrong to argue exclusively from either class of passages; *as* wrong to say man is all soul upon the authority of one, as to say he was all body upon the authority of the other. *Neither* body, nor soul, nor spirit, is the man exclusively, but "spirit, and soul, and body" (1 Thess. v. 23) make up the man; in such sort, that he may be, and is, identified with either, according to the line of thought which is in the mind of the speaker; his identification with the body, which man sees and touches, being in general the language of sense, while *faith* identifies him with the unseen "spirit." Our poor Annihilationists see and confess what sense recognises, and are blind to the other. It is a sad evidence of their condition.

Of the Lord Jesus Himself, I read in the account of His burial, "there laid they *Jesus*," not "there laid they his *body*" merely, but that Joseph "took *him* down, and wrapped *him* in the linen, and laid *him* in a sepulchre" (John xix. 42; Mark xv. 46). Is this, therefore, as conclusive that the Lord was "all body," as similar words about Stephen would seem to be that *he* was? I know that Thomasism, with its fearless self-consistency in error, and shameless denial of the glory of His person, would not shrink even from this result. The One who, walking on earth, could yet say, "The *Son of Man* who *is in heaven*," they are strangers to.

But I would ask even them, if their horrible thoughts were true, how He who had "power to lay down his life," had, after having laid it down, "power to take it again?" If the dead are nothing, and know nothing, as they teach, how could a dead body have power to take its life back? Yet this power distinctly the Lord claims (John x. 18).

But for the Christian, who has learnt the glory of Christ (and he is none who has not), I would again urge my question. "They laid *him* in a sepulchre;" "Christ died and was *buried*" (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4); "Come, see the place where the *Lord* lay." Do these words intimate, as corresponding words are supposed to do in the case of David, Stephen, and others—that there was nothing of Christ but what was laid in the grave? It may be said that the words apply only to the humanity of the Lord, not of course to His divinity. But then, this is just my argument, for the Lord says of Himself, "The Son of Man which is in heaven," showing how truly the divine and human natures were united in one Person. And, according to the language we are examining (simple enough if taken as the language of sense merely, as before said), this Divine-human person lay in Joseph's tomb! Just as simply and as surely as "David" or "Stephen" is said to denote the whole personality of David or of Stephen, so, *after the same mode of interpreting*, must "Christ" and "the Lord" denote the whole personality of Christ. And, let me ask, would *Christ* be such—your and my Christ, reader—*without the Divine nature?* But if, as you assert, the Divine nature of Christ did not lie in the grave, but only the human "body," then "the Lord," in the whole force of

that expression, did not lie there; the words are only the language of sense which applies to the material part which we see and touch, and we are manifestly precluded from carrying them further. Now, if the Lord lay in the grave, and yet the higher part did *not* lie there, so (plainly) might David, or Stephen, or Moses lie in the grave, and yet have another and higher part of them which did not lie there.

And we have seen before, that the language of Scripture is as plainly that the man dwells in the body, as it is that the body is the man. From its own point of view each of these things is true.

CHAPTER II.

MAN TRIUNE.

WE are now prepared for the question, What is this part of man which dwells in the body? Or, What is the physical constitution of man as defined by the Scriptures?

The answer, from 1 Thess. v. 23, is, that he is "spirit, and soul, and body:" "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God that your *whole spirit, and soul, and body*, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The prayer is manifestly for the sanctification of the whole man to God, and to emphasize it, as it were, it is, that the man is divided into his three constituent parts, and the sanctification of the whole man is interpreted to be the preservation, blameless before God, of "spirit, soul, and body."

Of course this is denied on the part of those who hold that the body is the whole man; but it is also denied by many others who are far enough from holding their views. It is a point, therefore, which we must not pass over lightly, but which must be seriously weighed, and as satisfactorily as possible decided, before we are entitled to account it a settled thing. And it may be as well in the first place to review the objections urged, or that might be urged, to this view, before

we examine the passage more strictly upon its own ground.

The objections of Annihilationists will not detain us long, as, indeed, few seem to have looked at the text in question. The remarks of Ellis and Read upon it are a remarkable specimen of their style of reasoning, as well as of how little convinced they seem themselves by it. "This *cannot* mean," they say, "that man has *two* ghosts. Perhaps it may mean your whole disposition, and life, and person, the whole compound nature of man, for spirit sometimes means person." ("Bible vs. Tradition," p. 21.) I should think as they have evidently translated *spirit* as "disposition" already, that, according to their interpretation, *body* ought to mean "person," and also that it would be in far better accordance with their views. But they can scarcely expect others to be satisfied with what does not satisfy themselves, for they add, in defiance of all criticism: "And 1 Thess. v. 23 *may also have been a little amended by some officious copyist*"! (p. 21). But even so they are not yet satisfied, and, having given up the idea that spirit is person, they further add: "And the *spiritual nature*, be it remembered, does not naturally belong to man, but is superinduced as a subsequent and peculiar development in the cases of those who have submitted themselves to Christ" (p. 22).

In the last sentence these writers are in near agreement with Mr. Morris, who interprets spirit also here of a new and spiritual nature. Of John iii. 6, he says, "That which is born of the flesh' is a child constituted of soul and body; but 'that which is born of the spirit' is a new and spiritual constituent of personal being.

He who is born of the spirit is constituted of a 'spirit and soul and body' (1 Thess. v. 33)." ("What is Man," p. 57.)

I shall be obliged to reserve to the next chapter the consideration of what "spirit" is, and whether his proposition that it is never applied to man *as such*, "in a substantive sense," is warranted by Scripture usage. That the new nature of regenerate men is "spirit," according to our Lord's words, is what none can, with appearance of truth, deny; but upon the face of what he himself says, his explanation of the text in this way is thoroughly inconsistent and untrue. For the "flesh," he says, in the words of the Lord, John iii. 6, is "the whole natural man, and the entire *offspring* of the natural man, *soul and body*" (p. 37). The apostle, however, puts down this "offspring of the natural man, soul and body"—which, according to Mr. Morris, the Lord calls *flesh* for the plain purpose of stamping it with hopeless evil—side by side with the new spiritual nature, which (still according to Mr. Morris' citation of Gal. v. 17, 22—25) it "lusts against" and "is contrary to,"—praying that they may be "sanctified" together! If this be his deliberate doctrine I cannot tell. It *is* the plain inference from what he has said, and this is all I have to guide me in the matter. Whether or no, I would refer him to Rom. viii. for his answer, that "the mind of the flesh (*margin*)* is enmity against God, for it is not subject to

* In the margin "minding." In the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. ix., it is called "the lust of the flesh, which some do expound, the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh."

the law of God, neither indeed, CAN BE," and that is why "they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Even the one who in the seventh chapter could say, "with the mind I myself serve the law of God," had to add, "but with the flesh the law of sin;" and if that means body and soul, and soul and body have this character, then there would be poor hope of their being "preserved blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The grossness of this mistake lies in its materialism. Even Mr. Morris, little as he would like to be identified with this, cannot see in the Scripture doctrine of the flesh anything less material than the body, although perhaps in connection with the soul which he allows to be in it. All is referred to man's *physical constitution*, but with this glaring inconsistency with Scripture, that, whereas the word of God condemns the flesh, with its utter evil, to hopeless destruction, Mr. Morris' teaching puts the old nature *alongside of the new* to be sanctified.

Now in the text as to which I have been speaking, 1 Thess. v. 23, it is plain, by the terms "soul and body" which are used, that the physical constitution of man is spoken of, and it should be equally plain, that "spirit," therefore, *also* refers to his physical constitution. The very pains which Ellis and Read have taken in their interpretation to blot out all thought of the body in the passage, is a proof of it. It would have been an incongruous jumble indeed, to have said, "disposition, and life, and *body*," and they felt it. Body in Scripture, in such a sentence, requires "soul" as its natural antithesis. "Body and life" make no sense, for the sanctification of the body, upon *their* theory of body, supposes

it. And if, according to Dr. Thomas, it is the flesh that thinks, and the brain is the fleshy tablet of the heart, let the body be sanctified, and all is done. And it will not avail to say that the body needs "spirit and life," or soul, to make it capable of sanctification, for that still leaves it true that the body is the only part that can be sanctified, and there would be no sense in talking of the sanctification of the mere agency in giving it life.

But still—and this is the only question that we further need to ask at present, may not the "spirit" here refer to the new and spiritual nature, which confessedly the regenerate man has? I answer, that as far as this passage is concerned, the fact that the apostle prays for the *sanctification* of the spirit is positive proof that the new nature is not meant. For the Scripture doctrine is that, inasmuch as "that which is born of the spirit *is* spirit," "whosoever is born of God *doth not commit sin*, for his SEED remaineth in him, and he *cannot* sin, BECAUSE he is born of God" (1 Jno. iii. 9). I am well aware how little the truth of this is apprehended by many, and it would not be consistent with my present purpose to enter deeply into it. I would only say, that the one born of God is here looked at simply in his character *as* so born. The flesh is not seen here. It is in the believer, but as a foreign thing. It is "sin that dwelleth in me" (Rom. vii. 17), in that sense, *not myself*. The new nature owns no brotherhood with it. *As* born of God the believer does not sin,—*cannot*. The new nature, thus, as proceeding from God, is altogether according to God: He could not communicate a half-evil thing: "That which is born of the spirit *is* spirit," partakes, *i.e.*, of the nature

of Him from whom it came. Mr. Morris himself says of it most truly, "all the moral qualities thereof answer to the moral perfections of God." If so, it cannot sin, because it is of God; so, as born of God, we cannot. Therefore you cannot talk of sanctifying *it*. It is of God: therefore already wholly good.

And "spirit" is not here the "motion" of the soul, as Mr. Morris elsewhere defines the word, for the soul is mentioned apart, and there would be no sense in speaking of the sanctifying of the soul *and* of its motions. Sanctify *it*, and its motions will be sanctified.

Thus, then, we return with confidence to our first conclusion: "spirit and soul and body" are the man. The ample confirmation of this by every part of Scripture will come out, as we now take up separately these three constituent parts—"spirit, and soul, and body."

CHAPTER III.

SPIRIT.

THE word which stands for "spirit" in the Old Testament is, as we have abundantly seen already, רוּחַ (*ruach*); in the New Testament, πνεῦμα (*pneuma*). They are words precisely alike in significance. Both are derived from words which mean "to breathe,"* and in their primary sense therefore signify "breath," or what is a kindred thought, *air in motion*, "wind." From this as the type of *viewless activity*, its meaning of "spirit" is most evidently and easily derived. The comparison between the two is what the Lord makes in John iii., where the same word is both "wind" and "spirit:" "The *wind* bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the *spirit*." Here manifestly the thought is of invisible activity beyond control; the effects are manifest, the power which produces them unseen and uncontrollable. In the formation of language, where that which can be conceived of only, gets

* The verb רוּחַ is not used in the Old Testament, except in the Hephel or causative form, and in this form it signifies to "smell." How this is really the same as to "cause to breathe" is plain on a moment's consideration. Πνεῖω occurs seven times in the New Testament, in every place to represent the "blowing of wind."

its name from that which is recognized by the senses, what more simple than that "wind" should give its name to the power that, omnipresent in its activity, acts unseen and uncontrolled? Hence "God is spirit,"* and the third Person of the Trinity, whom Scripture represents as the immediate mover, both in creation and in new creation, is pre-eminently "the *Spirit* of God."

Upon this use of the word it would not be needful to dwell a moment longer, were it not for the daring infidelity which has not shrunk from assailing, along with the Godhead of the Son, the Personality of the Holy Ghost. And this is not confined even to the followers of Dr. Thomas. The interpretation of "spirit" adopted by Ellis and Read, if not borrowed from the former, tends directly the same way. Miles Grant, as we have seen, makes it a mere *influence*. And I have a book before me, of the history of which, or of its author, I know nothing, save that it was published in Albany in 1851, and that the writer's name is Thos. Mitchell. I have

* In the "Personal Recollections" of Charlotte Elizabeth occurs a well-known and touching illustration of the connection of thought. A poor dumb boy, in whom she was interested, and whom she had been seeking to impress with the fact of the being of God, told her that he had been looking everywhere for God, but could not find Him: "there was 'God, NO.'" She seized a pair of bellows, and blew a puff at his hand, which was red with cold on a winter's day. He showed signs of displeasure; told her it made his hands cold, while she, looking at the pipe of the bellows, told him she could see nothing, there was "wind, no!" "He opened his eyes very wide, stared at me, and panted; a deep crimson suffused his whole face, and a soul, a real soul, shone in his strangely altered countenance, while he triumphantly repeated 'God like wind! God like wind.'"

not quoted from it before, as it seemed needless to multiply quotations of precisely the same character and import. But with regard to this fundamental use of the term "spirit," the writer's views are not exceeded in grossness by Dr. Thomas himself. "In the first place," he says, "we learn by the text, 'God is a spirit;' that he is *possessed* of a spirit, which we have shown to be a substantial agent, susceptible of being despatched by the power of the Almighty mind, for the accomplishment of his purposes, whether of creation, government, or destruction of anything that exists in the universe, or for the performance of his moral purposes among mankind. The Scriptures throughout teach the idea (!) that God possesses a spirit; but they *nowhere* teach that that spirit is INTELLIGENT, independent, or separated from himself, or that it is an *intelligent* PERSON." ("Gospel Crown of Life," p. 114.)

It is indeed essential to the self-consistency of materialism, that this primary use of the word "spirit" should be denied. Once get rid of the Spirit of God as a Person,—put Him upon the list of "material forces,"—let it be electricity, or anything else you please,—and plainly you have at once reduced the spirit of man also to "electrical energy," or something else just as unintelligent, and well suited to the purpose they desire to accomplish. According to Dr. Thomas, as we have seen before, the Spirit of God is electricity, or, combined with nitrogen and oxygen, the atmosphere, which Job calls the "breath of God." According to Mr. Roberts, his follower, it is *proved*, by the shaking of the house on the day of Pentecost, and the energizing of Samson's muscles, when it came on him, to be "as much on the

list of material forces as light, heat, or electricity!" The doctrine is developed in full in his fifth lecture, that God is a material being, surrounded by a kind of electrical atmosphere, so dazzling and consuming in His immediate presence, as to be called "light unapproachable," but which, attenuated by degrees, is the material out of which He creates all things, and by which He becomes cognizant of everything, and executes His purposes in the whole domain of the universe. This is the ruach, the principle of life in the nostrils of all flesh, which the foolish animals "use all up" in the mere process of existence, but which wiser man can use to move tables, read unopened letters, and even (when in a high state of nervous susceptibility) to perceive distant facts and occurrences! "When concentrated under the Almighty's will," it "becomes *holy* spirit, as distinct from spirit in its free, spontaneous form;" in which way apostles received it, but "it is given to none in the present day." In "evolving a new man" in people, "the spirit has no participation, except in the shape of the written word. The present days are barren days, as regards the spirit's direct operations." (See "Twelve Lectures," p. 110—125.)

All this is but the legitimate fruit of materialistic teaching. It may seem not to need reply, nor anything but the simple statement I have given from Mr. Roberts' book, to condemn it sufficiently. Nevertheless, I shall answer it; for in these days of wide-spread infidelity, God alone knows in what unlooked-for places the answer may be needed. Nor does the gross folly which marks it all hinder its reception. Man has no wisdom apart from the word of truth, and, once

astray from that, the apostolic declaration is fulfilled, "professing to be wise, they became fools." How like, too, to what is now occupying us, that which he goes on to say!—"and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into AN IMAGE MADE LIKE TO CORRUPTIBLE MAN!" (Rom. i. 22, 23.)

Scripture disowns this system in all its parts. In Scripture the Spirit of God is a Person, Divine, and intelligent in the things of God. Just as, "What man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of God KNOWETH no man, but the SPIRIT OF GOD." (1 Cor. ii. 11.) This is as different from Mr. Grant's "influence," or Mr. Roberts' *medium*, through which the Deity receives impressions (much as the human ear sound through the atmosphere), but itself as unconscious as the atmosphere, of which indeed, according to Thomas, it forms part,—as can well be conceived. "The Spirit *searcheth* all things, yea, the *deep things* of God." (Ver. 10.) Not *God* searches *by* the Spirit other things, but the *Spirit* searches and knows *divine* things. Moreover, again, "He who searches the hearts"—*i.e.*, God—"knoweth what is the *mind of the Spirit*," which, living and active, "ITSELF maketh intercession for us," "according to God." (Rom. viii. 26, 27.)

If this is not the announcement of an intelligent Person, words cannot convey the idea of one. The Spirit knows God's mind; God knows the Spirit's mind, and yet (says Mr. Mitchell) "the Scriptures NOWHERE teach that the Spirit is an INTELLIGENT PERSON!" Surely "the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not."

The argument that the Spirit of God is "in the nostrils," and so a mere principle of life in all living, because Job xxvii. 3, in the common version, speaks so, I can only say, is worthy of men who, when they please, can quote Greek and Hebrew abundantly, but who chose to ignore in this case the fact, that one of the commonest renderings of ruach is *breath*; and that the expression refers to Gen. ii. 7, where the word for "breath of life" is a word which never is applied to the Spirit of God at all. And moreover, so far is Scripture from asserting that the Spirit of God is in all men, that it speaks of Christians expressly, as those "who have received the Spirit which is of God."

The proof is indeed abundant and decisive as to this, which is alone subversive of the whole theory. If I begin with Genesis (xli. 38), I find Joseph spoken of in terms which would be singularly *indistinctive*, if their thoughts were true: "Can we find such an one as this, a man in whom *the Spirit of God is!*" If I look in Jude 19, I read of some, even professing Christians, "sensual, having not the Spirit." So I find in Gal. iv. 6, that, "*because ye are sons*, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father!" This is no question of Pentecostal gifts; it is the proof of sonship. And "ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, *if* so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you;" and then it is added, "now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is NONE OF HIS" (Rom. viii. 9). Solemn utterance, indeed, for men who have to confess that they have no "Holy Spirit," for only "by the Holy Ghost given to us" is "the love of God shed abroad in our hearts" (Rom. v. 5); and the "kingdom

of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (ch. xiv. 17), and if that be withdrawn, there is no more "communion of the Holy Ghost" (2 Cor. xiii. 14), no more "sealing to the day of redemption" (Eph. iv. 30); no more "renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. iii. 5). Sad work, indeed, if this be true! and barren days indeed! But what an account for men to give of themselves, that they have no communion, no renewing, no sealing, no peace, no joy, no love of God in their hearts! They have pronounced their condemnation with their own lips, when they say that the only Spirit of God *they* know is one subject to men's wills, and "used up" by animals "in the mere process of existence."

The second application of the word "spirit" is to angelic beings, and that whether "holy" or "unclean."

The application of the word in this way is again denied by Thomasism as to the latter class, but this is scarcely the place to examine what they say on this head. It will suffice for our present purpose that there are spirits whose existence as separate personalities cannot be denied. And if this be so, there is no *reason* at least, beforehand, why man's "spirit" should not be also an individuality, a real and living entity, though in him united to a body which is of the dust.

And this is the third application of the word to which I would now invite particular attention.

A cloud of dust is here endeavoured to be raised by the assertion of the wonderful variety of meanings given to the word. Yet if we take the language of our

common English version as a guide, and refer to the passages in which it relates to man, we find, as the translation of the Old Testament Hebrew word, but *five* words used: "breath," "spirit," "anger," "courage," "mind." And of the New Testament Greek word corresponding to it, nothing but "ghost" or "spirit" (which every one knows to be intended for the same thing), and *once* "life" wrongly, in Rev xiii. 15, where it ought to be rather "breath." This looks more like uniformity of rendering in the matter, and a common idea running throughout, than some would wish to have us suppose. Of course I do not mean to deny that there are various secondary applications of the word "spirit" itself. But surely the greater that variety is, the more needful to look for the key to these different applications (which must be somewhere), the possession of which will enable us to find harmony in these various uses of the word, instead of discord.

The fact is, that the only key to this hidden harmony is in an application of the word which these writers, almost to a man, reject—viz., to a real intelligent entity in the compound nature of men, of *all* men as such, "the spirit of man, which is in him," placed at the head of, as well as in connection with, his other constituent parts by the apostle, where he speaks to the Thessalonians of the sanctification of their "whole spirit and soul and body." Let us take up the proofs of this, and examine them as carefully as the importance of the subject demands, and subject the separate points to be examined, one by one, to the test which Annihilationists themselves appeal to—the judgment of the inspired Word.

Now, it is but quoting Scripture to speak of "the

spirit of man which is in him" (1 Cor. ii. 11), and of "the spirits of men" (Heb. xii. 23). And observe, before we pass on, one fact here. Scripture says "the *spirit* of man." It does not say "the spirit," but "the *spirits* of men." Now Annihilationists tell us (or many of them) that "spirit" is a universal principle of life, lent to man indeed, in common with the beasts, but forming no real part of himself, like the air he breathes, and in which Dr. Thomas says it is contained. Now if this be so, we might as well talk about the "breaths" of men, as of their "spirits." Yet every one would perceive the incongruity of the former expression. We say "the breath of men," just because it is one common breath they all breathe; but it is NOT one common spirit they all have, and therefore we speak of their "spirits," because each has his own, and it is a separate entity in each one.

But more than this, it is an entity, which is not a thing which, floating about outside, has been introduced within man. Scripture again tells us, it was *formed* within him, (Zech. xii. 1) "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and *formeth the spirit of man within him.*" Thus along with the formation of the heavens and the earth, as of equal importance with these (the body being, moreover, quite passed over in the matter), there is put, by the inspired writer, this formation of the spirit of man. And this is the complete upsetting of the materialistic theory. The spirit of man is *formed within* him. It is a separate entity then in each individual man, not a common principle shared by all.

Moreover the possession of a spirit by the beast is not asserted in Scripture, except in one passage* by the writer of Ecclesiastes (ch. iii. 19—21), "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath (ruach); so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast, for all is vanity. All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. *Who knoweth* the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" This is the language of human doubt merely. It is only what "he said" at a certain time "in his heart" (verse 18); not necessarily false therefore, but not necessarily therefore true, and his appeal is to the uncertainty of human knowledge: "Who knoweth?" It is the language of a man who (ch. i. 13) had "given his heart to *search out by wisdom* concerning all things that are done under heaven;" who had "said in his heart" (ch. ii. 1);

* Gen. vii. 22 (*marg.*) quoted by Annihilationists as proving "spirit" to belong to beasts is a mere mistake. The same phrase is found in 2 Sam. xxii. 16, and is there translated "The blast of the breath," where again it is referred to the nostrils: "The blast of the breath of his nostrils." It is the action of the breath upon the nostrils, so strongly marked in states of excitement and fear often, which is strikingly referred to in the passage in Genesis: "All in whose nostrils was the breathing of the breath of life . . . died."

As for Num. xvi. 22, it refers, from the context, to man simply. "Except those days should be shortened, *no flesh* should be saved" (Matt. xxiv. 22); "*All flesh* had corrupted his way upon the earth" (Gen. vi. 12); "Thou that hearest prayer—to Thee shall *all flesh* come" (Ps. lxxv. 2); "All flesh shall come and worship before me" (Isa. lxvi. 23), are some out of many similar examples.

“Go to, now, I will prove thee with mirth;” and who had “sought in his heart to give himself to *wine*,” and “to lay hold on *folly*, that he might see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under heaven all the days of their life” (verse 3). This is no Spirit-taught man. The Spirit of God plainly could not lead in such a path as that; and no wonder therefore that, “searching out by” human “wisdom,” he should get only conjecture, and often wrong conjecture, too. It is by the Spirit surely that we are given this history of human searching after wisdom and after good, *but* the lesson is, that, *by* human searching, he could attain neither the one nor the other. Listen to Solomon’s own exposition of this, as he comes out into the light: “As thou **KNOWEST NOT** what is the *way of the Spirit*, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou *knowest not the works of God* who maketh all” (ch. xi. 5). But he has something to say now about his former “thoughts,” for he says, finally and conclusively, that man’s spirit does *not* go downward to the earth: “Then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was, and the *spirit* shall return to God who gave it.” But this text will again come up, when we come to the consideration of the Scripture testimony as to death.

I return then with confidence to my former position, that so far from the spirit in man being a principle of life held in common with the beast, the Spirit of God *never* asserts the beast’s possession of it. There is complete and absolute silence as to such a thing. And the silence of Scripture is authoritative against the materialistic assumption. For their whole theory they are

indebted to the endeavour to search out by human wisdom, without the Spirit, which they deny, the works of God.

The spirit of man, then, is a special entity, an individual thing, peculiar to him alone (as far as Scripture leads) of all the mundane creation; not a principle floating about in the air everywhere, but a part of his compound nature, *formed in him* by the Lord Himself.

And I need hardly say, that before these few Scripture facts, Mr. Morris's theory of the spirit in man—that it is the new nature in the believer, or “the motions and emotions of the soul” in men at large—equally breaks down. Zech. xii. 1 will not bend to either supposition. It speaks definitely of the spirit of *man*, not of the *believer*, and says God formed it, not surely the motions and emotions of the soul! Beside which, to this “spirit of man which is in him” the apostle (in 1 Cor. ii. 11) refers all human knowledge: “What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?” Could we say, the “motions” or “emotions” of the soul know?

My object has been here just to establish the doctrine of the distinct existence of the spirit as a separate entity in man. The various uses of the word, and the relationship of the spirit to the soul, will come up more naturally, after we have examined in a similar manner the Scripture doctrine of the soul itself.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOUL.

THE Hebrew word for soul is נֶפֶשׁ (*nephesh*) the equivalent of which in Greek is ψυχή (*psuchē*). A fact, significant enough in view of what we have already had before us when speaking of the word used for spirit, is, that both *nephesh* and *psuchē* are, equally with *ruach* and *pneuma*, derived from words which signify "to breathe." The same idea of *viewless activity* enters into them. Even Dr. Thomas tells us that *nephesh* is from the verb to breathe, although, with the characteristic want of honesty which marks all that he says upon the subject, he gives its primary meaning as "creature." "Nephesh," he says, "signifies creature, also life, soul, or breathing-frame, from the verb to breathe." "To return to the philology of our subject, I remark, that by a metonymy, or figure of speech whereby the container is put for the thing contained, and *vice versâ*, *nephesh*, 'breathing-frame' is put for *neshemet ruach chayim*, which, when in motion, the frame respire. Hence *nephesh* signifies life, also breath and soul" ("Elpis Israel," p. 27—29). One would think, from the admitted derivation of the word from the verb to breathe, that the metonymy, if such there be, would be all the other way, and that the *primary* meanings would be "life, breath, and soul."

In point of fact, *nephesh* is only used for breath once in the Old Testament, and for *life* only as the principle or source of life—a meaning derived from the soul being strictly that source of life to the body. So that “soul” (in the common acceptation of the word) is properly the primary *Scriptural* meaning, and the other meanings (except that of breath, once given it, Job xli. 21) are derived from *it*.

Dr. Thomas, on the other hand, stoutly contends that soul and body are one. “Now, if it be asked, what do the Scriptures define a living soul to be?—the answer is; a living, natural, or animal body” (“*Elpis Israel*,” p. 27). But I would ask Dr. Thomas or any other who takes the same position, if he would understand such an expression as “everything wherein there was a living body?” You find in Gen. i. 30, “everything wherein there was a living soul.” Now, if the soul be *in* the body, it cannot *be* the body, as is evident; and the fact that it is called a “living” soul, precludes the possibility of translating it “life,” as materialists love to do. A “living life” would make no sense;* a “living breath” would be no better: and the passage shuts us up to the necessity of allowing that *something* is alive, *within* the “breathing frame” which Dr. Thomas

* Mr. Grant does not see the difference between “*living a life*” and a “*life living*.” “We often hear the expression, ‘We should *live a life* of virtue,’ so, in the passages under consideration, it would be correct to say, ‘And my *life* shall *live*.’” (“*The Soul*,” p. 13.) This is a notable specimen of discernment or the want of it. If I can talk of “*giving a gift*,” I can *therefore* talk of a “*gift giving*”; or, if I can speak of “*thinking a good thought*,” I can equally speak of a “*good thought thinking*”!

speaks of, so that the soul and it are distinct from each other.

Now, note that it is even of the "beast of the earth," and from that down to every creeping thing, that this is said. It is *not* said that the beast has a *spirit*, but it is said that it has a *soul*. So much so, that all the lower animals are called "souls," just as much as men are. This is to be observed, for it is itself an answer to the materialistic theories of organization, of the most complete kind. It cuts off at once all those arguments as to the faculties of the brute, their display of attachment, of sagacity, &c., which men ground so much upon. Scripture refers these, not to organization, but to the "living soul," as even in man, while it refers the "understanding of the *things of a man*" (1 Cor. ii. 11) to the spirit *which only man possesses*—his sensual faculties, appetites, nay, his affections, &c., are ascribed to the "living soul,"—a soul so distinct in its life from that of the body, that they that "kill the body" *cannot* "kill the soul" (Matt. x. 28).*

Man is thus a living soul. How he became so, Gen. ii. 7 informs us. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man *became* a living soul." Now, upon the most cursory glance at this, it is evident that something more took place in man's creation than in the creation of the brute. It is plain that God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and that He did not into the brute's, and this prepares us to expect to find in man an altogether higher condition

* The text will come up for examination elsewhere.

than in the brute. Even his body is (so to speak) moulded by God Himself, and that would show, I suppose materialists themselves would admit, a higher organization than that of the lower creatures; and I ask, then, does not God's breathing the breath of life argue for man *spiritually* (if I may say so) a higher existence than for other "living souls?" If only breath were communicated, that of course is common to all, and there is no difference. But it was not mere breath that was given, for man became thereby—man, who was only "dust" before—a "living soul." And that purports that he was now *characterized*, as we have seen before in the beast, by something now *living* within that man, who was just now dust. He is a living soul now, *not* because of the completion of his bodily organization—that was complete before,—but because the breath of God has added a new element of being. He is now not a mere body—he is *become a living soul*.*

Still, why is man called a living soul, a title which is his in common with all the animate creation, rather than a "living *spirit*," which would distinguish him from them? The answer suggested by Scripture is, that the point of contrast here is not with the lower animals, but with the class of God's creatures to which, as a *moral* being, man belongs. The angels are *spirits*, never *souls*. The distinction between them and man,

* Mr. Morris's gloss that *nephesh chayah* means a "*vigorous soul*" will be repudiated by any scholar. In a secondary sense נֶפֶשׁ is used for revival, and recovery, but its simple ordinary established meaning is living. It is in contrast with נֶפֶשׁ, *to be*, as the being of a stone (for instance) is distinct from the life of an animal.

"made a little lower than the angels" (Ps. viii.), is thus, that man is a *soul*. That which links him with the inferior creatures, is that which distinguishes him from pure "spirits," such as angels are.

The fact here manifest, that the soul is thus put for the whole man himself, as what characterizes him, or gives him his place in the creation of God, serves to explain many passages which would otherwise present difficulty. We talk in just the same way of "all the souls on board a ship," "every soul was lost," and yet are neither materialists nor Annihilationists. There are other renderings, however, of the word *nephesh*, and other uses of "soul" which we must look at. As usual, the deniers of the Scripture doctrine make again a great display of various meanings given to the word. Says Miles Grant ("The Soul, What is it?" p. 20),

"Nephesh, the word rendered soul, is translated in *forty-four* different ways in the common English Bible. We now propose to give *all* these variations, and quote the texts that contain them."

Now, I would say that nothing is more common than various renderings of the same word in our ordinary translation. Good as it is, and in most cases giving the sense with sufficient accuracy, it often varies from literal exactness. With all this variation there is far less difference than would appear. Mr. Grant himself reduces these meanings essentially to four, "creature, person, life, and desire." "Soul," of course, disappears out of this catalogue, although it is the translation of *nephesh* 475 times out of 752. And we are, therefore, to translate Gen i. 30, "everything that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is a living *creature*," or

“wherein there is a living *person*,” or “wherein there is a living *life*,” or “wherein there is a living *desire*.” Choose which you will, reader, so that you give no currency to the supposition of an immaterial soul in man!

Mr. Grant has very ingeniously given in his book *all the variations* from the ordinary meaning of the word “nephesh,” but he has given only select specimens of passages which retain that meaning. I will supply the deficiency, and present him and my readers with a few of those omitted passages:—

Num. xxi. 4.—The *soul* of the people was much discouraged because of the way.

Deut. xi. 18.—Ye shall lay up these, my words, in your *soul*.

1 Sam. xviii. 1.—The soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David.

1 Sam. xxx. 6.—The soul of all the people was grieved.

2 Sam. v. 8.—The blind that are hated of David's soul.

Ps. lxxxvi. 4.—Rejoice the soul of thy servant, O Lord.

Ps. cvii. 15.—He sent leanness into their soul.

Ps. cvii. 26.—Their soul is melted because of trouble.

Isa. x. 18.—And shall consume from the soul even to the flesh (*marg*).

Gen. xlii. 21.—When we saw the anguish of his soul.

Job xiv. 22.—And his *soul within him* shall mourn.

Job xxiii. 13.—What his soul desireth, even that he doeth.

Isa. liii. 11.—He shall see of the travail of his soul.

Ps. xiii. 2.—How long shall I take counsel in my soul.

Ps. cxix. 20.—My soul breaketh for the longing it hath.

Mic. vi. 7.—The fruit of my *body* for the sin of my *soul*.

Take one only of these examples and examine it narrowly. “His soul within him shall mourn,” says

Job. Should it be, "his creature within him," "his person within him," "his life within him," "his desire shall mourn," or what? "Anything you please," Mr. Grant would seem to say, "so that it is not his *soul*." But what sincere mind will be satisfied with this? "His soul within him" is so exactly the story of Gen. i. 30, applied to man, that it is hard to make it speak differently. Put them side by side a moment: "everything *wherein* there is a living soul,"—"his soul *within* him." Who would not say the one was the exact reproduction of the other? And this soul in man *mourns*! It is a "living" thing, then, as Gen. i. 30 declares.

Remember I do not touch the question of immortality here. I do not base it upon these texts. Otherwise they would prove for the beast what they prove for the man. I am taking up one point only,—the existence of a living soul in man. This these passages do establish.

Take again the New Testament equivalent of nephesh—*psuchē*:—

Matt. x. 28.—Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul.

Mr. Grant says of this: "We know of no reason why it may not be translated *life* in this passage as well as any other. . . . We think it does not mean *this* present *soul* or life, for the reason that the destruction threatened is not in this life, but in the world to come. Man can and does take *this* life."

But the trouble is that *ψυχή* is *never* in Scripture the life to come. I challenge one example to be produced. For that there is another word altogether. *Psuchē* is never life, except in the *causal* sense, because the soul

is the cause of life to the body. Just as with nephesh, of which it is the exact synonym: "The *life* is in the blood," *i.e.* in a secondary sense, "the *cause* of life" (Lev. xvii. 11).

And as for the *present* life, Mr. Grant admits that "man can and *does* take *this* life." So that *psuchē* here must be (in spite of the protest of materialism) that which lies *back of the life itself*—"the *soul within*," which is out of man's reach altogether. And to this interpretation Mr. Hudson, destructionist as he is, fully agrees.

There is then, reader, a living soul that dwells within the man. I grant other uses of the word, *derived from this*. I grant that because the distinctive characteristic of man is that he is a "living soul" (as distinguished from the angels), soul becomes often a mere synonym for man or person, even for the dead. I grant that in the same way it is used for birds, beasts, fishes, creeping things. But the key to the use of it in all these different ways, is neither in the unscriptural theories of Dr. Thomas, nor of Miles Grant, but in that primary meaning of "soul" which they reject, as a distinct entity, a living component part of that "fearfully and wondrously made" creature, man.

Hence, it will not do to bring up other uses of the word in order to raise a laugh at "immortal souls" eating and drinking, &c., as these writers love to do. As I have said before, it is language in common use to say, "All the souls on board perished," and yet it does not mean that we believe in annihilation. And I would ask, if this admitted use of the same word in different meanings be not allowed, how am I to translate John

iii. 8? "The *wind* (pneuma) bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is *born of the spirit*" (pneuma). Here the same word is wind and spirit, and the transition from one meaning to the other is abrupt as can be. Are we then to say, "Thou hearest the sound of the *spirit*?" or else "every one that is born of the *wind*?" It would be just as wise as the arguments of some of these writers about "souls" eating.

And I say again, I am not raising the question of immortality here at all. That I reserve for after consideration. I simply say here, that Scripture establishes beyond the possibility of doubt, the fact of there being a living soul in man—a soul that feels, and mourns, and longs, and loves and hates; a soul in close and intimate union, during life, with the body, but which is NOT the body.

CHAPTER V.

FUNCTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS OF SOUL AND SPIRIT.

WITH these facts before us, the way is prepared for us to see a new and beautiful harmony in the Scripture teaching as to soul and spirit. That these are quite distinct from each other, although so nearly related, the Word of God bears abundant witness. "Your whole spirit and soul and body," and "piercing even to the dividing asunder of . . . soul and spirit," are passages sufficiently plain. But the question naturally arises, How, then, are they distinguished, and what are their relationships to one another? In the answer to this which the inspired writings furnish, we find also the fullest confirmation of the fact of the existence of these two separate entities in the compound nature of man.

"Spirit and soul and body," which I have taken as the key to the discovery of man's nature, gives us, I believe, very clearly the *order* of relationship. The soul is the connecting link here, between the spirit and the body. The spirit is the higher part. Hence, although it be true that "the body without the spirit is dead" (Jas. ii. 26), yet the spirit is never looked at as the *life* of the body. The word for *life*, as we have seen, is *psuchē* or *nepshesh*, in its secondary or *derived* meaning.

And to soul or spirit, not merely the moral qualities, but also the senses, and the emotional and intellectual faculties, are ascribed. Striking fact for materialists, the *brain* (to which *they* ascribe everything) is not so much as once mentioned from Genesis to Revelation. Nor has the *head*, which contains the brain, any mental or moral faculties ascribed to it. "Visions of the head" are mentioned (Dan. iv. 10, &c.), plainly because the eyes are in it. But no mental or moral qualities, no faculties beside, are ever attributed to it.

I do not say this, as doubting the result of men's researches in this respect. But as fully allowing it, it makes only more striking the way in which the Spirit of God passes over it altogether. Still more so, because feelings and faculties are attributed figuratively to the heart, the belly, the bowels, the kidneys, the womb, and the flesh in general, but *never* to the head. Look at this in relation to Mr. Roberts' remarks before cited (pp. 8, 9), and see how the wisdom of God meets the insane folly of would-be philosophers. He who foreknew all their self-sufficient speculations, has poured contempt upon them by utter silence; while, except the figurative language alluded to, all the faculties of man are attributed to what their science of course cannot detect, the unseen soul or spirit. They may correct the Word indeed, and they are bold enough to do so, by their more perfect knowledge; but there stands the fact, let them meet it how they can.

But, moreover, in proclaiming these attributes or functions of the spirit and the soul, there is no looseness of language, much less confusion. The mental faculties, emotions, sensual appetites, &c., are ascribed to soul

or to spirit with the utmost exactness and the most unvarying harmony. It is to this point that I would call most earnest and special attention. We shall find in every case the intelligence and judgment belong to the spirit; the affections, desires, appetites, &c., to the soul. I place before my reader the passages, or all the *varieties* of them, upon which the judgment may be formed.

And first, with regard to *spirit* (ruach or pneuma):—

Gen. xli. 8.—Pharaoh's spirit was troubled in the morning.

Judg. viii. 3.—Then their spirit was abated towards him.

Ps. cvi. 3.—They provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly.

Prov. xiv. 29.—He that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly.

Isa. xxix. 24.—They that erred in spirit shall come to understanding.

Ez. 1. 21.—The spirit of the living creature was in the wheels.

Mark viii. 12.—He sighed deeply in his spirit.

Acts xvii. 6.—His spirit was stirred within him when he saw.

1 Cor. ii. 11.—What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?

Rendered in our version, "mind":—

Prov. xxix. 11.—A fool uttereth all his mind.

Ez. xi. 5.—I know the things that come into your mind.

Ez. xx. 32.—That which cometh into your mind.

Dan. v. 20.—His mind hardened in pride.

"Understanding":—Isa. xi. 3.

"Courage":—Josh. ii. 11.

Now here it will require but little examination to see that the spirit is presented in Scripture as the seat of

the *mind* or *understanding*, as we have just seen it to be sometimes even translated. The passage from 1 Cor. ii. is indeed the most positive assertion of it that can possibly be: "What man knoweth the things of a man save the *spirit* of man which is *in him*?" Here the spirit of man *in* the man is that part of him to which all intelligence is referred. Hence we may know what to think of the knowledge or honesty displayed in such a statement as the following from one of Miles Grant's writings: "In all the 400 passages in the Old, and the 385 in the New Testament, where these words occur, we do not find one that teaches that, when this spirit or breath is in man, it is the thinking, accountable part, or that it ever did or ever will think. Why is the Bible wholly silent on this point? Why are we not taught somewhere that the *ruach* or *pneuma* is 'the real man?'" ("Spirit in Man," p. 31, 32.) Mr. Grant, of course, as usual with him, confounds the "breath of life" with "the spirit of man," and I do not mean to assert by any means that the "breath of life" is the real man. But to his latter question, I do most positively and distinctly answer that the Bible does teach that the spirit of man is the conscious thinking part, and that his not seeing it is only due to his own blindness, not to its not being there. It says most definitely and distinctly that the "man," which "knows the things of a man," is "the *spirit* of man, which is *IN* him." There is no escape from its plain speaking. It speaks so plainly, indeed, that Mr. Grant has not thought fit to notice it in his pamphlet just referred to; and it is *his* silence that is to be remarked, not the silence of the Scriptures.

This "spirit of man," then, cannot be with Mr. Grant either an "influence" or "a state of feeling," or "the atmosphere or breath of life." It cannot be Mr. Morris's "*new nature*" (or else all unconverted men are born idiots) or "*motions and emotions of the soul.*" No, it is simply what the words declare, a conscious, intelligent existence *in* the man, and that to which all his intelligence of the things of a man is due. "*What man knoweth the things of a man, save the SPIRIT OF MAN which is IN him?*"

Passages which also identify the spirit as the seat of the mind or understanding, I have already quoted; but it needs not to examine them, except to shew how other uses of the word are derived from this one. Thus in Josh. ii. 11, and v. 1, it is used for courage, the connection of which with "presence of *mind*" is familiar to all. And in Judges viii. 3, it is used for anger, which is again the judgment of the mind, true or false, upon what presents itself as evil. Another use of the word, which also we have in English, for the prevailing temper or disposition, as "a meek and quiet spirit," "a spirit of pride," &c., is derived from the fact of the spirit being in man the higher part, and the rightful governor of the man—what (in short) characterizes him.

Now let us gather, in a similar way, some passages as to the soul, and the difference will be at once apparent.

Thus it is the seat of the affections:—

Gen. xxxiv. 8.—The soul of my son longeth for your daughter.

1 Sam. xviii. 1.—The soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David.

Ps. xlii. 1.—So panteth my soul after thee, O God.

Ps. lxxiii. 1.—O God, my soul thirsteth for thee.

Ps. lxxxiv. 2.—My soul longeth for the courts of the Lord.

Ps. cxix. 20.—My soul breaketh for the longing it hath.

Cant. i. 7.—O thou, whom my soul loveth.

Isa. xxvi. 9.—With my soul have I desired thee in the night.

Luke ii. 35.—A sword shall pierce through thine own soul.

Heb. x. 38.—My soul shall have no pleasure in him.

As it loves, so it hates :—

Lev. xxvi. 15.—If your soul abhor my judgments.

2 Sam v. 8.—The blind that are hated of David's soul.

Zech. xi. 8.—My soul loathed them.

It compassionates :—

Judg. x. 16.—His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel.

Job xxx. 25.—Was not my soul grieved for the poor?

Ez. xxiv. 21.—What your soul pitieth shall fall by the sword.

It is the seat of lusts :—

Job xxiii. 13.—What his soul desireth, even that he doeth.

Ps. x. 3.—The wicked boasteth of his soul's desire.

1 Pet. ii. 11.—Fleshly lusts which war against the soul.

Of the appetites, even, of the body :—

Ps. cvii. 18.—Their soul abhorreth all manner of meat.

Prov. xix. 15.—An idle soul shall suffer hunger.

Prov. xxv. 25.—As cold waters to a thirsty soul.

Prov. xxvii. 7.—The full soul loatheth the honeycomb.

Isa. xxix. 8.—His soul hath appetite.

Lam. i. 11.—Meat to relieve the soul.

Luke xii. 19.—Soul take thine ease, eat, drink,
and be merry.

So its derived meanings are "appetite" (Prov. xxiii. 2, Eccl. vi. 7); "pleasure" (Deut. xxiii. 24, Ps. cv. 22, Jer. xxxiv. 16); "desire" (Jer. xlv. 14, Mic. vii. 3, Hab.

ii. 5); "mind," in the sense of will or intention, not of the understanding (1 Sam. ii. 35, 2 Kings ix. 15).

A slight examination of these passages will serve to demonstrate the truth of my former assertion as to the soul's place and functions. It is here seen plainly as the link between the spirit and the body; that which is indeed the "life" of the latter. The sense of "life," given to it often in Scripture, is plainly a meaning derived from this very fact. In all this the difference between soul and spirit is preserved in the most marked way, and the most thorough consistency maintained everywhere throughout the Bible. Passages there are, I doubt not, which may at first sight appear confusing, but a little examination will in every case clear away the difficulty to a reflecting mind, and that consistency be only more thoroughly established. Types, indeed, of the difference and of the relationship between these two essential parts of man's being, are to be found, I doubt not, in the human race at large. Man and woman, in their characteristic differences, seem to present very much the features which distinguish the spirit from the soul: the one predominant in mental activity, the other in emotional; the woman formed *for* the man, and not the man for the woman, yet each the complement of the other, made for mutual support and relationship.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FALL.

THE analogy may be traced further than this, however, and grows in significance as we contemplate it, for the man was seduced *through* the woman ; his judgment not astray, but led captive by his affections. "Adam was not *deceived*," says the apostle (1 Tim. ii. 14), "but the woman, being *deceived*, was in the transgression." "The serpent *beguiled* me," says the woman. "The woman *gave* me of the tree" (not *beguiled* me), says Adam, "and I did eat." Thus as the man was led by the woman and fell by her, so was he, it is plain, led by the affections of the *soul*, and with the *soul* the *spirit* fell.

It is always so. To use other language—the language of the day, though not of Scripture—the *head* is seduced by the *heart*. "How *can* ye believe," asks the Lord Himself, "who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?" (John v. 44). And so again—"that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but" [mark the reason] "had *pleasure* in unrighteousness." (2 Thes. ii. 12.) And so again, when there is real turning to God, "with the *heart*"—not the head—"man believeth unto righteousness." (Rom. x. 10.)

Thus, though the spirit be as much astray as the

soul, it is *through* the soul as well as *with* the soul, that it is seduced and has fallen. And the Word of God, in its own wonderful and perfect way, ever keeps in mind the distinction. It proclaims the fact, that in fallen man the spirit has yielded its supremacy to the soul, and that the "natural" man is "*sensual*" or soul-led (*ψυχικός*) (1 Cor. ii. 14). In the believer, and especially in the blameless state of such, the spirit has again recovered its supremacy. "Spirit and soul and body" are again in the divine order.

Nor are these by any means solitary expressions. The same thing is expressed in various ways in the language of Scripture. Thus, the *will*, in the now natural state is identified or connected with the soul. This is *translated* three times "will" in our common version (Ps. xxvii. 12, xli. 2, Ez. xvi. 27). "Let her go whither she will," is (in Deut. xxi. 14) "let her go to *her soul*." "Ah ha, so would we have it" (Ps. xxxv. 25) is "ah ha, *our soul*." And the expression, "binding the soul with a bond," *i.e.* by a vow, repeated ten times in Num. xxx., shews how intimately will and soul are connected together. Thus, it is even so that "the *lust* of the flesh, and the *lust* of the eyes, and the pride of life," characterize the world for God; and man, alas! is but the creature of fleshly impulse—"sensual," if "not having the Spirit" (Jude 19).

On the other hand, that the spirit should have supremacy, and so give the will (I say not in independence of the soul, but as guiding it), is evident from the chief place it gets. Indeed, the old nature has its synonym of "flesh" from the opposite tendency of being guided by the soul, which is so nearly connected with the body.

But into the mystery of this it is not in my province now to enter.

Still, I would point out how, in perfect accordance with all this, as sin is thus in a special sense "the sin of the soul" (Mic. vi. 7), so atonement is said to be made in the same way "for the *soul*." The expression is three times found (Exod. xxx. 15, Lev. xvii. 11, Num. xxxi. 50). And I speak of it to shew the blessed harmony of Scripture on this as on every other point. Moreover as *for* the soul atonement is needed, so *by* the soul atonement was made. "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his *soul* an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the *travail* of his *soul* and be satisfied." (Isa. liii. 10, 11.)

So complete, so uniform, is the testimony of the Word.

Let us now gather up its statements upon the subject we have been examining:—

1. The body is *not* the whole man, for he is often said to be "in" it, or "absent from" it, "clothed with" it, or "unclothed." Thus, for faith the body is the clothing of the man, and his "tabernacle," which supposes an inhabitant. Moreover, Paul tells us of a vision of unutterable things, and does not know whether he was "in the body or out of the body" at the time he saw them.

2. In the language of sense man is identified with the body; for faith, with what dwells in it. "The Lord" lay in Joseph's tomb, and, yet, confessedly His divine nature lay not there.

3. Man is "spirit, and soul, and body."

4. Spirit is not a universal principle floating in the atmosphere, but a separate entity in every individual, "spirit of man," "spirits of men." It was formed within man by the Lord, and all his knowledge is ascribed to it. This spirit the beast has not.

5. The soul is not the body, but *in* the body. Beasts have and are "living souls," and man is called a "soul" to distinguish him from the rest of intelligent creatures, who are called "spirits." The soul is the link between the spirit and the body; the seat of affection, appetites, &c., which are never referred to the body. It is that through which man was seduced and fell, and which characterizes the natural man as led by it. It is thus connected in Scripture with "will," with *sin*, and with *atonement*.

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

PART II.

DEATH AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

CHAPTER I.

DEATH.

WE have thus far then arrived in the prosecution of our subject, and are prepared for the further enquiry, What is death, and what is life, in the Scripture thought of each. That these terms are correlative to one another, and that death is the opposite of life, is simple enough. But in defining the terms themselves we cannot accept anything short of Scripture statements. Annihilationists in general assume that they speak for themselves. Hence Mr. Roberts says, "The popular theory will not allow that a dead man is *really dead*. . . . It is incorrect in orthodox language, to say that the *man* is dead. . . . In reality, therefore, the word 'death,' as popularly used, has lost its original meaning."

He goes further, and defines for us what death is. He says, "It is a negative suggested by the positive: and as life is the positive, *death is the opposite of life*." Very true, so far, but note what follows: "In order, therefore, to understand death, we must have a definite conception of life. Of this we do know something, since it is a matter of *positive experience*. All we have to do is to bring our knowledge to bear, but this is what the majority of people have great difficulty in doing. Their minds are so occupied with established

theories, that they are blind to facts under their immediate cognizance. Throwing metaphysics aside, what is life, as known experimentally? It is the aggregate result of certain organic processes. Respiration, circulation of the blood, digestion, &c., combine to generate and sustain vitality, and to impart activity to the various faculties of which we are composed (!) Apart from this busy organism, life is unmanifested, whether as regards man or beast."

This is plain enough. You have only to take for granted that the body is the whole man, and you need no revelation to tell you what death or what life is. The death of the body is plainly, *for it*, the cessation of all sensation, of all (at least *practical*) existence. And if the body be the whole man, the dust that lies in the tomb, death is of course for him the extinction of being. "Apart from this busy organism, life is *unmanifested*," says this writer; and with him to be "unmanifested" is "not to be." He really excludes revelation; "positive experience" sets it aside, and we have only to apply the knowledge that every one already has.

The fallacy is apparent the moment we remember, what already we have learnt from Scripture, that man is something more than body: that this is the "tabernacle" of an unseen soul and spirit. If death is "putting off my tabernacle" (2 Pet. i. 14), then plainly I cannot argue from the effect it has upon the body, the tabernacle put off, to what it has upon the one who puts it off. Death may be one thing to the body, another to the soul or spirit. Man may die, and all functions cease as to the body: it does not follow that spirit and soul are equally extinct. Now here we do want

revelation, and must trust implicitly to its guidance too.

Now we have seen that the word of God does on the one side use the popular language, the language of sense, and identify man with his body. This is seen in the mass of texts of which Annihilationists are so fond. The man is the flesh and blood we see and touch. A dead *body* is a dead *man*. We all speak so, unconscious wholly of being exposed to the charge of materialism in doing so. Our daily speech in this way might convict us in the profound wisdom of another generation of disbelieving, equally with Annihilationists themselves, in the existence of an immortal soul. Yet we really *do* believe it, in spite of that, and even the attacks of Annihilationists themselves have not as yet, at any rate, made us a whit more cautious. We quote even "Dust thou art," and believe it, and yet do not believe that we are *all* dust. And we find, on the other side, and use as freely, a number of texts which Annihilationism cannot teach us how to use, which speak of man being "*in* the body," "*in* the flesh," "at home in the body," "absent from the body," or "out of" it, and yet believe that the body too is part of the man in spite of that.

Let us now fairly put the question, and seek to answer it: Is the Scripture view of death extinction, even of all "organic processes"?—is it "ceasing to exist," or, as they delight to quote from Job x. 18, to "*be as though we had not been*"?

You put seed into the ground, and in Scripture language, "it is not quickened *except it DIE*" (1 Cor. xv. 36). Does the living germ you sow become extinct in order to bring forth the harvest? Are the "organic

processes extinguished in it? Where would the harvest be, if they were? Yet this is twice over in Scripture spoken of as "*death*." And, if you reflect a little, the analogy to the death of man is nearer than it seems. There is that of the seed which is cast off as refuse and decays. The germ within "puts off its tabernacle," but so far from itself becoming extinguished in the process, springs up into the plant thereon. Is there no lesson in that? no type? no analogy commending the use of this strong word, "death," in this case? Would it ever have struck Mr. Roberts, or any other of his brethren, that "except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and DIE, it abideth alone, but, if it DIE, it bringeth forth much fruit"? Does the grain of wheat become extinct in order to bring forth fruit. They have never (at least that I can find) attempted to illustrate their doctrine by it, that death is the cessation of existence, the extinction of organic processes.

The death of man is spoken of, moreover, in language which is not doubtful. I have fully admitted already, and without hesitation, that there are a large class of passages which (identifying man with his body) speak in the ordinary popular phraseology about it. Passages, too, there are, which will be examined in the sequel, which may present difficulty in harmonizing them with the language of other parts. But, on the other hand, the clear, full light of the New Testament affords us, in many simple and intelligible statements, abundant satisfaction as to what death is. Some of these I shall now proceed to examine, together with the arguments of the class of writers to whom I am replying.

1. As we have seen, the Apostle Peter styles death,

“the putting off of his tabernacle” (2 Pet. i. 14). The language of Paul is similar, and, if comment be needed, may supply it: “we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved” (2 Cor. v. 1).

The language of Annihilationists upon this expression shews their perplexity. Mr. Ham says on the latter passage, “Man, the one compound being, is compared to an ‘*earthly house*’ or ‘*tabernacle*,’ which will be dissolved.” This is plainly incorrect. The apostle distinguishes between the tabernacle and the one who dwells in it! “for *we* which are IN this tabernacle,” he says further on. The tabernacle was to be dissolved, *not* the inhabitant. But Mr. Ham admits that man is a “compound being.” The passage proves, however, a little more than that, for the man is here plainly identified not with the body, the house, but with its inhabitant. And which (according to the figure used) is the more important?

2. Another expression used in the same passage (2 Cor. v. 4) is “being unclothed”: “not that we would be *unclothed*.”

Even Dr. Field, materialist as he is, speaks here of “a disembodied state.” Mr. Dobney, on the contrary, maintains, that “Scripture recognises no *perfectly* disembodied state.” I ask, if there be not something to be disembodied, how can you use the expression at all? Could you talk of “disembodied” *breath*, or “disembodied” *life*?

The putting off of clothing, if that is a figure of disembodiment as it is, is simple enough indeed, but only when we recognise a part, and that the higher part, of man to be something that is not the body,

but is *in* it, as the living soul is. Plainly death here is not cessation of existence, whatever (which for the present I leave open) may become of soul or spirit afterwards.

3. In the text in Peter before referred to, death is called "decease," literally, exodus, "departure." (2 Pet. i. 15.) "After MY departure."

Now here the *man* departs. Where, is not the question yet. The man departs. He leaves the earthly house of this tabernacle. Say, if you please, and if you can gather it from the Bible, that afterwards he becomes extinct or unconscious. That you must prove, if you can, from elsewhere. Death is not it; it is MY departure. That is more than saying, the departure of *life*. That would be life departing from *me*. It does from the body. But in the force of this expression *I* depart. Looking at the texts already quoted, we may add, "*from* the body."

4. And to this agrees the expression used again in 2 Cor. v. 8, "absent from the body."

People contend, I know (and it is their only hope), that this does not refer to death at all. Mr. Dobney thus attempts to paraphrase it by "absent from *this* body," "this gross corporeal investiture," "the *present* body." Mr. Ham, with absence from "our natural body," "our present, mortal and corruptible nature." Ellis and Read speak in the same way of the "body" here denoting "a state of corruption and mortality," "this corruptible body or nature." All apply the expression "absent from the body" to the resurrection-state, when we shall not be "absent from the body" at all. Mr. Roberts says, "What absence from the body

was it that Paul desired? Not disembodiment, for he says, in verse 4 of the same chapter, 'Not that we would be unclothed.'"

Now what Paul says is, that what he *groaned for* was not to be unclothed, but clothed *upon*. He *groaned* for the resurrection, that is true, but meanwhile he was always confident (or of good courage), knowing that after all to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord, he *would rather* be absent: death had no terror for him, but the reverse. To make absent from the body apply just to the time when the body will have its fulness of bliss, is simply to make incomprehensible what is very simple. "In the body" never has the meaning attributed to it, and that they have to add words to make it suit their thoughts is a plain proof that their thoughts are foreign to Scripture. And when the apostle, speaking of his vision of the third heavens, says he cannot tell whether, at the time, he was "in the body" or "out of the body," we have the exact expression in a way which no wonder they shrink from, as they do. For Paul could not imagine he had possibly had his glorious body when caught up there, and lost it afterwards. Yet he supposes he might have been conscious of unspeakable things "*out of the body*." If so, why may not one (as this chapter teaches) be "absent from the body, and present with the Lord?"

I shall have again to speak of this when we come to consider the question of consciousness in the disembodied state. It is sufficient for me here that such a state exists, as it does, if words have meaning. Death is that disembodiment, the putting off of the tabernacle

of the body, being unclothed, departing, and being absent from it.

But we go a step further when we take up Matt. x. 28, where the Lord bids us "fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

This teaches, as Mr. Hudson allows, that death is not the extinction of the soul, nor involves it. Killing the body did not kill the soul. Mr. Dobney follows on the same side. Mr. Ham wavers, admitting that it is implied "that the soul is *distinct* from the body," but at the same time suggesting that "soul" here may be merely *life*. Ellis and Read interpret it to mean, that "wicked men can only destroy the present being of the righteous, and that God could raise them up again." Miles Grant, as we have seen, interprets "killing the soul" to mean "taking the life to come." Similarly Mr. Roberts makes soul to be "a life in relation to those who are Christ's, which cannot be touched by mortal man, however they may treat the body and the poor mortal life belonging to it." While others say that "the dead in Adam are not *destroyed*," because "in consequence of the provision made in Christ for the resurrection of every human being from the Adamic death, those who can kill the body (take this life), only suspend our being till the resurrection."

But the texts before us will not bend to any of these criticisms. If soul be "life" merely, those who kill the body kill *it*. "Life to come," or the believer's life, *ψυχη* does *not* mean; another word (*ζωη*) is invariably used when it is spoken of. And the contrast between

suspension of life for the present and utter destruction of it, is not what the passage makes, but between a killing which affects the body only, and a destruction (or ruin) which will overtake both body and soul in hell. I am only repeating here what I have said before, and what Mr. Hudson, destructionist as he is, has said before me. Proof is conclusive that when man dies, his soul is not touched by it. If it is conscious is another thing presently to be examined. And what destruction of body and soul in hell is, I do not enquire yet. Suffice it just now, that when we put off the body at death, the soul still lives.

CHAPTER II.

CONSCIOUSNESS AFTER DEATH.

THE question of consciousness may now be taken up. Of course every proof of it is proof also of existence. But many who allow that the soul *exists* after death, will not allow that it is *conscious*. Thus Mr. Hudson regards "the soul as an entity not destroyed by the death of the body, however dependent it may be on an embodiment for the purposes of active existence." So with others, whom I need not here quote. The thing contended for is what is unknown to (while professedly based on) Scripture—"the sleep of the soul."

But you never find in Scripture the *soul* sleeping. The *'man* sleeps, but always as identified with the body. It is a mode of speech found in later Greek outside the New Testament. It is never the soul that is in question. So Matt. xxvii. 52, "many *bodies* of the sleeping saints arose." Again, John xi. 11: "our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go to awake him out of sleep," *i.e.*, by raising the dead. So Stephen fell asleep, and devout men carried him to burial—*i.e.*, his body. So "David fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and *saw corruption*." Again, in 1 Cor. vii. 39: "if her husband be dead (asleep) she is at liberty to be married to whom she will." There it is no question of soul or spirit. Again, chap. xi. 30: "many sleep;" he is

thinking of it as chastening, not the joy of presence with the Lord, which the soul had. Chap. xv. 6: "some are fallen asleep;" fallen out of the rank of witnesses. Chap. xv. 18: "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Verse 20: "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." There again the resurrection of the body is in question.

So always, if death be looked at as chastening, sorrowed over as we do over the breathless corpse; if it be simple history of the outward fact, or if resurrection be in question, it is here that we find the phrase which people have blundered over; perfectly simple, intelligible, and beautiful, as we gaze upon the inanimate form, and brush away our tears at the thought, "our brother shall rise again."

Abundance of inspired testimony there is that death is not, for the soul, a state of unconsciousness. The passages are well known, and need only to be cleared from the objections which have been raised to their apparently very simple meaning.

The conceptions of the Pharisees upon this point are acknowledged on all hands, and the familiar story of Lazarus and the rich man, in the 16th of Luke, is confessedly in full accordance with them, yet we are forbidden to believe this to be anything more than accommodation to the superstitions of those whom the Lord addressed. Mr. Roberts naturally suggests, that "it may be asked, Why did Christ parabolically employ a belief that was fictitious, and thus give it his apparent sanction?" To which he answers, that He "was not using it with any reference to *itself* (!), but for the

purpose of introducing a dead man's testimony. . . . This did not involve his sanction of the theory, any more than he approved of slavery by introducing it into his parable of the ungrateful debtor. . . . It may be urged that it was unlike Christ to perpetuate delusion, and withhold the truth on such an important question as that involved in the parable used. To this the reply will be found in the following (Matt. xiii. 10, 13)." That is, that "to them it was not given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," and that therefore He spoke in parables, because "seeing they saw not, and hearing they did not understand."

But Mr. Roberts will permit me to say that he has entirely failed to justify the thing he pleads for. For the reason last given is a reason for the Lord speaking in *parables* indeed, but not *making parables teach error*, or, as he admits, "*perpetuate delusion.*" Furthermore, the introducing slavery into a parable was only introducing what, under certain restrictions, the Mosaic law permitted; and if it had not been so, the bare introduction of a custom *that obtained*, was not sanctioning it; while the introduction of what had no existence, save as superstition, *would* tend, as he owns, to "perpetuate" it. This is a difference which upsets all his conclusions.

But then, he asks, "Are we to make a parable paramount, and throw away plain testimony? Are we to twist and violate what is clear to make it agree with what *we think* is meant by that which is admittedly obscure?"

Indeed this is the common refuge of all the writers of this class, except Mr. Dobney, who seems to admit all we claim about it. He cannot really, since he contends

that "Scripture recognises no perfectly disembodied state." He must therefore apply it to the final state. His words are: "Our Lord shows an ungodly man in a state of wretchedness after death. How long it would last is not intimated. It is true there was no hope for him. He could not buoy himself up with the prospect of restoration to enjoyment. But whether that torment should endure for ever, or would ultimately destroy him, the parable does not intimate. It teaches a terrible and hopeless state for the wicked after death, and that is all."

Edwin Burnham also *seems* to admit the doctrine of conscious existence after death. Speaking of eternal punishment he says, "So far as this question is concerned, man may be conscious or unconscious in death until the final judgment. Therefore the parable of the rich man and Lazarus proves nothing to the point of eternal torment, for that parable refers to *some transaction* before the judgment." But then he adds, "The same may be said of all those scriptures which to some *SEEM* to teach that the dead are in a conscious state."

For the rest, all seem to agree with Mr. Hastings: "of course the *parable* of the rich man and Lazarus is not reckoned as teaching the doctrine; for all laws of criticism forbid that parables be made use of to teach doctrines."

Unfortunately, however, for those who speak thus, they themselves are forced to admit that (parable or not) it is "founded upon," what Mr. Roberts calls, "a theoretic fact," *i.e.*, the belief of the Pharisees. That the object of it, moreover, is really to lift the veil from the other world will be plain if we consider the connection with the rest of the chapter. For the Lord had been

speaking in the first part of it of man as an unfaithful steward under sentence of dismissal, but with the goods of his Divine Master yet in his hand. It would be his wisdom so to use these, as that, when he failed, he might be received into everlasting habitations. Thereupon the Pharisees, who were covetous, derided Him, and to them He preaches this (parable, if you please) to show how what was "highly esteemed among men" was "abomination in the sight of God." This is the point and moral of the whole. "Thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things," is what is said to the rich man. No crime charged but this, his failure as to the "unrighteous mammon." He could not serve God and mammon. He *had* served mammon and not God. And while the beggar was borne from his gate into Abraham's bosom, *he* was tormented. How this addressed itself to covetous Pharisees is easily seen. And the state described is of a man immediately after death, in torment, before the resurrection and the judgment, with brethren still on earth to be preached to.

You may call it parable, if you will. The state of the dead is the very thing it is designed to enforce; and this representation of it is acknowledged to be in accordance with Pharisaic sentiments.

It is singular, however, how the terms used by our Lord are quarrelled with. If literally construed, Mr. Roberts urges, "it upsets the belief it is quoted to prove, and substitutes the tradition of the Pharisees, which Jesus was parabolically using. If a literal narrative, it clashes with the popular theory of the death-state in the following particulars. We read, verse 22, that *the beggar died, and WAS CARRIED*—not his immaterial

soul, but he, his *bodily self*—by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell, where he had been buried (hell, hades, and grave being synonymous) he lifted up his eyes," &c. He also tells us that "immaterial souls" could easily have got over the great gulf fixed; and that if the "popular view" were correct, a spirit might have been sent to the five brethren without one needing to rise from the dead.

This is said, perhaps, in serious earnest, although it would not seem so. But it is a specimen of the blinding influence of the delusion under which these men lie. Think of a man telling us that it was the *tradition of the Pharisees*, that men were carried *bodily* after death into Abraham's bosom; and that hades or hell and the grave were synonymous! and that men were tormented in the grave! If this parable teaches, literally, the traditions of the Pharisees, this is what, he says, it teaches.

But I pursue this no further than to ask where the parable states that the beggar's "bodily self" was carried into Abraham's bosom? Of course if there is no *other* self than a "bodily" one, all is plain. But then that is not the doctrine of the Bible. As to hades, and what it is, we shall see shortly. But would it not be rather foolish, even in a parable, to put it that "in the *grave* he lifted up his eyes being in torment"? But to such straits are men reduced who refuse the Scripture doctrine of the soul's consciousness after death. We may well thank God for making it so plain.

Figurative, no doubt, the language is. "Abraham's bosom" is not literal, any more than the gulf over

which souls could not pass. Nor do we contend for souls absent from the body having eyes, or tongues, or fingers; but thus are conveyed to us, in just such language as the Lord uses about Himself, thoughts that perhaps in no other way could we get so vividly presented. The meaning is only *so* clear, that our poor Annihilationists are driven to the wildest manœuvres in order to escape from its plain speaking.

I pass on now to Luke xxiv. 36—39, a passage which shews how far the disciples of the Lord had imbibed the Pharisaic doctrine as to this point. For we read that when, after His resurrection, they were gathered together, "Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith 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 hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have."

Now here it is plain that they recognised the form of the Lord, for in none of His appearances to them do we find anything spectral to make them think otherwise it was a spirit they saw. The two on the way to Emmaus just before had taken Him for an ordinary man. Moreover, they had just come among the other disciples, and found them, "saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon." Then, while they were giving their own account, "Jesus himself stood in the midst." It was this sudden appearance, the door being shut, that staggered them. They did not doubt *who* it was, nor does the Lord inform them.

He does not say, "It is I, *Jesus*," but "it is I *myself*," using that common language which I have spoken of, the language of sense, which identifies man with his body: "HANDLE ME *and see*; for a *spirit* hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Thus it was not a question as to its being *Jesus* or *another*, but as to its being *Jesus* in the body or as a spirit only. This the Lord's answer shews.

The objections of Ham and Storrs are thus clearly set aside, for they make the question one of (to use the language of the former) "the existence of *other beings*, who are called *spirits*." But this is not the question, but whether it was He Himself (bodily) or as a spirit. Take the whole circumstances, and the Lord's words, and this is plain.

And how common a use of the word "spirit" this is, we may see by the inspired statement as to the Jewish views, in Acts xxiii. 8: "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, *neither angel nor spirit*: but the Pharisees confess *both*." There the word "spirit" is taken as ordinarily applying (as our word "ghost," which is equivalent, does now) to the spirits of men apart from the body. Angels are given as another class. And the context confirms this; for Paul being called in question about the resurrection of *Jesus*, had declared himself a Pharisee, a believer in resurrection; and hereupon the council was divided: "and there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man, but if a *spirit* or an *angel* hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." Against this passage, Mr. Storrs' criticism on Luke xxiv. 39 falls pointless: "Angels are

spirits," says he, "but have not a body of flesh and bones." But in these two last-quoted passages, *and as identified with the Pharisees' belief* (the nature of which all admit), angels are named as a separate class of beings from these "spirits" spoken of: "if a spirit *or* an angel." In a Pharisee's mouth even our opponents allow the meaning of such words. And with their belief Paul links himself. For having declared himself a Pharisee, and called in question as to one point of a Pharisee's belief, the resurrection of the dead, it is added, as shewing the points in which their faith coincided with the Christian's: "*for* the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, *neither angel NOR SPIRIT*, but the Pharisees confess both." The very language of the inspired writer here shews his own consent with this doctrine: the Pharisees confess (or acknowledge) both. When I speak of acknowledging a thing, I plainly suppose it true, what I acknowledge. And thus in these matters the Pharisaic and the Christian faith are one.

If I take the light this gives me, how plain and simple it makes such passages as the Lord's words to the dying thief, for instance: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Or Stephen's prayer in the midst of the stones of his enemies: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."* Or, "The spirit shall return to

* Would it be believed that in the "Bible *vs.* Tradition" it is asserted that "the grammar of the text charges the saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit, upon the wicked Jews, and afterwards records what Stephen said and did." (2nd ed., page 98.) This is from people who appeal not only to Greek and Hebrew, but to Syriac, and what not; and yet they assert what any school boy at

God that gave it." Or yet again, the passage that speaks (Heb. xii. 23) of "the spirits of just men made perfect," as chap. xi. 40 shews, by resurrection, which we all get together. The Lord's saying to the thief will come up in another connection. Meanwhile I turn to a few more passages before I close this chapter.

Phil. i. 21—24 is a text, of course, much disputed. It reads in our version, which is sufficiently correct: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour [an idiomatic expression meaning "worth while"], yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better; nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

Greek could contradict. For the words translated, "calling upon and saying," are in the singular number, and could not possibly apply to the Jews, or to any but Stephen himself.

Z. Campbell ("Age of Gospel Light," p. 44) concurs with this: "Now, it seems it was the same *they* that *ran upon him*, and calling upon God. . . . But it may be asked, why the Jews should say, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit? Only by mocking the confidence of Stephen in the Saviour."

In the 6th ed. of Ellis and Read's book, just referred to ("Bible vs. Tradition," p. 99), they give another version of the passage equally remarkable for learning: speaking of the word translated "receive," they say, "Dexai means the *right*, cheir, hand, being understood; metaphorically it means assistance, aid, strength, courage, and is equal to the expression, Lord Jesus, strengthen my spirit, or nerve me up to endurance." Here a common Greek word, δεξαι, rightly translated *receive* (a verb), is mistaken for the *adjective* δεξια, dexia, "right (hand)."

Whether the wickedness surpasses the folly of this, or the folly the wickedness, I leave others to decide. But these are Annihilationist leaders.

The passage is simple enough, and needs little explanation. But for the sake of distinctly reviewing the objections made I shall divide it into its parts, and look at each separately.

(1) In the first place, to the apostle, the object of his life was Christ, and to die was gain. This is the plain meaning. Nevertheless it is denied. "Do you ask," say Ellis and Read, "how then it would be gain to Paul to die? Paul does not say it would be gain to him. Fill up the ellipsis according to grammatical laws: 'For me to live will be gain to the cause of Christ, for Christ will at all events be magnified in my body, whether by my life or by my death. And for me to die is gain to the cause of Christ, for Christ will be magnified in my body whether I die or live.' If you insist that it would be gain to Paul to die, we reply, *He does not say so*, and if it would be gain to him personally, *then* he would not be in perplexity which to choose." ("Bible vs. Tradition," p. 139, 140.) Mr. Hudson speaks similarly, though more cautiously. So Dr. Field.

But the interpretation is not admissible. For the *εμοι γαρ* (for to me) standing at the commencement of the sentence is plainly related to both clauses of it, "to me to live is Christ, and (to me) to die is gain." Nor does he say, to me to live is gain to the cause of Christ, at all, but to me to live is Christ, *i.e.*, as the object of it; it is no question of gain to Christ's cause. And when he comes to speak of death being gain, he never says "to the cause of Christ" at all, but "(to me) to die is gain." I need not comment upon the remark that if "it would be gain to him personally he would not be in perplexity which to choose." Of that people must

judge for themselves, and of the knowledge of Christian spirit which it shows. The apostle goes on to say:—

(2) “Yet what I shall choose I wot not; for I am in a strait betwixt two.”

Is it not plain that it was *in spite of* death being gain to him, that he was in a strait betwixt choosing death or life; *not* because as Ellis and Read say, “they were equally indifferent to, him”—that would be a strange way of being in a *strait*, betwixt two equally indifferent things—but because it was a question of choosing his own interests or that of the saints, as he goes on to tell us. But the authors quoted have another version of it. “But there was a *third* thing that Paul possessed an earnest desire for; but this third thing was obviously not either of the former two indifferent ones, and therefore must be something distinct from dying and going immediately to Christ; for dying or death was one of the things that he did not deem so greatly preferable to life as to decide his choice. But again this third thing was “far better.” Better than what? Better than life, better than death; therefore *death could not be the thing desired.*

This is wonderful reasoning certainly. The apostle says, “I am in a strait betwixt two;” “that means,” say these writers, “they were equally indifferent to him!” “I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart,” says the apostle. “Which is a *third* thing,” say Messrs. Ellis and Read, “as he was indifferent to the former two!” Nevertheless I am persuaded any candid mind will think that the apostle is only revealing the cause of his perplexity between the two, when he says, “having a desire to depart and be with Christ,

which is far better; *nevertheless*—here is the perplexity—“to abide in the flesh is *more needful for you.*” So that although death would be his gain, and he knew it, the strait was between *his own* gain and other people’s gain. And he was *not* indifferent to *either*, but desiring this and desiring that, and did not know which to choose.

There was no third thing at all. His having a desire to depart and be with Christ was just his strait on the one side, and his abiding in the flesh being more needful for them, was just his difficulty on the other. And thus “departing and being with Christ” is fixed to mean his *dying*; just as his “abiding in the flesh” is fixed to mean his *living*.

(3) But here a great tumult is raised, and great knowlege of Greek is endeavoured to be shewn in letting us know that *τὸ ἀναλῦσαι* does not mean “to *depart*” at all. So Mr. Hudson, Roberts, Ellis, and Read, who would all have it “having a desire for the RETURNING and being with Christ,” supposing it to refer to Christ’s returning. The latter writers go on even to suppose that it was better for the Philippians that Christ should not come, and that so Paul should abide in the flesh. However it is at least a little unfortunate for their theory that the substantive, *ἀνάλυσις*, derived from this verb *ἀναλύω*, is used by Paul in 2 Tim. iv. 6, undoubtedly for his death; “I am now ready to be offered, and the time of *my* DEPARTURE is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course,” &c. If it be departure there, and death, why cannot it be so, where, as we have seen, the context fixes it down to apply to *death*. And it is true that it sometimes means

“return,” but not so often as depart, so that an Annihilationist alone could tell us why it should be so translated here. The reason being only in the exigencies of a theory, which must bend Scripture to its need, or be convicted of open opposition to it.

I shall not again do more than refer to 2 Cor. v. Its “at home in the body” and “absent from the Lord,—its “absent from the body and present with the Lord”—speak manifestly the same language as that we have just been considering. Those who tell us that in the resurrection-state we shall *not* be “at home in the body,” and that we are “absent from the body” when it has been raised in glory, or changed into the likeness of Christ’s glorious body, may well be left as hopeless of conviction. I pass on to just one more Scripture under this head, which gives us in full reality the thing of which we have been in search,—not in parable, but in historical fact,—a man absent from the body,—a spirit conscious of unutterable things,—a bright if transient gleam from the unseen,—Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration with the Lord.

It is no dream, for eyes, that closed in sleep beheld it not, awakened to behold it. (Luke ix. 32.) “But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were *awake* they saw His glory, and the two men that stood with Him.” This proves also that it was no mere vision, even waking. The thing was there before they beheld it: “Moses and Elias talking with Jesus.” Thus it was a real thing, apart from all spectators. And how simply described, “two *men*, which were Moses and Elias.” One of these, a man caught up in glory centuries before, and one

still longer "*departed*," and his body buried, yet still a "man," and not extinct, nor yet asleep, but in activity of thought, and of enjoyment. Not raised from the dead either, as some would have it, because Jesus was *Himself* (for it is no question of simple restoration to earthly life, as with Lazarus) the "first fruits," and the "first begotten of the dead." Apart from the body therefore he was, yet associate with one who had never passed through death, and though not in the likeness yet of Christ's glorious body, yet appearing "in glory" (*ἐν δόξῃ*), let men make of it what they will; entering moreover into the "bright cloud" (as Peter calls it afterwards, "the excellent glory"), the Shechinah of the Divine Presence.*

I confess I do not understand how it can be plainer that we are here permitted to gaze upon one departed, and to realize as far as we can how a departed "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" still "live unto Him," who, as the Lord tells us, "is not the God of the dead but of the living." We thus see how "to *Him*" they live, who to *men* are dead. We learn to distinguish between the language of sense and the language of faith. We learn how really there is a departing and being with Christ which is, compared with life on earth, "far better." No argument that Annihilationists can bring against this passage will avail for a moment. Their arguments have in fact been already disposed of, as they either suppose on the one hand that Moses was raised from the dead, which Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 23,

* "They (the disciples) feared, as those (*ἐκείνους*)"—Moses and Elias—"entered into the cloud."

and Rev. i. 5 confute, or that it was a mere "vision" or "appearance," which the passage itself confutes. I may leave here then, the question (though there be many other texts) of the consciousness of the separate state, with the full conviction of its complete, manifest, and divine answer.

CHAPTER III.

HADES AND PARADISE.

I TOUCH briefly now upon a point which is only a secondary one, but which will help to give completeness to this sketch of the Scripture doctrine of the soul's immortality. The word "hades" (*hell*, Auth. Version) is found, as we have already seen, in the story of Lazarus and the rich man. The word "Paradise" is found in the Lord's reply to the dying thief, and in 2 Cor. xii., where Paul tells us he knew a man in Christ caught up into *Paradise*.

The Annihilationist interpretation of these words is pretty uniform. Hades, they say, is the grave. Paradise, the place of blessing on the restored earth; therefore, of course, not in relation to any intermediate state, nor existing for a man to be caught up into.

But the Scripture use of both words is awkward for their theory. It is awkward to have to read: "In the grave he lifted up his eyes, being in *torment*." Even in a parable such a statement does not read well,* nor like the usual pictures of the grave which these writers themselves give us. They confess, moreover, that the Pharisaic idea of hades was not its being the grave, as

* Storrs, Z. Campbell, and Ham translate *ἐταφῆν. καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾄδῳ* by "was buried in hell." This is their learning: a small thing, if it were not for the pretence of it used to mislead the unwary.

some even bring Josephus' elaborate dissertation forward to shew. And yet they quote the word as meaning "the grave" in a parable which they allow gives Pharisaic sentiments, as Luke xvi. does! Is there not here a consciousness of facts being against them?

The word *hades* (ᾍδης) is only one of two words translated "hell" in our version, the other of which will come up for future enquiry. It applies, undoubtedly, in ordinary Greek, to the region of departed spirits, but got naturally thence to be applied loosely to death and the grave. It was never the distinct proper word for either. The Pharisaic use of the word was quite the Greek. All its occurrences in the New Testament are the following eleven:—

Matt. xi. 23.—"Thou, Capernaum, shalt be brought down to *hell*."

xvi. 19.—"The gates of *hell* shall not prevail against it."

Luke x. 15.—"Thou, Capernaum, shalt be thrust down to *hell*."

xvi. 23.—"And in *hell* he lifted up his eyes."

Acts ii. 27.—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell*."

31.—"That his soul was not left in *hell*."

1 Cor. xv. 55.—"O *grave*, where is thy victory?"

Rev. i. 18.—"And have the keys of *hell* and of death."

vi. 8.—"Was Death, and *Hell* followed."

xx. 13.—"Death and *hell* delivered up the dead."

14.—"Death and *hell* were cast into the lake of fire."

Now we recognize the fact that a word in Scripture usage may, from the necessity of the case, differ in meaning from that simply classical. But which of these passages will the writers in question take up to prove their position from in this case? The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 55 may at least as well be rendered "hell"

as "grave." No other passage needs such rendering. The one in Acts ii. 31 distinctly points out hades as the abode of Christ's *soul*, in contradistinction to his "flesh" not seeing corruption. The passages in Matt. xi. 23 and Luke x. 15 are figurative, but just as well "hell" as "grave." The passage in Luke xvi. 23 is almost confessedly against them. Those in Revelation xx. we shall by and by consider more closely, but cannot, with any show of reason, be urged as meaning necessarily "the grave." Thus, the only *positive* teaching of these passages is all against them, along with the allowed classic and Pharisaic use.

Next, briefly, as to Paradise. The greatest importance of the word in this connection is from our Lord's use of it in His reply to the dying thief. They contend* that we should read His words: "Verily I say

* Others, however, translate *σήμερον* "in *that day*," which it never means. Dr. Thomas' reading is perhaps the strangest, and I give it as a proof of the perplexity into which writers of this class are thrown by the passage. "'To-day' is a Scripture term, and must be explained by the Scripture use of it. In the sacred writings, then, the term is used to express a period of over 2000 years. This use of it occurs in David, as it is written, 'To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, lest ye enter not into my rest.' The apostle, commenting on this passage about 1000 years after it was written, says, 'exhort one another while it is called to-day' . . . Thus, it was called to-day when David wrote, and to-day when Paul commented upon it . . . This to-day is, however, limited, both to Jew and Gentile; and in defining this limitation, Paul tells us, that to-day means 'after so long a time' . . . If then we substitute the apostle's definition for the word 'to-day' in Christ's reply to the thief, it will read thus: 'Verily I say to thee, *after so long a time* thou shalt be with me in Paradise.'" ("Elpis Israel," pp. 54, 55.)

But he is evidently afraid that will not answer, and so he is careful

unto thee *to-day*: thou shalt be with me in paradise." That is, to-day, in spite of my apparent humiliation, I say to thee. But the order of the words in the sentence is all against them. *Σήμερον*, if it were emphatic, would rather precede the verb. As, compare in the Greek, Matt. xvi. 3, Mark xiv. 30, Luke xix. 5, 9, Acts xiii. 33, Heb. iii. 7, 15. But beside this, the Lord is answering a prayer in which a time in which the thief sought to be remembered was expressed. He had said, "Remember me *when* thou comest in thy kingdom." The Lord says, "To-day, I will." This is the simple intelligible reason for the specification of time, "To-day," not when I come, "shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

But just there we are met with this assertion that Paradise is in the renewed earth, and therefore not yet in existence, which of course would dispose of the passage effectually as far as applies to any teaching concerning an intermediate state. I shall therefore briefly state what Scripture furnishes about it.

"Paradise" is an Eastern word for a "park" or "pleasure grounds." The Hebrew פֶּרְדֵּי is only used, Neh. ii. 8; Eccles. ii. 5; Sol. Song iv. 13. It is there translated once "forest," twice "orchard." It is not used

to give other interpretations of the passage, even though contradictory of this. He urges too, what is common with all this class of writers, that *after* this, and when risen from the dead, the Lord says, He had not yet *ascended* to the Father. They fail to see that the Lord is in this case speaking as the Risen One, and that His ascension, as such, when He had conquered death, was altogether a different thing from the mere departure of His human spirit, which He had commended to that Father on the cross.

for the garden of Eden in Hebrew, but the ordinary word (גן) for "garden." The Septuagint translation, however, gives here *παράδεισος* (paradise), which is uniformly the word it uses for the "garden of Eden," or "of God," except in one place where the usual word for garden (*κήπος*) is used. From the Septuagint use of the word, the New Testament use is doubtless derived. It does not follow, however, that it will have exactly the same application. Rather the earthly paradise is taken as a type of another. It is used but three times:—

Luke xxiii. 43.—"To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

2 Cor. xii. 4.—"How he was caught up into Paradise."

Rev. ii. 7.—"—— in the midst of the Paradise of God."

In the last of these passages the mention of the tree of life connects itself plainly with the after account of the heavenly Jerusalem, which is therefore, at least, not earth renewed, however connected with it it may be. The second passage plainly speaks of it as existing, for Paul was caught up into it, and whether in the body or out of it he could not tell, even at the time he wrote. Manifestly, if he supposed he *could* be caught up *bodily* into it, he supposed it to be an existing place, and the plea that it was a "vision" will not answer. The "visions" doubtless refer to what he saw there.

CHAPTER IV.

OBJECTIONS FROM OLD TESTAMENT TEACHINGS.

I NOW proceed to consider the objections which are made to the views I have expressed, grounded upon the supposed plain teaching of many passages of Scripture. It is a point worthy of attention, however, at the outset, that these passages are, with few and slight exceptions, all found in the Old Testament, and especially in three books which lie near together in the middle of it (united really I doubt not in many respects), Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes.

To shew this I mention from Mr. Roberts' book all the passages upon which he relies to maintain his views of death and the intermediate state. From pp. 40—50 of his "Twelve Lectures" (4th edit.) I find thus quoted: Job xxxiii. 22—28; Ps. xxx. 3; xxii. 29; lxxxix. 48; lxxviii. 50; Ezek. xviii. 4; Jas. iv. 14; Ps. cxliv. 3, 4; ciii. 14, 16; Gen. ii. 7; iii. 19; xviii. 27; Rom. vii. 18; Jas. i. 10; Job xiv. 12; Eccles. iii. 18—20; Gen. xxv. 8; xxxv. 29; xlix. 33; l. 26; Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6; Josh. xxiv. 29; 1 Sam. xxv. 1; 1 Kings ii. 1, 2, 10; Acts ii. 29, 34; 1 Kings xi. 43; Heb. xi. 13; John vi. 11, 14; 1 Thess. iv. 13; Eccles. ix. 10; Job. iii. 13—19; x. 18; Ps. lxxxviii. 5, 10, 12; cxv. 17; xxxix. 5, 12, 13; cxlvi. 2; Eccles. ix. 5, 6; Ps. cxlvi. 3, 4; vi. 5; Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19.

He then proceeds to cite the passages commonly urged against his views, as follows, Luke xxiii. 14; xvi. 19—31; Acts vii. 59; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; Matt. xvii. 3; xxii. 32; xviii. 10; Prov. xii. 28; Matt. x. 28.

Thus for *his own* views, out of over 50 passages produced, 9 belong to the New Testament, and 47 to the Old. While out of the passages which might be adduced as *against* his views (though scanty in number), *nine* out of the *ten* are from the New Testament.

But the disproportion is even greater than this, when the real value of the passages quoted to the writer is kept in view. Thus even Mr. Roberts can make but little of Jas. i. 9, 10: "As the flower of the grass he shall pass away;" or of ch. iv. 14: "What is your life? it is even a vapour." The other passages are that in Paul (*i.e., in his flesh*) dwelt no good thing; as to David, that he was dead and buried and not ascended into the heavens; that Abraham and others died in faith, not having received the promises; that Lazarus was sleeping, or in plain language, *dead*; and finally, that those that sleep in Jesus God will bring with Him.

Really does it not seem as if it were a question between the Old Testament and the New?

It is *not* that; but I point Mr. Roberts' attention, and that of his companions in the doctrine that he advocates, to a tale that these quotations tell, the moral of which will be found in 2 Tim. i. 10; where we find that Christ "has abolished death, and brought life and incorruption (not immortality) to light *by the GOSPEL.*"

That means that our poor Annihilationists are groping for light in the midst of the shadows of a dis-

pensation of comparative darkness. Another passage furnishes us with a further point about that old economy they need to know: that by the hanging of the veil before the holy places, "the Holy Ghost this signified, that the way into the holiest was *not yet manifested*, while the first tabernacle was yet standing." (Heb. ix. 8.) Which simply means, inasmuch as the holy place was a figure of heaven (verse 24), that that dispensation dealt with earthly and not heavenly promises. Outside the present scene there was little light, heaven not opened, death a deep, dark "shadow," well nigh impenetrable, resurrection and restoration to a scene of earthly blessedness the tangible, plain thing. This is the truth as to the Old Testament, though scattered hints there were of other things. Enoch had of old gone to God, and not seen death. Elijah in a later day had followed him. A little gleam of light had broken in there. But still that was not the revelation of the heavenly places and a portion there for those who believed. Nor was death abolished, or life and incorruption brought to light.

Still they were not Annihilationists, as Phariseeism, which the people followed, shews. Something they did know; and, with all their darkness, were wiser than those that have now turned from the light which has come, back into it.

This even *necromancy* witnessed. Heathenish as of course it was, yet does Scripture recognize it as a real thing; and we have an example in the bringing up of Samuel too plain for any cavils of questioners to set aside.

True indeed, the departed spirit of a saint was not

at the mercy of a witch to summon into presence. And the appearance of the prophet threw the woman herself into astonishment; but so God permitted Saul to get his answer of doom. The language of the historian is plain to one who believes in the inspiration of Scripture, that "the woman saw Samuel," and that Samuel spoke to Saul. I only dwell upon this to shew that all was *not* dark, even here, as to immortality. People may talk if they will of resurrection, but there is none, and no instance of a man raised from the dead to answer the purpose of a few moments, anywhere in Scripture.

Without further preface I turn to the passages which adduce as decisive of the point we are upon, that the dead are non-existent or at least unconscious till the resurrection.

We naturally begin with Genesis, but here the passages produced have been already examined, save xviii. 27; xxv. 8; xxxv. 29; xlix. 33; l. 26. The reader may refer to these (except the first) for himself, as they are the mere chronicle of the deaths of the patriarchs, "sober and literal," as we quite believe, and with "no heaven-going rhapsody," as Mr. Roberts tells us. The reason for this I have already given. Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6, Josh. xxiv. 29, 1 Sam. xxv. 1, 1 Kings ii. 1, 2, 10, and xi. 43, all come under the same category. Gen. xviii. 27, in which Abraham's lowly expression, "I am but dust and ashes," is taken to mean literally the lowest materialism, I may also perhaps leave to speak for itself. Especially when Mr. Roberts joins with it Paul's "in me, that is in my flesh," as equally implying that Paul was, in the same way with Abraham, nothing *but* flesh. Into the doctrine of the "flesh" or old

nature, as it is here, I cannot and need not go. I have already said all that is needful.

Outside of Job and its kindred books two passages remain. One is Ezek. xviii. 4, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Here the "soul" is put, as I have elsewhere noticed, for the personality of the man. The soul that *sins* shall die. Not a son for a father's sins or a father for a son's, but every one for his own. All through the Old Testament "my soul" is equivalent often to "myself." And it is simple enough how it became so. While this does not prejudice the proper force and use of the word, which has been already insisted on. The other uses are all secondary to and founded on the one of which I have at large spoken.

The other passage is Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19. It introduces us to that class of texts to which belong the quotations from Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes, and I shall therefore look at it with these.

These three books belong to a portion of the Old Testament very distinct in its character from the rest. While the historical books are (as a whole) the language of the divine historian, and the books of the prophets are even still more directly the words of Jehovah Himself, addressed through the prophet to the people, that section of Scripture which includes the five books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon, is eminently *man's* voice. Of course I do not mean that they are the less fully inspired on that account. Every word, I doubt not, is penned for us by the Holy Ghost Himself, so that we have nothing but what is profitable and needed. Still if we find, as in Job for instance we do find, even Satan speaking, we

do not any the more adopt *his* sayings as the expression of divine truth. We do not say "it is written" of Job, that if God put forth His hand, and touch all that he hath, he will curse Him to His face. That was what Satan said, although it *is* written. So, in like manner, when the Lord says to Job's friends, "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, like my servant Job," it is plain we cannot adopt *their* sayings as divine truth either. And when we come to Job's own sayings, spite of the commendation so far expressed, we find that *he* too, in his words, had "justified himself rather than God" (ch. xxxii. 2). So that neither can we adopt without discrimination *his* words either.

I have noticed elsewhere something equivalent as to the book of Ecclesiastes, where we have the experience of a man who had ransacked the world in vain for happiness, and the things he "said in his heart" while he was pursuing that vain and weary course. Would it yet be believed that this man's "sayings," because written down for our instruction in the Word of God, have been taken by Annihilationists as the utterances of divine truth, to settle it that "a man hath no preeminence above a beast"? Surely they might as well quote the fool's saying as an inspired utterance, that "there is no God."

The same cannot be said, indeed, as to the Psalms. They are much more prophetic in character, indeed fully so. Still they have the same peculiarity with the others as being the thoughts and utterances of man himself, *not direct revelations from God*. Thus David muses upon his own sufferings until his thoughts find vent in words, which, under the guidance of the Holy

Ghost, become full of a deeper meaning than David was himself conscious of—prophetic utterances of another, more than royal, sufferer. But that is very different from direct revelation. It leaves the utterer to speak of things as from his own point of view he sees them, even while giving them this deeper significance.

All the weight of what Job says is found in the following expressions: that had he died from the womb, he would then have been lying still and quiet, he would have slept and been at rest, as an hidden untimely birth, there where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest (ch. iii.); that he would have been as though he had not been, in a land of darkness and the shadow of death (ch. x.); and that in death man lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep (ch. xiv.).

Now, as I have said, I am not concerned to prove the harmony of all Job's utterances with the actual revelations of Scripture as to the intermediate state. He might have been mistaken, and that in no way touch the question before us, or the perfect inspiration of the inspired record in which his words are found. They are given as Job's words: that is all. Still, as the words of a saint of those old days, they contain no doubt the assurance of the dimness and uncertainty which then prevailed. But the words cannot fairly be pressed even thus far into the service of Annihilationism. Take the strongest expression, "I should have been as though I had not been," with relation to the world and its sorrows, of which he was speaking, it was simple truth. So as to oppression: "there the servant is free

from his master." He might have died under the lash, as many a slave has; but dying, death set him free. "There the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary are at rest."

But, you say, although that may be as regards earthly troubles, yet if there were misery of another kind awaiting man after death, could he talk so complacently of "the weary being at rest"?

Well, but to all that made Job weary, the grave would be rest. And for aught else, Job was a saint of God after all, and had confidence in God. He was not meditating upon the portion of the wicked, but what his own would be; and though in death a "land of darkness" stretched before him, into which his eye could little penetrate, he had something of the Psalmist's confidence in One who would be with him there. The sorrows of the wicked are not at all before him, but for himself the end of all present sorrows.

Moreover, ch. x. 21 and xvi. 22 prove positively that it is in this track that Job's thoughts are running. If otherwise, then when he says that in dying "he goes whence he shall not return," he simply denies all resurrection. But he is thinking of a return to the scene before him. It is not an abstract statement, but one very simple in view of that scene of mingled joy and sorrow, in the midst of which then he was. And so Scripture very often speaks. Enoch "*was not.*" Is that extinction? No, "he was translated, that he should not *see* death." As to the world "*he was not,*" but as to God he *was*, for "God took him." Just as with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who really died. To men they died; to God they lived: "for He is not the

God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto Him." (Luke xx. 38.) People say, I know, that that means "in the purpose of God;" but then, if they had ceased to be, He could NOT be God to them, the relationship between God and His creature must end with the *being* of that creature. That is simply and evidently the Lord's meaning. If to *Him* they are dead, they are no longer His creatures, nor He their God. The relationship is broken.

Job's words, then, are no contradiction of what we have seen elsewhere to be the revealed truth as to those departed. To weariness such as his, a place of "rest" the grave indeed was; as to all earth's sorrows, had he died from the womb, he would have been as though he had not been.

There is but one other passage in the book of Job which we need now consider, and that is found in the words of Elihu, chap. xxxiii. 22—28. It has been adduced by Mr. Roberts as an example of the soul being spoken of as "going into the grave," and reads in our common version "his soul draweth near to the grave." I think it, therefore, well to examine it here.

Now I have before observed that "soul" is used in many ways, derived from its first signification. As the soul of man is the animating principle of the body, the seat of emotions, &c., in short, man's "*sensible self*," if I may so say, it is used very often as the vivid representation of a man's own personality. In this way you find the expressions which materialists naturally catch at, "my soul shall live," "the soul that sinneth it shall die." As we have seen, such passages as "they which kill the body are not able to kill the soul,"

guard us from any mistake that this might lead to, and establish the doctrine of the soul's real immortality. To meet this they can only explain "soul" to be the "future life" or "eternal life," which it never once means, but to which another word altogether (*ζωή*) is appropriated. Moreover, man's spirit is *never* said in any sense to die, a fact which they have to admit, and can only attempt to answer by asserting that neither does it live, it is "neither mortal nor immortal," as Ellis and Read say. This we have already examined. But thus, did Elihu really say "his soul draweth near the grave," it would prove little to the point. After all, although it die not, the soul it is that really feels the power and sting of death, and if it were represented as drawing "near the grave," it would be but vivid picturing of that mental condition which Elihu's words are intended to set forth.

But the fact is this. The word used here for "grave" is one which is never elsewhere used for it in our English version. Translated (vers. 24, 28, 30) as "the pit," and in ch. ix. 31 "the ditch" (where it cannot refer to the grave at all), its simple and literal meaning, as often rendered, is "*corruption*." This *may* be corruption of the body in the grave, as in Ps. xvi. 10, but it may be also, as undeniably in ch. ix. 31, the state of moral and hopeless ruin quite apart from physical decay.

Now, in the passage before us, the discipline of a soul under God's hand is quite evidently the subject. As in Ps. xxxii., his bones may wax old through his roaring, and as "his soul," on the one hand, "draws near corruption," so, on the other, may "his life draw near to the destroyers." But if physical death be before him, it is not merely as such, but as such under the terrors of the

Lord. The one is seen connected with the other, and the expressions are not equivalent though connected.

I turn now to Ecclesiastes. As far as what Annihilationists urge from it is concerned, it has been already virtually and, except one passage, actually answered. That one passage is found, ch. ix. 5, 6: "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; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun." Further on (verse 10) in continuation: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest."

Now this is a very plain example of that way of speaking, looking at things from a mere human standpoint, which I have before remarked upon. The writer's point of view is most evident. Nor was he capable, at the time he had these thoughts, of any other. As to the dead actually, *he* "knew not anything," for he knew not whether the spirit of man went upward or not. This we have seen. He was not therefore capable of looking at anything save from his stand-point in the world. Otherwise clearly he could not have said, "Neither have they any more a reward." That would deny all resurrection and life to come, if taken absolutely. But he was looking at the scene around, out of which men departed, and left no sign behind to indicate that they had been; their memory was forgotten, their love, hatred, envy, once so conspicuous, had vanished; and, *in relation to that scene*,

they knew nothing, their wisdom and knowledge had departed too: no part had they any more in what was done under the sun. Therefore the moral was, Be busy now; work ceases in the grave; wisdom for this busy scene, there is none there: no heart that deviseth; no planning head.

All true in its way. But this was man's musing, not divine revelation of the state of the dead at all, nor given as such. Had you asked this man what he knew of that, he would have said, as he *did* say, Who knows? "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward?" He saw the dust laid in the tomb, and that was all he commented upon. The rest was conjecture, nothing more.

But that was only part of the preacher's utterances, the musing of his heart, vainly given "to search out by *wisdom* concerning all things that are done under heaven" (ch. i. 13). But the time came when he had to own his inability to do so. To quote once more his lowly confession (ch. xi. 5): "As thou knowest not what is the *way of the spirit*, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all."

Simple, but most important confession! on the *dark* side of which all the passages are found on which Annihilationists rely; while on the other one pregnant sentence at least is read, which, to do justice to the Old Testament preacher, we should look at a little closer than we have done:—

"Then"—in death—"shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return to God that gave it" (ch. xii. 7).

As we have seen, men seek to explain the "spirit"

here to be merely "the breath," as they do that which the Lord upon the cross commended to His Father, and Stephen to the Lord Himself. Few simple minds, however, will accept that conclusion. They will scarcely see the sense of the return of man's *breath* to God, whereas if it be his spirit indeed, such a statement becomes of the greatest possible importance. Moreover, the words are so exactly the answer to that former question, which (as we have seen) themselves insist upon so much, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward?" that few there are who will not accept it as the answer. Having come to the end of *human* wisdom in the matter, he is able to know "the way of the spirit." It returns to God who gave it. And thus there is complete harmony with that "conclusion of the whole matter" which the closing verses invite us to "hear." That conclusion is: "Fear God and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For *God shall bring every work into judgment*, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

Now, if *that* be the conclusion of the whole matter that he has been speaking of, does it look as if the matter from which he drew the conclusion ended with the blank and silence of the grave? Rather does it not conclusively shew that that return of the dust to the earth "as it was," is intended to be put in contrast with the return—*not* "as it was," but with the character acquired in its "earthly tabernacle"—to the God who gave it?

I now pass on to consider the testimony of the Psalms. Some passages quoted by Mr. Roberts I may be con-

tent with quoting. That "man is like to vanity; his days as a shadow that passeth away" (Ps. cxliv.), and that "as for man, his days are as grass" (Ps. ciii.); statements like these, which depict the brevity of man's life on earth, are not quite new or unknown to believers in the soul's immortality. And that it is a solemn and unnatural thing for God's creatures to be thus "subject to vanity," quite irrespective of what comes after death, is a thing for such as Mr. R. to consider. *He* thinks that, if man's existence be for ever, such words as these lose force. But it is far from being really so. For the point is the wreck and ruin of the first creation by death coming in at all. This is what gives solemnity to the brevity of his earthly history.

The other passages are mostly of similar character to those we have already looked at. That is, they look at man as connected with the world through which he passes. Thus, "while I live will I praise the Lord; I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being" (Ps. cxlvi.); "before I go hence and be no more" (Ps. xxxix.), are expressions no stronger than we have seen to be used of one who was translated that he should not see death. Enoch "was not," yet even Annihilationism has not yet taught us that he has literally ceased to be. To be consistent, they should do so.

Or again, take Ps. cxlvi. 3, 4: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help; for his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, and in that very day *his thoughts perish.*" Is it not plain here that, so far as the context leads, his "thoughts" that perish are the plans and purposes in which he who was to be benefitted by them had been

made to hope, and which the death of his patron in a moment might frustrate and cut off.

Again, there is a slightly different class of passages, as Ps. vi. 5: "For in death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?" and again (Ps. cxv. 17), "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Or again, that passage in Isaiah (xxxviii. 18, 19): "For the grave cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee, they that go down into the pit cannot hope for Thy truth; the living, the living, he shall praise Thee, as I do this day: the father to the children shall make known Thy truth."

This may take a little deeper looking into: but only because we are so little accustomed to realize the point of view from which the pious Israelite beheld things. That "congregation of the righteous," in which "sinners" should not "stand," which the first Psalm gives us, was what he looked for. A day, as we say, "millennial,"—a scene in which righteousness should reign, and the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, this is what his faith anticipated; what our's does; but his much more exclusively, for his knowledge of heavenly things was very dim. To swell that great Hallelujah chorus, such as the last five Psalms give it to us, and in a scene such as they prophetically anticipate, that were a godly Israelite's ambition. To celebrate His praises now on earth, to train up children for the service of his sanctuary, to go up to that temple where the glory of Jehovah visibly dwelt, this was with the Israelite connected with every thought of Jehovah's praise. You

see it in that last part of Isa. xxxviii. 19 omitted by Mr. Roberts in his quotation of it, "The father to the children shall make known thy truth." Death *would* cut short that declaration, and make those praises cease. Death could not in that sense "celebrate." "Who should give Him thanks in the grave?" Nay, the living, the living alone could do it.

I have now gone through, as I believe, all the objections urged from Scriptures of the Old Testament. And while it is true, light and incorruption are not brought to light there, a very far from Annihilationist or Materialist doctrine do they teach. Rather do they prepare us for the fuller revelation of Christianity, which is so little congenial to writers who love to hide in the shadows of that old dispensation, from its mid-day light. In vain. He, whom a large part of these men deny, the Holy Ghost, is not the author of confusion or contradiction. With Christ on the Mount of Glory, Moses and Elias become transfigured too, and bear witness to Him who says that "they who kill the body are not able to kill the soul," and those dead to *man live* to Him, who is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

PART III.

THE FINAL ISSUES.

CHAPTER I.

ETERNAL LIFE.

WE are now to look at the final issues of life or death eternal. And here it is we meet the full united phalanx of opposition to the commonly received doctrines. However discordant up to this point their statements may have been, they have here at least the merit of agreement. Says Mr. Morris:—

“The Son of God came to give life, even eternal life; and if it be asked, ‘Who will live for ever?’ the answer of the Lord and Giver of life, who is also ‘the Bread of life,’ is in these words: ‘He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.’ And it is most irreverent and evil in any man to say, that in the vocabulary of the Son of God the word ‘life’ does not mean life; and that the words ‘eternal life’ do not mean eternal life; and that the words ‘shall live for ever’ do not mean shall live for ever. And yet, in their ecclesiastical teaching, certain men are hurried into this kind of irreverence and evil by reason of their having adopted the false doctrine of the innate and essential immortality of ‘the earthly’ race.” (“What is Man?” p. 46.)

At the other end of Annihilationism, the follower of Dr. Thomas, Mr. Roberts of Birmingham, after quoting various passages which speak of eternal life, writes (“Twelve Lectures,” p. 82):—

“Now, if immortality be the natural attribute of every son of Adam from the very moment he breathes, what can be the meaning of testimonies like these, which, one and all, speak of immortality as a future contingency, a thing to be sought for, a reward, a thing to be given, a thing brought to light through the gospel, &c. There is an utter incongruity in such language, if immortality be a natural and present possession. How can you promise a man that which is already his own? The divine promise is, that God will award eternal life to those who *seek for* glory, honour, and immortality; and this is the strongest proof that human nature is utterly destitute of it at present.”

Immortality and eternal life are here confounded. And it does not make it better that Mr. Roberts quotes apparent Scripture to justify the confusion. He may shelter himself under the fact that he is not alone in it.* But that will not make him less responsible for deception, even unwittingly practised.

The true Scriptural statement is this:—

In the New Testament the true word for immortality (*ἀθανασία*) occurs but three times: 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, “this mortal must put on *immortality*;” “when . . . this mortal shall have put on *immortality*;” and once of God it is asserted (1 Tim. vi. 16) that He “only hath *immortality*.”

There is indeed another word (*ἀφθαρσία*) twice translated in our version “immortality,” and that is the word

* Messrs. Dobney, Hastings, Ham, Moncrieff, and Zenas Campbell, all agree with him. No doubt, others also.

Mr. Roberts with others has caught at to make good man's *seeking it*; but its proper meaning is "incorruption," and so mostly translated. I cite all the passages:—

Rom. ii. 7.—"Glory, and honour, and *immortality*."

1 Cor. xv. 42.—"It is raised in *incorruption*."

50.—"Neither doth corruption inherit *incorruption*."

53.—"Must put on *incorruption*."

54.—"Shall have put on *incorruption*."

Eph. vi. 24.—"Love our Lord Jesus Christ in *sincerity*."

2 Tim. i. 10.—"Brought life and *immortality* to light."

Tit. ii. 7.—"Uncorruptness, gravity, *sincerity*."

Its adjective (*ἀφθαρτος*) "incorruptible" is used seven times, and applied to God (Rom. i. 23, 1 Tim. i. 27); the crown of the righteous (1 Cor. ix. 25); the resurrection state (1 Cor. xv. 52); our inheritance (1 Pet. i. 4); the word of God (1 Pet. i. 23); and once figuratively, "that which is not corruptible" (1 Pet. iii. 4). It is only once in our version (1 Tim. i. 27) rendered "immortal," but with no more reason than in other places.

Furthermore its *opposite* (*φθαρτος*) "corruptible" is six times found, and always so rendered: Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25; xv. 53, 54; 1 Pet. i. 18, 23.

The difference between these words, as used in Scripture, comes out in 1 Cor. xv., in which they are all to be found. Speaking of the dead body of the saint (verses 42—50) the apostle uses the words "corruptible" and "corruption." It was not "*mortal*," but *dead*. Then speaking of the resurrection of "those that are Christ's at His coming" (ver. 23), he brings in also the *change* of the *living* saints which would

accompany it: "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed;" "the *dead* shall be raised *incorruptible*, and we (the *living*) shall be *changed*; for this corruptible (applying to the dead saints) must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal (applying to the living) must put on *immortality*."

Thus, there is evident distinction in the use of these words in Scripture; and when it is said (Rom. ii. 7) that God shall render "to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and *incorruption*, eternal life," it is not at all the same as seeking for *immortality*, but the blessed, incorruptible state in which resurrection, or the "change," will put the saints at the coming of Christ. And it applies *only* to the saints, as the description in 1 Cor. xv. 42—50 does. The wicked are not those of whom it is said: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power." Such words are applicable alone to the bloom and beauty of the "resurrection of *life*."

Quite true, that the saints alive but mortal when Christ comes will then get "immortality." The liability and tendency to death will of course in their case be at once removed. But that word is the expression of a different fact to that which is pointed out in the case of those who have died. All will alike of course possess incorruption, putting on alike the image of the heavenly; but the fact noticed as to the living is that they shall not sleep at all, "mortality" at once "swallowed up of life."

For of course "mortality" is our condition down

here. "Immortality is" *not* "our natural and present possession." Immortality is deathlessness, but who among the people Mr. Roberts is opposing asserts that we do not die? It is a poor quibble, that. The *soul* does not die; nor the *spirit*; but man does surely. The question is as to what death is, not whether men are subject to it. Of course with Mr. R. it is "cessation of existence," but then, that is not what we mean by death. *We* mean the dust returning to the earth as it was, while the spirit returns to God who gave it. Under the same word we are in reality speaking of different things.

But, say these writers (quoting 1 Tim. vi. 16), "God *only* hath immortality." What then? Why, it is meant, "The soul can't have it." Let them go a little further, and the result will be apparent. The angels, therefore, cannot either. Does death then reign throughout the ranks of created, sinless beings? That will not of course be contended for; but it is involved necessarily in the argument; and must follow, or the argument be given up. The Scripture sense of the passage is far otherwise, and does indeed involve the angels and all created beings. It is the essential difference between the Creator and all His works, that He alone by Himself subsists. "By Him," on the other hand, "all things subsist." He "upholds all things by the word of His power." Thus we by no means maintain what Mr. Morris calls, and rightly calls, "the false doctrine of the *innate* and *essential* immortality of 'the earthly' race." So far from that we contend that the race is mortal, and that immortality "innate and essential" belongs to no creature, fallen or unfallen. It

is the assurance of this that this passage in Timothy gives. In that sense, as possessing it in Himself, God *alone* hath it, and "in Him we live and move and have our being." "By Him all things subsist."

But this no more proves that the *soul* dies, than that angels die. Dependent, derived immortality it may have equally with them, and, in *that* sense, its immortality *is* affirmed; for they that kill the body are not able to kill the soul.

Nor is immortality represented in Scripture "as a future contingency, a thing to be sought for, a reward, a thing to be given," &c., as Mr. Roberts asserts. "The gift of God is," indeed, "*eternal life*." But then that is not merely immortality nor eternal existence.

One thing that makes this plain is, that "eternal life" is a thing we get here and now, whereas we do *not*, except the Lord come, get *immortality*.

"He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life" (John iii. 36) is definite enough. Put that side by side with *their own* interpretation of "who *only* HATH *immortality*." How do these things agree, if immortality and everlasting life are the same thing?

Thomasism is consistent with itself at least in this point, for it affirms the birth of the Spirit, the commencement of eternal life in man, to take place only in resurrection. ("Twelve Lectures," p. 86.) Such passages as the above, therefore, must be interpreted by them as only meaning that "he that believeth hath everlasting life" reserved for him. But unfortunately for them, there are many yet that will not bend to such an explanation. "Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God" (1 John iii. 2), is in direct contradiction of it.

The Lord's words, moreover (John v. 24), affirm positively, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but IS passed from death unto *life*." Lest any should still demur, the apostle's words (1 John iii. 15), telling us that "no murderer hath eternal life *abiding in him*," assure us that that one who had so "passed from death unto life" (ver. 14) *did* have "eternal life abiding in him." From such plain speaking there is no escape. It not only settles conclusively the question when eternal life begins in us, but no less conclusively that eternal life is, therefore, not, and cannot be, immortality.

For immortality we have *not* got, though life, eternal life, we have. Thus they are different things; and, therefore, so far as we can see thus far, men might have immortality (the wicked might) and not possess eternal life.

Now, let us take some passages that speak of the latter and see if these expressions are in other respects interchangeable ones. As when John speaks of "that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us?" "For," says he, "the *life* was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you, that eternal life" (1 John i. 2). You may say, if you please, immortality was in Christ for us; but then we have not here the idea of immortality at all, but of a pure and holy, yea, a divine *nature*, shewn out in the walk and ways of the Son of God down here. It is a *life*, a *nature*, immortal if you will, but then that is not the point at all. It was a life that was "the light of men" (John i. 4) a

life that in our turn, as receiving it from Him, we are called to manifest, "that the *life* of Jesus might be made manifest in our *mortal* flesh" (2 Cor. iv. 11). (Put immortality in there and see how it would look). A "life" from which we were once "alienated" through the ignorance that was in us (Eph. iv. 18), and which is now characterized in us by the knowledge of the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent (John xvii. 3).

This life it is that, quickened by His grace, we receive in new birth, and the contrariety between it and the tainted Adam-life we had before, witnesses in those who know it how real a thing it is. Immortal, too, no doubt it is, but "manifested in *mortal* flesh," not yet swallowing up mortality although it shall, and those now "the heavenly" "put on the image of the heavenly." That is everlasting life in its full power, and in this way, as a *staté*, we shall yet "enter into" it. Thus it is a possession, and yet a "hope" (Tit i. 2); begun already, but whose full fruition we are yet to know.

. The Scriptures I have quoted abundantly shew that eternal life is another thing from immortality. We possess the one now without the other, for we have eternal life, but are not immortal; and even so on the other hand may there and will there be a class in the future who, with immortality, yet do not possess "eternal life."

CHAPTER II.

DEATH ETERNAL.

THE search we are upon is purely Biblical. Moral arguments, often most untruly called so, are but in general the effort of the poor, proud human intellect to fathom the unfathomable depths of the divine judgments. One thing, alas, we so easily forget, that the heart of man is not only "desperately wicked," but "deceitful" too. Will it be any the more likely to judge righteously, because the cause it judges is its own? itself? The sinner's estimate of sin and its desert! Is that so sure to be right, think you? Is there no self-interest in the way? No pride that forbids to stoop as low as to the truth? Ah, the heart of man! That question of the All-seeing is the judgment of its untrustworthiness: "Who can know it?"

Yet there is One who knows. Can I trust Him? and has He spoken? He has. I can. You might stir my poor human feelings, no doubt, and make me murmur at the judgment He has given. I am quite capable of that. But I look at the Cross, where for man His own Son hung, and I cannot persuade myself I have a more tender heart than He. No. His judgment is *not* an enemy's, nor the impassive estimate of One indifferent. *He has given His Son.* And though His judgments may be a great deep, and I may be little able to follow

out His governmental ways, I have what is better, for *I know Himself*.

Thus you and I, reader, are to listen to His words; not with hearts callous to human suffering, but subject to Him. The deep, dark shadow of the Cross, whereon for us the Son of God hung and died, prepares us for a view of sin and its results deep and dark enough in shadow. But we know the heart we cling to through the gloom; and the sheep, here as ever, know the Shepherd's voice.

Mr. Hastings may now state to us his views and those of his brethren upon the destiny of the wicked. His statements have reference (for what reason he knows best) only to the epistles of Paul, but of course they are considered as accordant with the general tenor of Scripture.

His propositions are:—

Paul “does not in *one place* speak of men as ‘dying and going to hell;’ or of their being consigned to a place of torment previous to the day of judgment.”

“He does not once speak of there being a hell of fire in existence at the present time.”

“He does not mention or make use of the word torment at all in the whole of his epistles.”

“In the whole twenty-five places where he speaks of the punishment of the ungodly, he only used the word *αἰώνιον* (eternal or everlasting) once, 2 Thess. i. 9, and then it is ‘*everlasting* DESTRUCTION.’”

“Not one passage in his writings teaches or *hints* that wicked men shall live or exist for ever under any circumstances whatever.”

“Every passage that relates to the destiny of the

impenitent imports their utter dissolution or extermination. . . . Eight times he speaks of the wicked as destined to *perish*. *Death* is used to express their destiny seven times. Nine times they are spoken of as being *destroyed*, once as *devoured by fire*, and once as *burned*." ("Pauline Theology," pp. 39—42.)

I have quoted this, not as meaning to confine the enquiry to the writings of the Apostle Paul, but as giving very distinctly the views held by the class of writers before us. There is little, if any, difference among them upon these points. A fuller summary as to "The Destiny of the Wicked" is given by the same writer in a small tract with that title, consisting of Scripture texts arranged under the following heads:—

"I.—They shall not live for ever.

"II.—They shall die.

"III.—They shall perish.

"IV.—They shall be cut off.

"V.—They shall be destroyed.

"VI.—They shall be consumed.

"VII.—The agent of punishment shall be fire and brimstone.

"VIII.—They shall be burned up root and branch.

"IX.—Their punishment shall take place, not at death, but at the coming of Christ.

"X.—They shall be as though they had not been."

Now, the first of these positions we have already considered, for the texts quoted under it are those which speak of eternal life, that which with God is really life. Take one as an example: "He that hath the Son hath *life*, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not *life*" (1 John v. 11, 12). Or again, John vi. 53,

“Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have *no life in you*.” How can we account for it except as the effect of the blinding power of the system, that Mr. Hastings does not see that according to the passages he quotes, taken as he would take them, not only the wicked will have no *future* existence, but HAVE NONE NOW? That what his proof-texts shew, if his system is correct.

But what his texts *do* prove is, that eternal life is not merely existence or immortality, and that in the Scripture language one may be (to use Paul’s expression as to the woman that lives in pleasure) *dead while* living. Now, if there be such a *living death* even now, as we are thus assured there is, *why not for eternity?* And if the believer having now (as we have seen) eternal life, yet enters into it (as his general state) hereafter, why may not the unbeliever, dead now, as, alas! he is, and alienated from the life of God, yet go into it, as his final adjudged condition, by the sentence of the Judge in the day of judgment?

And thus, in the consideration of Mr. Hasting’s second head, if we bear with us the remembrance of what death (in the ordinary sense of it) is, and that it never means, or implies, the extinction of being, we find at once that the large number of texts he adduces here are *against*, and not *for*, his view of the extinction of the wicked. No more than the “seed” is extinct when, sown in the ground, it is preparing the harvest—no more than man is extinct when the spirit returns to God that gave it—no more than the unbeliever is extinct, who existing physically yet has, in the pregnant words of the Lord, “*no life in him*”—no more, if I am

to accept the necessary conclusion from such use of words, no more will the wicked become extinct when eternal death becomes their awful portion. There is no extinction anywhere; no escape from God into the blank of nonentity. Alas for him who thinks to do so!

But we are not left even to such argument, conclusive as it may seem. The "second death" is explained in Rev. xx. 14 to be "the lake of fire." According to all the editors of the Greek text, the passage reads, "This is the second death, the lake of fire." "Second *extinction*" it is not, for there has been none before, as we have seen; and moreover, extinction would be rather deliverance *from* the lake of fire, whereas the lake of fire *itself* is the "second death."

I do not, however, for the present propose to consider this more at large, but go on with the series of Mr. Hastings' texts. His third and fifth classes I take together, "destruction" and "perdition" being often but translations of the same word in the original. Various words, however, represent them, both in the Old Testament and in the New. In the latter alone eight different ones have reference to the present subject. These we must glance at briefly.*

The words, nearly everywhere employed, are three, from a common root: ἀπολλυμι, ἀπώλεια, ὄλεθρος.

The first of these is often used in Scripture (as it was by the Greeks themselves) for "taking life." It is so

* All my citations of words throughout may be found by the most unlearned reader in the "Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament," or the "Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament."

used, Matt. ii. 13; xii. 14; xxi. 41; xxii. 7; xxvii. 20, and in many other passages.

It is used for the "marring" of the bottles (Mark ii. 22).

It is used in the sense of "losing" (Luke xv. 4, &c.). The "lost" sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. xv. 24), the "lost" sheep, the "lost" piece of money, the "lost" son of Luke xv., are all examples of the use of the word. Also Matt. x. 6; xviii. 11; Luke xix. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 3.

It is the word translated "perish," Matt. xxvi. 52; Mark iv. 38; Luke xi. 51; xv. 17; Acts v. 37; 2 Peter iii. 6; Jude 11.

It is translated "die" John xviii. 14.

In none of these places does it imply extinction. It is never used for it in any case, though some there might be where the "destruction" of the thing was, if you please, its annihilation. But the cases in which its use comes nearest to where it refers to the final punishment of the wicked are those in which (in a way exactly parallel to the use of "dead" and "death") the word is used to express the *present* condition of the wicked, and where no thought of annihilation can of course come in. Thus "if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are *lost*." That surely is not "annihilated" or "extinct."

The second word (*ἀπώλεια*) is but the substantive form of the verb just looked at. It is used in Scripture for the "waste" of the ointment, Matt. xxvi. 8; Mark xiv. 4; and for "death" in Acts xxv. 16. It was used by the Greeks in the sense of "destruction, loss, ruin," and is often applied to the "perdition" (or "ruin") of

the wicked, but never in terms which imply annihilation.

The word *δλεθρος* is but four times used; three times applied to the destruction of the ungodly. Its meanings are ("Liddell and Scott," sub voce) "*ruin, destruction, death.*"

Another three words, similarly united together, are *φθείρω, φθορά, καταφθείρω.*

The meaning of the first is "to corrupt, spoil, ruin;" of the second similarly, "corruption, decay; destruction, loss, ruin, perdition;" the third is an emphatic form of the first, given in Liddell and Scott as meaning "to destroy, bring to nothing;" in Epicharmus, *καταφθαρείς*, "*in sorry plight.*"

In the New Testament, the first and second are uniformly translated "corrupt," and "corruption," except 1 Cor. iii. 17: where we find "defile" and "destroy," and 2 Pet. ii. 12, "made to be taken and destroyed." The third is only found, 2 Tim. iii. 8: "men of *corrupt* minds;" and 2 Pet. ii. 12: "shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption."

There are but two more words left: *καταργέω*, to make void, of no effect, nullify. It is translated, 1 Cor. vi. 13, xv. 26, 2 Thess. ii. 8, Heb. ii. 14, *destroy*; in 1 Cor. ii. 6, *come to nought*; 2 Tim. i. 10, *abolished*; and lastly, once, *ἀφανίζω*, translated "perish" (Acts xiii. 41), literally, "disappear, vanish from sight."

Not one of these words means or implies annihilation, any more than our English words "destroy," "perish," &c., by which the translators of our common version so freely render them. It is *certain* that to *them* the words they used did not mean, and were not *meant* to

mean "annihilation." It is *certain*, also, that the Greeks (who at least ought to know their own language) used all these words often where annihilation could not be intended; and especially those most frequently found in New Testament usage, which they often applied to death, though, by the confession of the men whose views we are considering, holding the "pagan fable" of the immortality of the soul.

Now if this be so, why may not we use these same terms and hold it too? I only say, as far as the mere use of the words proves anything. Of course if the context of any of these passages can be brought to shew that the doom of the wicked is extinction, that is another thing. The words "destroy, &c.," and the Greek words they translate, do not of themselves prove it, that is all.

But that is just what they maintain. They tell us, in short, we do not know the meaning of words we are using every day; that the translators of our Bible did not, and thus they have unintentionally used Annihilationist language throughout, and never made the discovery of what they had done. Nor did any others, till Annihilationism.

Says Mr. Jacob Blain: "If destroy is sometimes applied to calamities on earth, it still means the *ending* of a thing, as of prosperity, liberty, country, character, &c.; so to say it does not mean the ending of the thing to which it refers is *false*" ("Death not Life," p. 21).

It is thus a question of English, which, it seems, we do not understand. Our translator used, however, both destroy and perish, in this way, for ruin where the

thing ruined remained in ruins and did *not* come to an end. As—

“ Knowest thou not yet that Egypt is *destroyed* ? ”

“ The land *perisheth* . ”

“ The valley also shall *perish* . ”

“ O Israel, thou hast *destroyed* thyself . ”

Beside the constant application to death, which is not a person's coming to an end, nor thought so by those who used this language. They used it often to denote a ruin hopeless and helpless save to God ; hopeless and helpless, indeed, if it were by His sentence. *That* is the final destruction of the wicked. It is called so because there is no hope, no help.

As I am only concerned just now with the use of the words in question, and as Mr. Hastings depends mainly if not entirely here upon what he considers the simple force of the words “ destroy,” &c., I pass on at once to his fourth class of texts. Their force is supposed to be in the use of the word “ cut off . ” All that he quotes in this way is from the Old Testament, and refers, as the quotations themselves prove, to the extirpation of the wicked *out of the earth* simply, without intimating their after condition. Thus Ps. xxxvii., speaking of millennial days : “ for evil doers shall be cut off ; but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth . ” Again, Nahum (i. 15) : “ O Judah, . . . the wicked shall no more *pass through thee* : he is utterly cut off . ” Or again, Prov. ii. 22 : “ But the wicked shall be cut off *from the earth*, and the transgressors shall be rooted *out of it* . ”

That I believe most firmly, but the cause of annihila-

tion must be weak indeed, if it looks for support to passages like these.

The same remarks apply to his sixth class, founded on the use of the word "consume." Take Zeph. i. 1, 2, for example: "I will utterly consume all things *from off the land*, saith the Lord. I will consume man and beast; I will consume the fowls of heaven, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumbling-blocks with the wicked, and I will cut off man *from off the land*, saith the Lord." So Ps. civ. 35: "Let the sinners be consumed *out of the earth*, and let the wicked be no more." These are some of Mr. Hastings' own texts adduced for the annihilation of the wicked! Again I say, the cause must be weak that needs such arguments.

I leave Mr. Hastings' next three heads for after consideration. To the tenth again the same remarks apply. It is all the earthly judgment which precedes millennial blessing. And upon the principle of interpretation which must be adoped in order to make texts such as these apply to the final extinction of the wicked, I could not only prove that Enoch was annihilated, because he "*was not*," but could find the doctrine of annihilation in most books that were ever written. According to Mr. H., if I but find Israel assured, that "they that war against thee shall be as NOTHING and as a THING OF NOUGHT," or that "they shall diligently consider his place, and it SHALL NOT BE," I am entitled to put these expressions in small capitals, and consider them conclusive proof that the wicked are annihilated! Once more I ask, what can I think of arguments such as these, or of the cause that needs them?

Nor must it be thought that when I quote these things I am meeting the arguments of a solitary writer. Far from it. Mr. Jacob Blain in his "Death not Life" (which, whatever its merits, purports to have reached the 12th edition) gives a still larger number of heads and texts, among which he not only gives most of those we have been considering, but some others, and with interjectional argument beside. Here I find, among his quotations of terms used in the Bible, considered by him to prove the annihilation of the wicked:—

"VIII.—Slay, slain, kill." All his texts, as usual, applying to earth by judgments.

"IX.—Blot out." Here he quotes Ps. lxxix. 28, which is earthly judgment, and Rev. iii. 5, which has reference to the peculiar case of those in Sardis, who had a "name to live" on earth, shewing that it applies to the profession of eternal life. *Man* had, as it were, written these names in the book of life. *Christ* would "blot them out." What eternal life is we have already seen.

"X.—Hewn down." Here he quotes Matt. iii. 10; vii. 19. But compare as to the force of the expression Dan. iv. 14. It does not at all imply even the taking away of natural life. His argument about the "fire" we may see the strength of afterwards.

"XI.—Lose life" is not what Mr. Blain takes it to be at all. John xii. 25, the last of these texts he quotes, gives very plainly the force: "He that loveth his life (*ψυχην*) shall lose it, and he that hateth his *life* (*ψυχην*) *in this world*, shall keep it unto life (*ζωην*) eternal." If a man (for Christ's sake) hateth and loseth his life here in this world, he shall not merely keep it, but keep it unto that eternal life which we have been already con-

sidering. If he loves, on the other hand, his life here in this world, he loses it. The whole force of which must be in the word "lose," which is the same word elsewhere translated "destroy." We believe fully that the wicked lose life and are destroyed. The question is, what is that destruction? I believe one sadder and more complete than Mr. Blain thinks.

"XII.—End." Mr. B. remarks, "If the wicked are immortal, then they have *no end*, and this language is absurd." But of what then, or of whom, is "everlasting life" (according to Rom. vi. 22) "the end?" If everlasting life be not an "end" in any way, whether of a saint or of his works, as this chapter teaches, then "end" is not necessarily cessation of existence. A man's final estate is his end, and the end of the wicked is "destruction," but not annihilation.

As to Ps. vii. 9, "O let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end!" it is the groan of a soul feeling the strong hand of oppression, and has no reference to eternal judgment.

Mr. Blain's following texts (except one) have all reference to that clearing out of evil from the earth, which he everywhere seems to overlook. Yet it is a most real thing, and figures largely in the word of prophecy as what is to take place at the coming of the Lord, before the earth shall have its blessing under the dominion of the Prince of peace.

CHAPTER III.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.

ERROR prepares the way for error. So it has been ever, and is in this case. The long-prevalent idea of a merely spiritual millennium—to be brought about by missionary effort, and *closed* by the coming of the Lord in judgment, a general resurrection of the dead, and the passing away of the heavens and the earth—has largely contributed to help forward Annihilationism. For the result has been of necessity to put in the background both the Lord's coming and the resurrection. Dying, and going to heaven individually so, became the expectation. Prophecies of Israel's future got to be spiritualized and applied to the Church. It was not seen that judgment at the hand of the Lord must introduce that blessing for the earth which they rightly looked for. Epochs of judgment, different in time and character, became mingled together in men's minds, until it is no wonder to find the prophetic picture of the "wicked becoming ashes under the feet of the righteous," taken to synchronize with the final judgment of the wicked.

It will be well, therefore, at the point at which we have now arrived, to get before us as distinctly as possible the different times and characters of judgment which are spoken of in Scripture.

They are found connected with two events which stand out conspicuously in the prophetic future.

The first of these is the coming of the Lord. Not death, but a real personal coming, foretold as plainly in the Old Testament as in the New, and foretold as introducing the millennial blessing.

Take only Zech. xiv. There I find that in the midst of a destruction of Jerusalem (not yet fulfilled, as the detail shews) the Lord appears upon the Mount of Olives. *His feet stand there.* The Lord God comes, and all His saints. And from that day the Lord is King over all the earth; there is one Lord, and His name one; Jerusalem is safely inhabited; and all the nations of the earth come up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts.

In the New Testament, its great prophetic book opens with the announcement: "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." It closes with His own voice, saying, "Behold, I come quickly."

For that coming men are exhorted not only to *wait*, but to *watch*, and that because they know not when the time is. If a millennium of blessing were to intervene this would be necessarily impossible, until at least the close of that millennium should be drawing nigh. But Scripture speaks of no such thing. Before apostles left it, the church had failed, and, John says, "the last time" come. The character of it was that there were "already many Antichrists." And things would grow worse with it, not better. "Evil men and seducers shall wax *worse and worse.*" Thus the Gentile professing body, not "continuing in God's goodness" (see

Rom. xi.), should be "cut off," as the Jews had been, and those Jews (if they abode not still in unbelief) grafted back in their place.

And that is to be. The Scripture announcement is that "*Israel* shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the earth with fruit."

But first they gather in unbelief, and become a prey as the consequence to the rapacity of the nations round. In the midst of their worst extremity, as Zechariah has shewn us, the Lord appears, and the judgment of the living takes place.

Before that comes, we who are now His own shall be with Him. If Zechariah and Jude's record of Enoch's prophecy leave any doubt upon the mind as to who the accompanying saints might be, other Scriptures are decisive of the matter. Thus Col. iii. 4 tells us that "when Christ, who is our Life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." If we look at the train that in Rev. xix. follow the white-horsed Rider out of heaven, we find upon them the fine linen granted to the Lamb's wife (verse 8). The marriage has taken place before, and in 1 Thess. iv. 15—17 we find the dead and living saints gathered up to furnish it. Thus those with Him when He comes are the "called, and chosen, and faithful" (chap. xvii. 14) of the present and past times. And then is fulfilled that which the apostle might well ask if we know not, "that the saints shall judge the world."

No wonder they have forgotten it, for this is not the judgment of the dead, but of the living. It is not the trial of men according to their works before the great white throne, for that throne is Christ's alone, and none

share it. Rev. ii. 26, 27 may tell us (among other Scriptures) what this judgment is.

The scene of judgment is a mingled one. The tare-field of Christendom (after the wheat have thus been taken out) lies there awaiting the gathering, and the tares are gathered and burned in the fire.

The confederate nations banded together around Jerusalem, and against Him who is really King of the Jews, will meet their "sudden destruction" also then. And in this case we find the fulfilment of what is written, that Israel "shall tread down the wicked, and they shall be ashes under the soles of their feet." (Mal. iv.)

Still further the judgment extends. Israel becomes a congregation of the righteous in which sinners shall not stand (see Ps. i.): "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume, into smoke they shall consume away." And "the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."

I cannot enter into details. It is at this time, however, that the judgment of Matt. xxv. takes place, to which we shall presently refer. And it is to this time that all the Old Testament texts, relative to the destruction of the wicked, will be found to apply. Thus, "when God's judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world shall learn righteousness."

This is the time of the fulfilment of *Israel's* promises, which Rom. ix. 4 shews the Old Testament "promises" are. The blessing the Gentiles will no doubt share—it

is so declared—but “the throne of the nations” will be Jerusalem, and thence “the law of the Lord will go forth.” Heaven is *not* the hope held forth, and the threatenings of judgment are those which, when executed, will gather out of Christ’s kingdom all things that offend, in order that “the meek” may “inherit the earth.”

Christianity, while surely confirming all this, has brought in a larger prospect—higher blessings, and deeper judgment. On the one hand, “spiritual blessings in *heavenly* places” for a “*heavenly*” people. On the other hand, the awful realities of eternal ruin. It adds to the picture of the millennial kingdom a “*heavenly* Jerusalem,” and saints who have part in it, an “inheritance reserved in *heaven*,” and joint-heirship with the great “Heir” of that inheritance. It adds, beside, the deeper woe of a “Gehenna of fire,” as far beyond the Gehenna of the Old Testament, as New Jerusalem transcends its earthly prototype.

The full end of prophecy is here reached. Past the millennial kingdom, past one final outbreak of Satan’s enmity, past the duration of the heavens and earth that now are, it reveals a great white throne set up, and the risen dead, *not* raised to the resurrection of life, judged in minutest detail, “according to their works.” There is discrimination and righteous apportionment of what each has earned, but alas! in a “day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.”

The saints have long ago stood before the judgment-seat, and received according to the things done in the body. With them it was no question of salvation. Caught up in one joyous company to meet the Lord

in the air, those that are Christ's at His coming are never questioned about that. The bodies in which they rise, incorruptible, spiritual, clothed with power and glory, attest whose they are. Nor is Paul put upon his trial now, to prove if those centuries of enjoyment he has had, "absent from the body and present with the Lord," were rightfully his or not. Reward had or lost is not a question of personal safety or title to that heavenly home, which Christ's work alone secures to faith in Him. So, in like manner, here it is not the question as to those brought forth to the resurrection of damnation, whether they are lost or not. Alas, they know that. The once rich man, long before the judgment, knows by the thirst figured by a "burning tongue" to what company he belongs. No, the judgment-day is not in that sense a day of *trial*, save of *works*. "Few" or "many stripes," lesser or "greater damnation," is what is in question. And that, after many centuries, it may be, of anguished looking for that hour, is still to come.

Judge if it be annihilation that Cain, the first murderer, after seven thousand years of "reservation" to that time, receives. If it be that, methinks he would rather have cause to dread what killed the body, and gave him up to those seven thousand years of misery, than the merciful "*destruction* of soul and body in hell," which should set him free from misery evermore! But no! However long the anticipation, it is only now that the *judgment* is received, only now that those "stripes," few or many, are given, and that damnation, greater or lesser is inflicted. To that the body comes forth to be a sad partner in the doom, as it

was in the sin which brought on the doom. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

"The former things have" now "passed away." "New heavens and new earth" are come. He that sitteth upon the throne saith, "Behold, I make all things new." But still I read, at this very juncture, when, if ever (and it is argued so), all sin and sinners would have ceased together, the solemn warning, as if to put an end to that fond, vain dream—"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death."

CHAPTER IV.

THE GEHENNA OF FIRE.

WE have thus far reached, then. That the testimony of Scripture is distinct and positive that there is a "life" of the saint, only truly such; a life now possessed by those who have believed in Christ, and which the unbeliever has not; which is not, therefore, immortality, because he who now has it, is yet as mortal as the rest of men; and which is not mere existence, because *that* (while having "no life in him") the unbeliever has. That death, moreover, is not extinction, either for the righteous or the wicked, and that, therefore, no one has title to say that the "second" or eternal death is. That the terms destroy, perish, &c., used for eternal punishment, do not in themselves imply any necessity of extinction.

We have seen, too, that many of the passages used by Annihilationists as emphatically putting forth their doctrine, such as "cutting off," "not being," &c., refer to the removal of the wicked from the earth, at the coming of the Lord, and not to the judgment of the "great white throne," when there is *no* coming to earth at all, but the earth and the heavens flee away.

We are now to consider more particularly some of the plain statements of Scripture with regard to the sinner's final doom.

Now, it is expressly stated that the punishment of the lost is one prepared for the devil, man's destroyer. It is *as* expressly stated that that punishment is torment. For the first statement we have, Matt. xxv. 41: "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." And *that* is the "everlasting punishment" of the 46th verse. Man seduced, and his seducer, share a common doom.

In Rev. xix., xx., we find this in detail: a "lake of fire burning with brimstone"—existing before the millennium, and therefore certainly not (as some have tried to make out) the world itself in conflagration—into which, first of all, and also before the millennium, the beast and the false prophet are cast *alive* at the coming of Christ. At that time Satan is cast, *not* into this lake of fire, but into the "bottomless pit," and shut up there until the thousand years shall be fulfilled, but after that to be loosed a little season (chap. xx. 3).

He is loosed accordingly (ver. 7), and after having deceived the nations, and the judgment of God overtaking his followers, he is again taken, and this time cast into the lake of fire. There, we are told expressly, a thousand and more years after *they* have been cast in, "The beast and the false prophet **ARE**," * and it is added

* "Are" is not in the original, but necessarily implied there. The word "they" is also omitted in the common version from the next part of the verse, which runs, "and shall be tormented." The difference between this and what I have given is, that the ordinary translation seems to confine the torment to the beast and false prophet; whereas mine includes the devil in it. The Greek is capable of either, but the connexion seems to call for the sense given here, as otherwise nothing is said of the devil being tormented. Still that would be implied in his being cast into the lake of fire.

of them, "and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (ver. 10).

Now if the lake of fire be extinction, how is it that two men remain in it a thousand years unannihilated, and that then we are told they are to be further tormented for eternity? The expression is "unto the ages of ages," the strongest expression ever used for eternity,* and if it were not so, but capable of some limitation, the use of such language would at all events preclude the possibility of reasoning, as Annihilationists

* *Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. The passages in which it is found are, Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11; Rev. i. 6; 18; iv. 9, 10; v. 13, 14; vii. 12; x. 6; xi. 15; xv. 7; xix. 3; xx. 10; xxii. 5.

Of these twenty passages but one can be even pretended to have a limited meaning, and that is where the smoke of great Babylon is said to rise up for ever and ever (Rev. xix. 3). This has been caught at of course, but without any reason, for although the expression there is not to be taken literally, as I believe, but figures the abiding remembrance of her judgment, yet "for ever and ever" is not used even there in a *limited* sense at all. It means what it says—"for ever."

Ellis and Read, however, render the phrase, "*until* the ages of ages," and quote Rev. xiv. 9, xix. 2, and xx. 9, as all *clear* examples of "the limited meaning of *aion*" (*αιων*)! How that should be is not quite apparent, especially with their rendering. Suppose I were to say, "*until* eternity" (odd as the phrase would be), it would be a strange thing to say that anything that took place *until* then could be a "clear example" of how long the eternity following should be!

But the "*until*" will not do here, and for this simple reason, that "the ages of ages" are not a point of time, but a long *duration*, and you could not there use "*until*." "*Until ages*" would have no sense, except it meant until they had *passed*, and even then would be very unnatural. But if it is to mean until the ages *begin*, that word should be added. And then, if the phrase is to be interpreted this way, how about the other seventeen passages, where of course

love to do, from the nature of fire, that it must imply the total consumption of those condemned to it. For if a man could live there a thousand years, why not ever so many thousand? and if he could be tormented there for ages of ages, why not for a proper eternity?

The attempted answer is, of course, that all this is figurative. The beast and the false prophet are systems and not men.* But it is surely strange to hear of *systems* being taken and cast "*alive*" into a lake of fire. Why *alive*? And further to hear of *systems* being tormented for ever! How tormented? Is it the judgment inflicted on them in men's minds. If so, "torment" is a strange word for it. And is that in the lake of fire? None are in the lake of fire during the thousand years that we know of (except perhaps the "goats" of Matt. xxv.) beside these two "systems." And is it only after the thousand years, that the devil is adjudged in men's

the same translation (if true here) must be adopted? "To whom be glory *until* the ages," &c. Is it to stop then?

And whereas Messrs. Ellis and Read tell me that *εἰς* "can never mean 'for;'" Messrs. Liddell and Scott give it as used "to determine a period," as "*for*, esp. *εἰς ἑνιαυτόν*, for a year, i.e., a whole year, *εἰς θεῖρον*, for the summer, i.e., *throughout* it." Which am I to trust?

* I do not at all deny that the "beast" represents in the first place the last of Daniel's four universal empires. But we find, as I believe, at the end, that this empire finds its embodiment in the man who rules it. Thus Nebuchadnezzar was himself the head of gold (Dan. ii.), though only as representing his empire. So in Rev. xvii. 8, we find that "the beast" is his own eighth head. The head that rules is the whole thing.

As to the "false prophet," who is to my mind "*the Antichrist*" emphatically, as his lamb-like horns and his dragon's speech among other things shew, he is still more plainly a man (see 2 Thess. ii.).

minds to their companionship? Or is the devil too a "system"? or what else?

Even this is stated; although in Rev. xii. 9 the "devil" is asserted to be the interpretation of the *figure* of "the dragon." I know well that some, from whom better things might be hoped, agree in this with Annihilationist writers, and say the dragon is the Roman empire. *Scripture* says, "the dragon" is "the old serpent, which is called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." Is it the fact that the Roman empire "is called" the "devil," except by interpreters whose aim would almost seem to be to make *Scripture* unintelligible to any simple minds?

Thomasism indeed, fearless as usual, proclaims that nowhere is the devil a person, but a "personification of sin in its several forms of manifestation." Into this I do not go, except so far as to say, that I can no more understand the "personification of sin" being tormented in a lake of fire, than I can understand the "Roman empire" being so tormented. Book of symbols as the Revelation is, I must believe that an interpretation so little accordant with the whole language used, can scarcely be the true one. As we see, moreover, in this book, the *dragon* is the *symbol*, the *devil* the *interpretation* of the symbol. So that in chap. xx. 10 we are in a region of literal plain speaking, and not of symbol.

Thus then, in spite of Mr. Blain's assertion, that "it is *agreed* that the book of Revelation *can* settle no doctrine," an assertion which is very convenient for his purpose certainly, the book does show us, in simple, plain language (only too plain for its reviewers), how

the words of Matt. xxv. are fulfilled, and man, unsaved man, shares a destiny appointed for "the devil and his angels." That destiny is "everlasting punishment" in "everlasting fire." Quite true, we have not yet seen all the unsaved as sharing it. But that this twentieth chapter gives: "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." This is spoken of the dead, standing in mass before the great white throne.

I know that "death and hell" (hades) are also said to be cast in, and am prepared for the question, Is not that a figure? I answer, it is one explained only by the facts with which it is connected, and which I am here insisting on. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works." Thus death and hell were emptied (it is "hades," as we have seen), and emptied of inhabitants, who, standing before God to be judged on the ground of natural responsibility, "according to their works," come forth only to hopeless condemnation. Long before have the saints ceased to be tenants there. Nor does Scripture seem to speak of death for the saints during the millennium. The result would be that as none but the "blessed" have part in the first resurrection, so none but the wicked would have part in the second. "Death and hell," thus figuratively presenting their inhabitants, are cast into the lake of fire.* It is immediately added, as if to

* See Isa. xiv. 9 for a similar putting of "hell" for its inhabitants. It is the constant thing when speaking of cities: "O Jerusalem that killest the prophets," &c.

shew that the *people* are intended: "*This* is the second death." Not of course, of death or of hell, but of those represented by them. And I press it again that the second death is the "lake of fire;" not extinction, for if there *has* been no *first* extinction there CAN be no "second."

But I turn back now for a moment to Matt. xxv. 31—46. It is the premillennial judgment of the nations when Christ comes, but the force of certain expressions is all that occupies us now. It would seem that the "goats" here mentioned, who are not raised from the dead, and therefore do not form any part of those judged before the great white throne, are cast into the lake of fire *before* the millennium, as the beast and false prophet are. I do not say positively it is so, but so it seems. This much is certain that they are appointed to everlasting punishment in everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.

Men have come in with their explanations again here, and to these I turn. The chief one is that *κόλασις* is "cutting off," not "punishment," and has no idea of torment in it. Morris says that it refers to the "cutting off" of false Christians from the flock of Christ, and from every pretence to the kingdom ("What is Man?" p. 101). Blain says, that "go *away into* adds darkness to the text. When a murderer is going to the gallows, it is proper to say he is going *to* punishment, but not to say he is going *into* punishment." And he quotes with approbation Ellis and Read's rendering: "And these will go to the cutting off that takes place at the age." Still he does not contend for the last part of this translation, but affirms that ever-

lasting death (in the sense of extinction) would be everlasting *punishment*, though not everlasting *torment*. Which last statement Mr. Dobney contents himself with.

These are substantially the arguments. Now as to the facts.

The word *κόλασις* is given by Liddell and Scott as meaning "a pruning: hence a checking, punishing, chastisement, correction, punishment." The verb *κολάζω*, from which it is derived, means "strictly to curtail, dock, prune, but usually to keep within bounds, hold in check, bridle, check, then, to chastise, correct, punish." All the words derived from this shew a similar meaning. Thus I find, *κολάσμα*, chastisement, punishment; *κολαστήριον*, a place of chastisement, a prison, (2) an instrument of correction or torture; *κολαστής*, a chastiser, punisher. *κολάζω* is the word used for *punish*, Acts iv. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 9. *Κόλασις* is only found in the passage before us, and 1 John iv. 18, "fear hath *torment*."

Thus all is against them as to the punishment being cutting off. Even where used for pruning, it is not the *cutting off* of the tree pruned, but simply of the branches. It cannot, therefore, be used for the cutting off of the *individual*. Mr. Hudson admits this: "In pruning," he says, "the tree is not cut off, only the branches." Thus this argument is fairly given up.

Next, as to "everlasting," the word is the common one used for it (*αἰώνιος*), and expressly in 2 Cor. iv. 18 for things *eternal*, in contrast with "temporal." Moreover, although sometimes limited by the context as our word "eternal" is, it never *in itself* implies a limited time. Here, too, the designed comparison, "these shall

go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal*" (the same word), forbids our attaching a limited meaning in the one case, which cannot be held to in the other. Mr. Dobney says of this: "I not only concede it—I affirm it, and believe it." But he adds, we must not put *torment* in the place of *punishment*.

In the only other place, however, in which the word occurs, it is translated "torment:" "because fear hath torment." I know that Morris says that even here "this is not justifiable; for the word relates to the children of God, who are not yet 'made perfect' in an experimental knowledge of the love of God. They are not *tormented*; but they are cut off from much experimental blessedness which properly pertains to them." But this is poor and foolish reasoning. The words are "*fear—i.e., dread of God—hath torment,*" and so it has, whether in saint or sinner. "Cutting off" (as he would have it here also) it is not, being never simply that. "Punishment" let it be, I do not object, but "*punishing*" is more literal. All the nouns of the class to which *κόλασις* belongs have literally this active participial meaning. Now what, reader, would "*everlasting punishing*" involve? Would it allow the passing away of the one who was being punished?

The context, moreover, assures us that this "*everlasting punishment*" is "*everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.*" And that is "*torment:*" "*they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.*"

Arguments still follow us, however, for to yield here would be to give up all. Among other things we are told that the devil is to be *destroyed* (Heb. ii. 14)—an

argument we know already how to estimate—but especially that βασανισθησονται is not “shall be tormented,” that being one of the frequent mistranslations which in their opinion so much disfigure our English Bible.

“The *dramatic* force and design of this plural verb,” says Mr. Morris, “is not—they shall be tortured, as some men count torture. As we have noticed before that the verb, basanizō, and the noun, basanismos, are derived from basanos, the name of a stone found in Lydia, by which gold was tried—a touchstone. From the literal meaning of basanos came the metaphorical use of basanismos—that which tests, or puts to the proof. In the mind of a Roman Inquisitor, this word and its verbs came to mean *torture*, and torturing to elicit evidence, to extort a confession. But even in this there was an end proposed to be obtained by means of the torture; and so an end to the torture itself. . . . In common discourse the words came to represent the ideas of painful toil and great bodily affliction, . . . and the infliction of torture. But basanismos and its verbs always retain their radical meaning when used in relation to the jurisprudence and penal administration of God. The feminine symbol, called ‘Babylon the great,’ and the masculine symbols, called ‘the beast and the false prophet,’ are said to be tormented; that is, the *systems* of ecclesiastical, and of secular and moral polity and power, which these symbols represent, shall be tested and put to the proof.” (“What is Man?” pp. 120, 121, *n.*)

We have all these words in the New Testament. βασανος three times, Matt. iv. 24; Luke xvi. 23, 28, always given as “torment;” βασανισμός, similarly, “tor-

ment," five times, Rev. ix. 5; xiv. 11; xviii. 7, 10, 15; *βασανιστής*, once, Matt. xviii. 34, "tormentors;" *βασανίζω*, once rendered "tossed," Matt. xiv. 24; once "toiling," Mark vi. 48; once, "vexed," 2 Pet. ii. 8; once, "pained," Rev. xii. 2; and the other eight times "torment," Matt. viii. 6, 29; Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; Rev. ix. 5, xi. 10, xiv. 10, xx. 10.

Mr. Morris's canon of interpretation is very simple. These words, so uniformly rendered by some word expressive of suffering and pain, may be allowed to retain that meaning *in every case*, where "the penal administration of God" is not in question, that is, wherever the interests of Annihilation do not require it otherwise, but there we must rigorously exclude the idea of torment; it must be, "put to the proof" in all such cases.

In vain we ask, is there another instance which requires or would allow this rendering in the New Testament? Mr. Morris is sufficient authority evidently in the matter, for he condescends to give no other, nor even reason about it.

But he is a little unfortunate nevertheless. For in the very text in question the canon strangely fails. "Divested of the dramatic dress," he says, the passage reads: "and they shall be PUT TO THE PROOF unto the ages of ages." "That trinity of evil," is his own comment upon it, "called 'the dragon,' and 'the beast,' and 'the false prophet' shall be *together* involved in the same final *doom*."

That is, these three, two of them *symbols*, are "doomed" to be put to the proof (without torture) in a lake of fire and brimstone for ever. The *end*

of the "putting to the proof" is never to come! For this putting to the proof, he himself tells us, is "to elicit evidence"! This grand trial is to go on for ever, and come to no result!

But this is not what Mr. Morris means. Of course not. It is only what he says. They are *tested* for ever. The fire and brimstone are of course "dramatic," and it is only the devil's *political* doom, as *personally* he is to be *destroyed*! Perhaps, that makes it plainer. If not, it may at least bewilder, which is the next best thing at any rate.

I do not accuse Mr. Morris of intentional deception. He is but a poor tool in the hands of one subtler than he. Put side by side, dear reader, the texts cited, and ask yourself, as in the sight of God, are they not parallel in meaning? Or is the one a figure merely, and a figure of one knows not what, or is it indeed the sad reality of the other?

MATT. XXV.

"Depart, ye cursed, unto everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

"And these shall go away unto everlasting punishment."

REV. XX.

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

But I pass on now to other Scriptures.

The next passage I adduce, contains similarly the

words in question, but there is nothing here of political symbols. It is the doom of individuals (Rev. xiv. 9—11):—

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day or night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.”

One would think that was as plain as solemn. Even Mr. Morris’s “putting to the proof” instead of “torment” could here scarcely much darken it. He has noticed the passage however, and objects to its teaching the commonly received doctrine on these grounds:—

1. It is the penalty of a specific crime, and *therefore* cannot be the doom of those who have not committed that crime. Therefore if it teach endless woe for some, that cannot be the “common penalty due to sinners.”

But Mr. Morris is again at fault; for hell-fire may be the common penalty of sinners, and yet men may be solemnly warned, as here, that once let them commit the sin in question, and that hell would be their portion. What is intended is, that for such persons there would be no escape. The objection is therefore vain.

2. Mr Morris says, that, whatever may be the “dram-

atic force" of what is said, "*it is evident* that it transpires on earth, and *before* the coming of the Lord."

But he gives no reason for this at all, for "it is evident" is scarcely such. I should say myself, that "the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb" mentioned, would rather make the opposite evident.

3. He appeals to the "smoke" of Babylon "rising up for ever" (ch. xix. 3) as showing that such words do not imply the necessary existence of the sufferers, as Babylon had been "utterly burned with fire."

Still Mr. Morris must allow that there is a difference. "The smoke of her *torment*" is not said of Babylon; and waiving all argument about this, the accompanying expressions are too strong and simple to be so evaded.

The comments of the rest of Annihilationist writers are even weaker than these. They do not pretend to go into any examination of the force of the terms used, but assert the fulfilment of all this to be on *earth*, as detailed in subsequent chapters. As to this any honest mind is competent to decide. The fulfilment is indeed in chap. xx., and we have already looked at it. Our readers may, if they please, put this passage in a third parallel column beside the other two just given. They will form a threefold cord not quickly broken.

We have now a well-known passage (Mark ix. 43—50):—"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having

two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace with one another."

It was to be expected that over this passage Annihilationists should have stumbled, as they have. The admitted borrowing of phraseology from Isa. lxvi., and the word "Gehenna" (translated "hell"), referring to the valley of Hinnom, where dead carcasses were burnt, are taken to shew that the terms used in these verses imply the "utter destruction" (in the new sense) of the ungodly.

But as to the valley of Hinnom, while the reference is allowed, it must be allowed also, that it is only a type of that "Gehenna of fire" of which our Lord speaks. The undying worm and the unquenched fire of Isa. lxvi., furnish also only the phraseology here applied to the common doom of sinners.

And there is one point of difference between these two texts which the writers we speak of have altogether missed, which at once shews the distinction between them. In Isaiah the unquenched fire remains as a perpetual admonition to *spectators* of it. In Mark the unquenched fire is spoken of in relation to the doom of *those cast into it*. In *both* cases it is an assurance of

the perpetuity of the flame, not merely that it cannot be hindered from doing its work, as these people say. In Isaiah, the representative of judgment which was to remain a perpetual spectacle before the eyes of others. In Mark, of perpetual punishment of those *suffering from it themselves*. In Isaiah it is "they shall go forth and look" from one new moon and one sabbath to another, for the fire shall not be quenched. In the other case it is: *Fear* it, for the fire shall not be quenched. That is a decisive difference; and the Lord's solemn reiteration of that tremendous fact testifies to the solemnity of the warning.

But the 49th verse adds something more: "For every one shall be salted with fire."* Salting is the figure of preservation. "Salt," which as the Lord says "is good," and always has a good meaning in Scripture, is the figure of that energy of holiness which preserves for God by keeping out corruption. But here it is not salting with *salt*, but salting with *fire*, a widely different thing, and always a symbol of divine judgment.

Now *every one* (it is quite unlimited) should be

* Morris, as usual, prefers another rendering: "But the word 'pas' in the Greek may mean every one *person*, or every one *thing*, and the word for fire is in the dative, *puri*; and the real force of the passage is this: "For every one shall be salted to or FOR the fire (that is, of the *altar*), even every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." ("What is Man?" p. 93.)

There is no ground for this: $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, standing *alone* as here, can only mean "every person," and the word "salt" is just as much in the dative ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota$) as "fire" is, so that there would be as much ground for saying "salted to or FOR the salt." Put without article as here $\pi\upsilon\rho\iota$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota$ are both datives of instrument, and exact parallels, "salted with fire," "salted with salt."

salted with *fire*—even the saint, for he needs the discipline of it, and it is for his preservation and salvation (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18). But the ungodly will have it after another sort. To them it will be unquenchable fire *preserving*, but *not* saving, its miserable victims. The Lord adds, “and every *sacrifice* shall be salted with *salt*.” There is the point of transition, at which he begins to speak of the saint alone.

I now turn for a moment to a chief text with Annihilationists, to show how completely their favourite weapons may be turned against themselves. The “everlasting destruction” of 2 Thess. i. 9 has been taken by perhaps all of them, as shewing what the “everlasting punishment” of Matt. xxv. is to be. I have nothing to oppose to that. But I go a little further into the second chapter, and I find one other who is to be similarly “destroyed.” “That wicked one,” “whom the Lord shall CONSUME with the spirit (or breath, as Isa. xi. 4) of his mouth, and shall DESTROY with the brightness of his coming.” Now this Wicked One to be so destroyed, is plainly either “the beast” or “the false prophet” of Rev. xix. 20. So that he does not even *die*, although “destroyed,” but is cast *alive* into the lake of fire, and there found still suffering a thousand years afterwards. What then, about the “everlasting destruction” of chapter i.?

To examine every text upon this subject would exceed the limits I have proposed to myself in this brief review. Many others will occur to my readers. “Outer darkness,” where there is, *not* extinction, but “weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth,” is twice over asserted to be the portion of the professing but

unfaithful servants, when Christ comes; and shews conclusively what "cutting asunder" and "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," at that time, represent. "Stripes," few or many, according to desert, are not consistent with extinction being the penalty of sin, for in this there are no degrees, and can be none. If they say that this may refer to processes of greater or lesser length or severity, by which the doom of extinction is accomplished, they bring in the idea of torment into punishment, from which elsewhere they seek sedulously to exclude it.* But not only "indignation and wrath," but "tribulation and anguish" also, are expressly asserted to be recompensed in the day of judgment, to "every soul of man that doeth evil."

We have seen too, that death is not extinction, and therefore *second* death is not. We have seen one after death in *hades*, speaking of it as a place of "torment," and yet that after such suffering, it may be for many centuries, the final judgment only comes with the "great white throne" and the "day of wrath." That can scarcely be extinction.

* "Even the common usage of the English word 'punishment' does not of necessity include the idea of pain and anguish; and in the judicial use of that word, the idea of torture is not found." ("What is Man?" p. 101.)

"Life or death is the theme of the Bible, not life or torment." ("Bible meaning of Forever," &c., p. 15.)

CHAPTER V.

THE ABOLITION OF EVIL.

ONE argument remains for examination. It is often brought forward, and is one in common use by so-called "Restorationists," for their own view of the matter. It is that which asserts the entire abolition of evil out of the universe. Mr. Blain adduces the following texts in proof: Acts iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26; Heb. ii. 8; i. 13; Eph. i. 10; Phil. ii. 10, 11; Col. i. 19, 20; Rev. v. 13; xxi. 4, 5; Ps. ii. 9; 1 John iii. 8.

But Acts iii. 21 speaks of the "restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." The passage itself therefore shews how far that restitution extends. Among Old Testament prophets Isaiah is the only one who ever speaks of "new heavens," and he only in one place (chap. lxxv. 17). The Old Testament "promises" are Jewish (Rom. ix. 4), and speak only of earthly blessings. Hence the "restitution of all things" cannot be extended further.

The next passage (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26), speaks only of all things being put under Christ's feet, which does not even imply restitution. The next two passages are identical with this.

The passage in Ephesians speaks of gathering together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven

and which are on earth; and that in Col. similarly of their reconciliation: but it is "things," not *people*, and hell is neither heaven nor earth.

In Phil. ii. 10 I do not doubt at all that "infernal beings" are referred to, but it simply states they will have to confess Christ's Lordship, which they will. It is neither their conversion nor annihilation.

The "creatures under the earth" praising (in Rev. v. 13) are, I believe, on the other hand, another class altogether. There "every creature in heaven, *on* earth, *under* earth, and *in* the sea" is evidently a summary of the whole creation" of Rom. viii. 21, now groaning under the bondage of corruption, anticipating deliverance.

Again, Rev. xxi. 4, 5 has reference to the scene there described, "new heavens and new earth." A glance at the following verses will shew how little the awful reality of hell is done away by it.

Ps. ii. 9 one would think was brought in to swell the number of texts, as it only speaks of the earthly judgment of the wicked, when Christ comes.

1 John iii. 8, we are told, "puts in the key-stone of this class of texts." It reads, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." The word here is *λύει*, "undo." I need only answer that hell is *not* the devil's work. It is his *punishment*. And although it is true that "he that committeth sin is *of* the devil," it is never said that he is his *work*. The punishment of such also will not be.

It may appeal to human sensibilities, this thought of the abolition of all evil. Our wisdom is not to be

trusted in the matter, however, for "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." It would be well if those who talk so much about the nothingness of man, would really believe what they talk so much of. Judgment is really God's "strange work," and a "great deep," too deep for the creatures of a day to sound with the plummet of their fancied wisdom. We know Him who gave His Son. Our path is a path of *faith*. What becomes us is: "Even so, Father, for *so it seemed good in thy sight.*"

CHAPTER VI.

TENDENCIES AND RESULTS.

THE end of my examination is then reached. It remains to say a few words as to the general tendency and connections of the doctrines we have been reviewing. Many, who by no means hold them, are yet blind to the evil they involve. In this way they gain toleration at the hands of many who learn to look on at their steadily increasing acceptance with an indifference which produces lamentable results. Quietly the leaven works. And Mr. Blain can say, with perfect truth, "a large number in the different churches believe the doctrine, who say but little about it, except to its open advocates." Nor does the profession of the largest amount of truth hinder its reception, as numerous instances bear painful witness.

I wish to point out, therefore, very briefly, some things that are connected with it, and some fruits which grow upon this root of evil. The tree is known by its fruit, and the fruit is here abundant and evident enough.

In the first place, the undermining of the authority of Scripture is very evident. Thinly disguised in the case of their most cautious writers, the tone of scepticism is in other cases unmistakeable. We are told that no vindication of eternal punishment can be made.

“Prop it up by popular opinion or disguise and conceal it as we may, it must ever appear to all *rational* creatures the very essence of folly, injustice, and cruelty. *Can* we believe such a doctrine is taught in the ‘precious Bible, book divine?’ And is it so? *must* our reason and sense of justice and goodness in Him in whose hands we are, float on a tempestuous and shoreless ocean for ever? No, the effort to lock up reason and common sense much longer in the narrow dark cell of mystery will be vain. Just, impulsive feelings, both of saints and *thoughtful sinners* must burst the bolts, and emerge into light and relief.” (Blain’s “Review of Beecher,” p. 33.)

If this were a solitary statement or of one writer I should not quote it, but language somewhat similar is used by nearly all. As a result, Mr. Hudson gives us a volume of 468 pages upon the subject, the “Scriptural Argument” occupying 67. This single chapter he afterwards enlarges into a smaller volume (“Christ our Life”), “designed,” he says, “to meet the convenience of those who rely for their views of future life upon the reading and interpretation of the Scriptures.”

All are not as open as this, but it is the secret undercurrent everywhere. It suggests to Mr. Blain that “the book of Revelation can settle no doctrine,” and whether this *one* text “looks strong enough to vanish (? vanquish) the 210 *opposing* ones.” It suggests to the authors of “The Bible vs. Tradition,” that, of this Bible, such a passage “*may* have been a little amended by some officious copyist.” Thus the authority of the Word is undermined; that Word which asserts for itself that “*all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and

is profitable for *doctrine*." To seek to get the sacred text as perfect as possible, free from the real mistakes of copyists is another thing, but to *invent* conjectural criticisms of this kind, is but the poor vain refuge of unbelief too timid openly to avow itself as such. Mr. Hastings' own words used as to one class of these, the deniers of the resurrection of the wicked, apply but too well to most: "and these passages still *stand*, after all the attempts to evade them, to convert them into mere figures of speech, or to retranslate them in [such] a manner that they shall flatly contradict their originals!" ("Retribution," p. 74.)

This last mode of evacuating Scripture is with the lowest class of Annihilationists (who are also the most popular) the one not the least frequently adopted. The "Bible *vs.* Tradition" is crammed with new translations, specimens of which have been already given. But at the other end of the scale, Morris's "What is Man?" a book of the most extravagant pretentiousness, is perhaps as full.* Ellis and Read, when Greek and Hebrew fail, bring in Syriac to their aid, yet do not know the difference between the singular and plural of a participle, or between the verb *δέξαι* (*dexai*) and the adjective *δέξια* (*dexia*). Christadelphianism has a new

* I present for those competent to examine them, a few of the new translations advocated in his book. I add no comment:—

Acts xvii. 28.—"For we are also His *product*."

Gen. ii. 7.—"Man became a *vigorous* soul."

Prov. xxiv. 20.—"There shall be no *hereafter* (no future state) to the evil man."

Prov. x. 28.—"The line (thread of existence) of the wicked shall *perish*."

translation specially to teach their views.* Thus the minds of the simple are thrown off the balance, and doubts insinuated even as to the honesty of the common translation, calculated to undermine all faith in that which alone to ordinary readers represents the authoritative word of God.†

(2) But there is another thing, most evident, and most disastrous in results. Mr. Hudson admits and laments the prevalence of materialism among the upholders of the views he advocates; and he notices one consequence, that the difficulty which results from this conceiving of the wicked as "wholly dying" twice, and the penalty being thus twice exacted, "has led many to deny that the 'resurrection of the unjust' signifies their being made alive." This view is spreading among them. That, at the worst, "death is an eternal sleep," and there is no day of recompense or retribution. What that leads to is plain enough.

But there are other results. There is no spirit of man. Is there then any Spirit of God? The passage already noticed in 1 Cor. ii. 11, links the two doctrines close enough together to make any tampering with the

* I find in "Elpis Israel"—

1 Thess. iv. 18.—"Shall God *produce by Him?*"

Gal. iii. 27.—"Have *entered into Christ.*"

Eph. i. 10.—"Gather together in one all things *under Christ.*"

† Mr. Blain says, "The translators *designedly* covered up the truth." ("Death not Life," p. 54.) One of his sub-sections (p. 52) is headed, "The Catholics more honest in their translation than the Protestants."

This same writer says (p. 104), "The 19th century has regulated brains so as to use steam and lightning, and it will yet regulate them so as to use the figurative language of the Bible aright."

one bode ominously the downfall of the other. Hence far and wide this view is also spreading. "The 19th century" may "regulate brains" (alas, what about *hearts*?) but not the Holy Ghost; and "*thoughtful sinners*" will not be able to believe the truth of God, if it speak to them of the impossibility of escape from His hands into eternal forgetfulness.

(3) But there is a third thing, which does not depend upon (although assisted by) the development of these others. Sin is softened down in all cases. You must not ask man to believe in a greater penalty attaching to it, than his natural conscience, dull as that may be, approves. "The doctrine of eternal anguish," thus Mr. Hastings asks, "how can it be received by the *unbelieving*?" May we not ask that of a good deal more? Thus "Christ crucified"—these "things of the Spirit of God"—how can the "natural man" receive them? "they are foolishness unto him;" shall we then discard them all? As well may we make men judges in their own cause, arbitrators of the penalty due to their own offences.

Necessarily then, the judgment of sin is lowered. "Man has NO preeminence above a beast." Carry out that to its full extent. A beast's conscience, what is it? a beast's responsibility, what is the measure of it? The actual fact is, that this reasoning is being followed to its legitimate result. As we have already seen, the resurrection of the wicked is being denied by many. A beast's end is thus simply and wholly a man's end, and there is no Divine judgment at all. The wages of sin is death, *i.e.*, simply what a beast suffers. Or if it be the suffering in view of death, then death

alone is not its wages, and the most hardened suffers least.

All have not landed there yet; in many ears "*after death the judgment*" lingers still, but they have started on the voyage, and the many outstrip their pilots. Another who has had practical experience of the working of these views, has written of it: "The effect in destroying responsibility was fearful; and in people of grosser habits, rejection of all truth, and immortality. The tree was bad, had a bad sap, and so was cut down, and there was an end of it." "And one of the chief teachers in the United States declares in his book, that the deep distress of conscience and terror about sin committed was a base servile fear and wrong. To one who found he had lost the atonement, and the sense of responsibility out of his mind, and who asked him what he made of responsibility, he replied, it was impossible to reconcile it with his system, but he saw it in Scripture, and so did not deny it."*

(4) The writer just quoted has added elsewhere, as to the effect upon atonement: "If sin means eternal exclusion from God's presence, it is dreadful enmity against God now, exclusion from God then. If death is the only wages of sin, Christ had no more to suffer for me. Nay, if I am a Christian, he had nothing to suffer, if I die before the Lord comes. I have paid the wages myself. If it be only some temporary punishment I had incurred, He had only that to bear. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' has lost its force. It is in vain to say, He gives us life. He can,

* "The Eternity of Punishment and the Immortality of the Soul," pp. 135, 139.

in itself, quicken without dying. If He died, He died for my sins, and bore them. If death [simply] be the wages of sin, millions of saints have paid them. And if a partial punishment be all I had to bear, it is all Christ had to bear. The sense I have of sin and its desert is not, being forsaken of God, shut out from Him when I can know what it is, but a temporary punishment, a quantum of offence, which is all I have to think of, and all Christ had to bear, if anything." *

Let me say, that while perhaps none rise higher than this, viz., the substitutional sacrifice of life for life, the death of the cross no more than a martyr's death, to which the Deity of the Sufferer gave all its value†—the mass go lower far, as for instance among those who are not absolute materialists, Mr. Hudson and Mr. Ham.

(5) And there is the germ of yet another evil, attacking not only the work but the person of the Son of God Himself. For if death is wholly extinction, did Christ die? We have already glanced at this. For the phraseology of Scripture is no more conclusive about the extinction of Stephen or any other, than it would be according to them about the Lord. Where, then, was His divine nature?

But I add no more. Thomasism has gone all these

* "The Eternity of Punishment, &c.," p. 128.

† "And it is a truth never to be forgotten, that the infinite value which pertains to the one sacrifice of Jesus, arises, not from any inherent dignity or value in man, as the subject of redemption, nor from the nature or extent of the penalty due to sinners, but . . . from His own essential Deity, and from the fact of His having voluntarily laid down His life in obedience to the commandment of His Father, God." ("What is Man?" p. 51.)

lengths, and more, but I speak not of it now. To the Christian that, at least, bears upon its forefront undisguisedly its deadly character. The subtler forms, clothed in more decent orthodoxy, are the most to be dreaded here.

But I close. Reader, you and I are soon to know, if either know not now, the truth as to all this. Will it be when all too late? or now when the revelation of God speaks not only of wrath to come, but of present mercy? O if the deep, dark gulf of despair has terror for thee, bethink thee that Christ died to save thee from it. If hell yawns, heaven invites. Never shalt thou know the "outer darkness," except as thou refusest at His hand "the light of life."

The death of the Cross was no *mere* martyr's death. It was that surely: the Prince of witnesses did there lay down His life in testimony to the truth He had come from heaven to declare. But there was much more than that, and much more than the substitutional giving up of life for life. "He who knew no sin was made sin" there. "He was made a curse for us." And that solemn 22nd Psalm, which, as we know, the Lord upon the Cross applies to Himself, declares to us a death exceptional in its character from that of all beside. *Not merely in its being vicarious*: that is not the point; but in what that vicariousness involved. No mere giving up of life—no pain of death—no bitterness of persecution—could have wrung that awful cry from the Lord of life and glory, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" That was the cup He dreaded. That was what the sacrifice involved. Not the mere giving up of life. Not, as has been said, a mere "quantum of suffering."

But isolation from the presence and communion of One, who had been from His mother's womb His trust and joy. It was the blood of One who had thus been laden with our burden of iniquities, and borne our sins in His own body on the tree, that alone could *atone*, alone could *cleanse*. The blood of a sin-offering burnt upon the ground outside the holy places, and *outside the camp*, alone could be "brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin" (Heb. xii.). Even so Jesus suffered, the Holy One in the sinner's place of wrath and distance from a holy God. If he did not, we have no blood of atonement, no efficacious sacrifice at all.

Beloved reader, it is written, "the Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquities of us all." Jesus is risen from the dead, and in testimony of the full acceptance of that work accomplished, is now gone into the presence and glory of God. The sins then that were laid upon Him are gone (Heb. i.). *Whose are they?* Are they yours? Beloved, they are those of *all* who, in the consciousness of sin and helplessness "have put their trust in Him" for their eternal salvation. Their peace is made. Their sins, borne by Him, are gone. And the coming of Jesus will put them, without question or challenge, into the blessedness of His Father's house, which He went to prepare as their abiding home. It is your's to choose, reader, whether you will have your "part" with the devil and his angels, or with the "blessed and holy" of the first resurrection in the only really "Eternal City."

It may suit you to soften down the terrors of the day of wrath, but what if you should find God just in inflicting severer punishment than now your conscience, or your

want of it, can allow as righteous? O ponder those words of the very one who came to save—"everlasting fire," "undying worm," are after all, realities. They *abide*, the solemn figures of judgment to come. On the other hand, God's grace invites you—whoso comes to Christ, He will in no wise cast out.

Reader, if you be one of His redeemed, trifle not with that which undermines the reality of His blessed work, and with that the reality of sin and of its judgment.

"A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

MAY BE HAD OF THE SAME PUBLISHER.

By J. N. D.

- Practical Reflections on the Psalms. Crown 8vo. Price 4s., Cloth.
Lectures on the Second Coming of Christ. Price 1s. 6d., and in Cloth, gilt, 2s.
Notes on the Gospel of Luke. Price 2s., Cloth.
A Series of Ten Papers on the Eternity of Punishment and the Immortality of the Soul. With a Preface by the Author. Price 1s. 9d., Cloth.
The different Papers may also be had separately for distribution.
Notes on the Epistle to Hebrews. Price 1s. 6d. cloth.
Notes on Scripture. Price 1s., Cloth, Post Free.
Notes on the Epistles to the Romans. Price 9d., Cloth Limp; and in extra Cloth, 1s.
Notes of Addresses on the Ways of God. By J. N. D. and G. V. W. Price 9d., Cloth Limp.
Thoughts on Psalm cxix. Cloth, 6d. 2 Copies Postage Free.
The Sabbath: Is the Law Dead, or am I? New Edition. Price 6d.
Meditations on the 16th and 17th Psalms. Price 6d., Cloth.
Christ's Work and its Consequences. Price 4d.
A Few Hymns and Spiritual Songs. New Edition. Cloth Limp, 6d., and in French Morocco Limp, gilt edges, for presents, 1s. 6d. Post Free.
An Address to his Roman Catholic Brethren. Price 3d.
On the Government of God and His Counsels in Grace; being Notes of an Address. Revised by the Author. Price 3d.
Brief Thoughts on the Apocalypse. Price 2d.
The Faithfulness of God, as seen in His ways with Balaam. Price 2d.
The Red Sea and the Wilderness. Price 1d. 12 Copies Postage Free.
Brief Notes of Addresses, delivered in Dublin, on Phil. iii. Price 1d.

By W. KELLY.

- Re-issue of the Bible Treasury in 1s. Parts. Vols. I. to IV. can now be had. Price 7s. 6d. each.
Lectures on the Book of Revelation. A new and revised edition. Price 5s.
Also the same, with a New Translation, &c. Price 6s. 6d.
Christ and the Seven Churches. Cloth, 1s. 6d., Post Free.
The Second Advent of Christ Pre-Millennial. Price 1s. 3d., Cloth.
Types of Scripture. Price 9d., Cloth Limp; and in extra Cloth, 1s.
Teetotalism and the Testimony of the Bible. Price 6d. (New edition.)
Notes on Matthew xiii.: being a Short Exposition of the Seven Parables. Price 6d. in cloth, and in paper covers 4d.
The Salvation of God, as Typified by the Red Sea and the Jordan. Price 3d.
Thoughts on Matthew xxv. Price 3d. 4 Copies Postage Free.
Thoughts Introductory to the Epistle to the Galatians. Price 2d.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

- Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer.** A New Edition. Price 2d. 6 copies Post Free.
- The Rest that Remaineth.** Price 1d.
- On Romans viii.** Price 1d.
- Thoughts on 1st Corinthians, chap. xv.**
- Presbyterianism Tested by the Word of God; a letter to the Editor of the "British Herald."** Price 1d.
- Christ the Last Adam and Second Man.** Price 1d. 12 Copies Postage Free.
-

By J. G. BELLETT.

- Miscellaneous Papers.** Edited by W. Kelly. Price 3s., Cloth.
- The Minor Prophets.** Price 2s.
- Short Meditations.** Price 3s. 6d.
- On the Return of the Lord Jesus Christ to meet His Saints in the Air.** Price 9d.
- The Confederacies of Men and the Judgments of God.** Price 2d.
- An Introduction to Isaiah.** Price 4d. 3 Copies Post Free.
- The Church at Thessalonica.** Price 3d.
- Convicted yet Confiding.** Price 1d.
- Waiting for the Son from Heaven.** Price 1d.
- A Few Words on St. Paul's General Epistles.** Price 1d.
-

By F. G. PATTERSON.

- The Blackrock Lectures on the Church of God, &c.** 1. The Body of Christ. 2. The House of God. 3. Christ amongst the Candlesticks. 4. Overcoming. 5. Our Present Condition and our Hope. 6. The Church of God in the Glory. Price 1s. 9d. Cloth, Bevelled Boards. These Lectures can also be had in separate Pamphlets, for distribution. Price 1s. 1d. per Set. Postage free.
- The Ways of God.** A brief outline of God's dealings with Israel, the Nations and the Church, and His purposes for the Glory of Christ. Price 2s.
- "Words of Truth,"** Edited by F. G. P., Vols. 1 to 5. Price 1s. 6d. each.
- The New Birth: What is it?** Price 6d., Cloth; Paper Covers, 4d.
- "There is one Body and one Spirit,"** and **"The Unity of the Spirit."** Price 3d.
- The Remnant Testimony.** Price 2d.
- "The Church which is His Body."** Price 1½d.
- God's Sovereignty and Man's Responsibility.** Price 1d.
- The Eternity of Punishment and Immortality of the Soul.** By J. N. D. Edited by F. G. Patterson. Cheap Edition. Price 1s. 3d., Cloth limp.
-

R. L. ALLAN, 15 Paternoster Row, London; and 73 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow.

57

1982

Digitized by Google

