

The Intermediate State

**A REPLY TO
DR. E. W. BULLINGER.**



By W. HOSTE.

The Intermediate State

A Reply to Dr. Bullinger.

W. S. GELDER, EVANGELIST

By W. HOSTE, B.A.,

Late of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Ridley Theological Hall.
Author of "The Coming of the Comforter," "Pentecost and After,"
"The Christ of God," &c., &c.



GLASGOW: PICKERING & INGLIS, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS
LONDON: ALFRED HOLNESS, 14 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
NEW YORK: D. T. BASS, 54 WEST TWENTY-SECOND ST., CITY

And may be ordered through most Booksellers and Colporteurs

BOOKS BY SAME AUTHOR.

- THE INTERMEDIATE STATE. A reply to Dr. Bullinger. Crown 8vo. 64 pages. 6d.
- PENTECOST AND AFTER. A reply to the no-baptism teachings of Dr. Bullinger and others. 72 pp. 3d.
- THE CHRIST OF GOD: His Humiliation and Glory. 3d.; in cloth, 6d. Also translated into French.
- CAN A CHRISTIAN FALL AWAY AND BE LOST? 2d. each, 1/6 per doz., or 50 for 3/6, post free. Also translated into French.
- THE COMING OF THE COMFORTER. 38 pages. 2d. Also translated into Italian.
- BAPTISM: ITS USES AND ABUSES. 1d. each, 50 for 4/, post free. Also translated into Italian.
- THE SERVICE OF SISTERS. Its Sanction and Scope. 2d. each.
- THE GREAT TRIBULATION THEORY. 2d. each.
- THINGS THAT DIFFER; Operations of the Holy Spirit Distinguished. 3d.
- IS THE REVELATION FUTURE? 1d.
- WORDS OF HELP. Letter Leaflets in Verse for Christians. 4d. per packet of 48. 8 varieties.
- WORDS OF TRUTH (Second series). Same price.
- WHY WEEPEST THOU? Lines for Mourners. On silver-edged court cards. For him or her. 4d. pkt. of 8.
- WHY ARE YE TROUBLED? Lines for the Tried and Tempted. On gilt-edged court cards.
- I SHALL SEE HER AGAIN. Lines for Mourners. Violet and Black and Silver. Court cards. 4d. for 8.

PICKERING & INGLIS, *Printers and Publishers, Glasgow.*

SYNOPSIS.

CHAPTER I.

THE TRUTH STATED (pp. 5, 6).

CHAPTER II.

THE SYSTEM UNDER REVIEW.

The Dangers of the System—Anonymous Conditionalism—Punishment—Gehenna—The Intermediate State—Perfect Quagmire of Heresies—Did the Son of God become Extinct?—"Annihilation" by any other name is the same deadly heresy (pp. 7-12).

CHAPTER III.

DR. BULLINGER'S WITNESSES CROSS-EXAMINED.

What is Death?—A False System of Exegesis—The Peculiar Character of the Ecclesiastes—The Fallacies of the System—Does God mean what He says? (pp. 13-20).

CHAPTER IV.

FALLACIES AND FANCIES EXPOSED.

What is Life?—Man and Brute Different—The Soul not Mortal—Man Tripartite—The Personality of Man—What Happens at Death?—Soul and Spirit never Divided—Soul and Spirit Distinguished—What is Life?—Is Hades "a Place of Silence"?—What is Hades?—Does Sheol mean "the Place of Corruption"? (pp. 21-34).

CHAPTER V.

OUR LORD'S DESCENT INTO HADES (pp. 35-37).

CHAPTER VI.

NOVEL INTERPRETATIONS CHALLENGED.

The Spirits in Prison (1 Peter iii. 18-20)—"The Lower Parts of the Earth"—"If it means more than this it is not true"—Satan's First Great Lie—The Special Revelation to the Thessalonians (pp. 37-43).

CHAPTER VII.

FOUR WITNESSES TO THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

Sadducees and the Resurrection—The Dying Malefactor—Absent from the Body to be Present with the Lord—Paul's Desire in Philippians i. 23 (pp. 44-54).

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS—Luke xvi. (pp. 55-61).

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

" There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day :

And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores,

And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table : moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom : the rich man also died, and was buried ;

And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue ; for I am tormented in this flame.

But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things : but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed : so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot ; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.

Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house :

For I have five brethren ; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.

Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets ; let them hear them.

And he said, Nay, father Abraham : but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.

And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."—Luke xvi. 19-31.

" I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints " (Jude 3).

The Intermediate State

A REPLY TO DR. BULLINGER.

"THY WORD IS TRUTH."—The Lord Jesus Christ.

"LET GOD BE TRUE AND EVERY MAN A LIAR."—The Apostle Paul.

"If it [*i.e.*, Ephesians iv. 9] means more than this it is not true."*

—E. W. Bullinger.

CHAPTER I.

THE TRUTH STATED.

A CERTAIN writer on the prophet Daniel warns would-be students of prophecy not to pose as prophets. Similarly those who teach "the things that are revealed" must not assume the rôle of "revealers of secrets."

This, then, is no attempt to satisfy what is termed "our natural curiosity" as to the present state of the departed, but a defence of the truth of their conscious existence between death and resurrection, as opposed to the doctrine of "soul-sleep" and the still more serious error of soul-extinction. If it has not pleased God to reveal much in His Word as to the actual conditions of this existence, what is known is very clear and amply sufficient to establish, at least, nine positive points. The state of the departed between death and resurrection is:

1. A *disembodied* state; described by the words "unclothed," or "absent from the body" (2 Cor. v. 4, 8).
2. A state of *real existence*. Though dead to the world and its activities, the departed are not dead to God, "for all live unto Him" (Luke xx. 38).

* "The Rich Man and Lazarus," page 41.

3. A *conscious* state—not one of sleep or insensibility. “He is comforted, and thou art tormented” (Luke xvi. 25).
4. A state of *recognition and remembrance*. “Father Abraham”; “Send Lazarus”; “Son, remember” (Luke xvi. 24, 25).
5. A state *at once entered upon*. “To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise” (Luke xxiii. 43). “The rich man died and was buried, and in hell (hades) he lifted up his eyes, being in torments” (Luke xvi. 22, 23).
6. A state of *being with Christ* (for the believer). “To be present with the Lord” (2 Cor. v. 8).
7. A state of *blessing* for the believer—“To depart and to be with Christ, which is very far better” (Phil. i. 23); of *suffering* for the ungodly—“I am tormented in this flame” (Luke xvi. 24).
8. A state of *waiting* for resurrection glory—“Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him” (1 Thess. iv. 14); or for resurrection judgment—“Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev. xx. 15).
9. An *irrevocable* state. The condition of the departed, though not final in degree, is yet fixed as to character. “Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed” (Luke xvi. 26).

But no doctrine, however plain, is beyond the cavillings of unbelief, and the truth of the intermediate state is no exception to the rule. The object of this booklet is to reply to a pamphlet by Dr. E. W. Bullinger, which is, in my judgment, most erroneous, and in general to testify to the truth on this subject as revealed in the Word of God.

CHAPTER II.

THE SYSTEM UNDER REVIEW.

THE pamphlet* by Dr. Bullinger, which I propose to examine, only came to my notice for the first time the other day. It has for its object to deny what is known as the Intermediate State, or the soul's existence, conscious or otherwise, between death and resurrection. With this in view, an effort is made to invalidate the testimony of our Lord's account of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke xvi., and to explain away such passages as Luke xxiii. 43 and Philippians i. 23. Though not a student of this author's general works, I know a few of his controversial writings. Anyone hoping to find therein accuracy of statement,† or logical sequence, will be greatly disappointed. His references to the original Greek cannot be accepted without great reserve; indeed in such matters as ‡ Greek rules and renderings, he may well be described as "a law unto himself."

On page 1 he claims the sympathy of "his fellow-members of the Body of Christ" in writing his booklet. It would indeed be "good and pleasant" to be able to accord such sympathy; but as the said booklet is by his own estimate opposed to the belief of nine-tenths of these same fellow-members, he is asking not a little.

It can hardly be to show his sympathy with those who differ from him, that throughout his book he calls us all Traditionists. This is an unjust aspersion, but we need not be greatly moved by it. It is the favourite weapon of all who share the author's views on the question before

* The Rich Man and Lazarus, or, "The Intermediate State."

† *c.g.*, pages 18 (closing section), 24 (last lines), 29 (top), 31 (foot note).

‡ *c.g.*, pages 34 (Hades), 46 (ζάω), 48 (σῆμαρ), 53 and 54 (foot notes).

us—Christadelphians, Annihilationists, and the like.* These men are always loud in their professed allegiance to the Word of God. To the rest they say, "Give up what you have learned; it is mere tradition." We need not, however, be in any hurry to do this on their mere "ipse dixit." "Buy the truth and sell it not" is much more seasonable advice.

We shall see later that this author is hardly so opposed "to the tradition of the fathers," as might at first appear; for, when it suits his case, he is quite ready to appeal to Councils, Creeds, the Talmud, and so forth.

The Dangers of the System.

He is not, I understand, a professed "annihilationist," but clearly he has studied, with a sympathetic interest, the works of this school. He has, as it is expressed, "borrowed their thunder," adopting one or other of their strange explanations all through his booklet, and it is not surprising to learn that he has been claimed by them as one of themselves. I have met one passage in his works where he speaks of "the heresy of the so-called 'larger hope.'" I never found one in which he protests against the heresy of so-called "conditional immortality."

Anonymous Conditionalism.

In fact, there are passages in the latest edition of his "Critical Lexicon" which fit in strangely well with "Conditionalist" teaching.

For instance his note on Immortality begins thus:

"Aphtharsia—incorruption, immortality. Not the inalienable possession of the human family since the fall, and now it is restricted . . . Athanasia—immortality expressly declared to be possessed by God alone."

This is exactly what the Conditional Immortality

* Witness the title of two Conditional Immortality works, "Bible *versus* Tradition," and "Truth and Tradition."

teachers say. But that "God only hath immortality" can only mean—hath it essentially; for He can and does communicate it to angels and to men, and the resurrection bodies of the saints are to partake of it (1 Cor. xv. 53, 54).

Punishment.

Again Dr. Bullinger defines "Punishment" (Kolasis*) in Matt. xxv. 46, to be "a result, not a process" *i.e.*, the eternal effect of an act, which is exactly what the "annihilationists" would have us believe. According to this definition, everlasting punishment is inflicted on a mad dog, for example, when it is killed; for certainly the result is eternal.

Gehenna.

In his note on Hell (Gehenna) in the same Lexicon the author curiously enough does not refer to one of the twelve occurrences of the word in the New Testament, but after giving us varied information of a very "traditional" character, which he certainly does not derive from the passages in the Old Testament to which he refers, he ends up with "*probably* used by our Lord as a *symbol* for the *notion* of a devouring judgment fire, which was current prior to the *possible* employment of Gehenna in this sense" (my italics). But a greater than Bullinger is here! Compare these drawn out, ambiguous phrases, these "probables," "possibles," "notions," &c., with the clear and emphatic words of our Lord in Mark ix. 43-48.

"If thy hand offend thee cut it off . . . it is better for thee to enter into life maimed than having two hands to be cast into hell-fire (Gehenna) into the fire that never shall be quenched."

* The termination "is" as in Kolasis punishment does on the contrary denote a process. For instance, dikaioma represents the act of justification, dikaios is the process.

Is this nothing more than "the symbol" of "a notion"? Did our Lord only "possibly" refer to judgment here? The whole passage in Dr. Bullinger's lexicon reads like the subtle insinuation of doubt on the subject of future punishment by a man who would fain undermine the general belief of Christians on this subject without incurring the stigma of heterodoxy.

I refer to these points at some length, that the dangers of the system under review may be well understood. Dr. Bullinger's whole teaching on these questions is a thinly-veiled "conditionalism" and leads his disciples straight into the arms of the heresy. A leading propagandist of his in London has, I am informed, just taken up with the denial of the solemn truth of eternal punishment, and only as I write I have heard of other cases.

The Intermediate State.

Objection is raised on p. 4 of the pamphlet under review to the expression "intermediate state," on the ground that it is a phrase unknown to Scripture; but so are such expressions as "the fall" "the Trinity" and "substitution"; nevertheless they represent scriptural facts. "Intermediate State" is a convenient phrase to indicate the condition of the soul between death and resurrection—that is, the state variously described in the Word of God as being in Sheol or Hades, "being with Christ" "being unclothed" "being absent from the body—present with the Lord." If the substance is admitted I am willing to exchange the term "Intermediate State" for any other term equally useful and expressive. This writer's real objection to the term is that it supposes the survival of the soul after death. For the same reason he objects to the expression, "soul-sleep." It does not go far enough for him. Now the "soul-sleep" doctrine is bad enough. It nullifies many Scriptures such as Philippians i. 23, "To be with

Christ, which is very far better." How could a dead sleep be "far better" for a man who, in spite of his trials, was "always rejoicing"? (2 Cor. vi. 10). The dying believer is thus robbed of his comfort; and the lie given to the experience and testimony resting on the Word of God of thousands of Christians on their death beds. Dr. Bullinger's doctrine is much worse. It is not "soul-sleep" but soul-extinction. The personality becomes non-existent. There is no soul to be asleep. This is far more subversive teaching, landing us in a

Perfect Quagmire of Heresies.

1. *It denies the scriptural doctrine of resurrection.* I know Dr. Bullinger talks much of resurrection, and generally, for some reason, prints it in capitals, but what he means by resurrection is really re-creation of an extinct personality, a thing unknown to scripture. The whole basis of our Lord's argument in Luke xx. 38 is that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though long before dead and buried, were surviving personalities, when God appeared to Moses in the bush.

The continued existence of the spiritual being of the three patriarchs in the disembodied state was the guarantee of future resurrection. The Word of God knows nothing of an annihilation of personality.

2. *It denies the present possession of eternal life by the believer.* The Lord assures us, "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life," but Dr. Bullinger says he has it, but "not yet in actual fruition"; whatever that is intended to mean. How could a man be said to "have eternal life," if at his death he became non-existent? A nonentity could not possess anything; so that at death the possession of eternal life would be alienated. This would entail a *hiatus in eternal life*, and predicate an eternal life, which is not eternal, which is a contradiction in terms.

3. *It denies the perpetual indwelling of the Spirit.* The

Lord promised "He shall abide with you for ever." "Soul extinction" makes this impossible, for how could the Spirit dwell with an extinct personality? How impossible it is to tamper with one part of the truth of God without introducing confusion into the whole! but there is worse to follow.

4. *It undermines the true doctrine of the person of Christ.* What is true of man as such must have been true of Him,* otherwise you deny His true humanity. Apply the theory under review to our blessed Lord. At the moment that He committed His Spirit into the hands of the Father, He must, according to this "soul-extinction" theory, have become "a dead-soul," in other words His personality became extinct. But He was a Divine Person, and His personality was connected with His humanity, as well as with His divinity.

Did the Son of God become Extinct?

Oh, no! we shall be told we must only think of Him here as man. Then are we to become Nestorians, and attribute to Him a double personality? Or Gnostics, and deny the reality of His death? Or again are we to divide His humanity from His divinity? It may be objected that the author does not use the terms soul-extinction or annihilation of the personality in his book. Well, it is not a question of his terms, but of his teaching. The things are there, whether the terms are or not, as we shall see later,† and

"Annihilation" by any other name is the same deadly heresy.

Many who have been dallying with this doctrine, and I am ready to believe that even the teachers themselves,

* Of course, this does not mean that our Lord was in any sense subject to death, but that when He voluntarily laid down His life, His death was a real one.

† See references to Dr. Bullinger's illustrations of the soul on pages 24, 25, 35, &c.

are unaware of all that it involves, but the fact remains that the true doctrine of the Person of Christ is at stake, and I am sure all who love that Person will recoil with horror from this baneful teaching, and the shameful tampering with the Word of God which it involves.

CHAPTER III.

DR. BULLINGER'S WITNESSES CROSS-EXAMINED.

What is Death?

On page 4 Dr. Bullinger asks, "What is death?" but we wait in vain for an answer, unless we are to accept as a definition the statement on page 5. "The dead are the dead; they are those who have ceased to live"; but this is mere trifling. No definition should contain the word to be defined, so we are left exactly where we were. How can we know what "ceasing to live" means until we know what life is? and Dr. Bullinger has not told us that. I suppose we shall be told "the living are the living; they are those who have not died." In his "Critical Lexicon," however, we read under the word "live" (*zao*), to live, not "*to exist*," for "*a thing can exist without living*." And so *vice versa*, by his own showing, a thing can cease to live and yet continue to exist, and therefore death is not necessarily cessation of existence. This is one great point at issue. When we say a man is dead we refer to his relation to this world, but we do not mean for a moment that as a personality he is extinct, and neither should Dr. Bullinger, if he would be true to his own lexicon. We ourselves constantly use the word "dead" in a relative sense. A Jew who receives Jesus of

Nazareth as the Christ and is baptised, is often counted as dead by his own people. A nun who "takes the veil" is supposed to be dead to the world. The Lord said of the Church of Sardis, "Thou hast a name to live and art dead." In none of these cases does the word "dead" carry with it the sense of non-existence. Consider, too, the words, "Let the dead bury their dead." "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. iv. 6), "dead in trespasses and sins." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead and buried, and yet to God were living. Without attempting a definition we may say with the Scriptures before us that death in its moral aspect connotes a condition of existence out of harmony with or of separation from God. The believer "shall never taste of death." He "sleeps" only; the worldling dies. Exactly the same physical process is described in both cases, but whereas physical dissolution brings the child of God into even closer relation with Christ than before, he is "present with the Lord," it seals the doom of the unrepentant sinner, and stamps as irrevocable his condition of alienation and separation from God. In his case "the great gulf is fixed," though he be in hades and not yet in hell, properly so called—*i.e.*, Gehenna (*vide*, Luke xvi. 23).

The doctrine of "soul extinction" leads straight to annihilationism, for if physical death means cessation of existence what can "the second death" mean but final and absolute annihilation? But the Word of God clearly teaches that "the second death" describes a *condition* of existence, not a *cessation* of existence. In Revelation xix. 20 we read of those two arch-rebels against God, "the beast and the false prophet," being cast alive into the lake of fire. A thousand years later they are found still existing in that fearful place (Rev. xx. 10). Those who affirm, as annihilationists do, that what will happen to anyone cast into the lake of fire, will be precisely

what would happen to anyone cast into a furnace, seem to forget the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego.

A False System of Exegesis.

On pages 4-8 Dr. Bullinger undertakes to show us "what God says about death." Out of "many passages" at his disposal he chooses five. We must suppose they are the strongest he can find for his purpose. On these five passages "hang all the law and the prophets" for Dr. Bullinger, and we may add, all the gospels and epistles. They are to settle the question "plainly, directly, categorically, and unmistakably" (*vide* page 49 of Dr. Bullinger's book), for all the rest of the Bible. New Testament passages, however clearly they seem to speak of conscious existence between death and resurrection (and Dr. Bullinger admits there *are* some such), cannot really do so, for their testimony has been rendered null and void by five passages in the Psalms and Ecclesiastes; at least this is what our author would have us believe. This is a thoroughly false principle of dealing with the truth of God. Every heresy that has afflicted the Church can find some support from garbled quotations from the Scriptures, but no heresy can bear the light of the whole Word of God. If there were sixty-six witnesses in a case all of equal credibility it would not be a just procedure to take the testimony of two of them and refuse to hear the rest. This is what Dr. Bullinger does. Only in his case he does not even give a fair hearing to his two witnesses, but an *ex-parte* interpretation of their testimony. Certainly his method is arbitrary, and his scope of inquiry very limited. Five verses chosen by Dr. Bullinger from the Psalms and Ecclesiastes are to settle the whole question. The verses, then, must be very clear, and we must be convinced that Dr. Bullinger's interpretation of them is the right one.

Dr. Bullinger's five witnesses are: (1) Psalm cxlvi. 4;

(2) Psalm cxlvi. 2; (3) Psalm civ. 29; (4) Ecclesiastes ix. 5; (5) Ecclesiastes xii. 7. Let us see if he has rightly interpreted their testimony.

1. *Psalm cxlvi. 4* is a warning not to trust in man, "in whom is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." This does not profess to give a scientific analysis of death. There is not a word about "that which has done the thinking perishing," as Dr. Bullinger suggests, nor his powers of thinking, but "his thoughts." This is the only place in which the word translated here "thoughts" occurs. Young, in his Analytical Concordance, gives "thoughts, purposes," and Dr. Perowne, in his work on the Psalms gives in his note "purposes or schemes." Man may purpose to help, but if death come in, his purposes perish. A dead man can do nothing for you. It is better to trust in the Lord, which "keepeth truth for ever" (verse 6). I think it will be seen that our author has misinterpreted the testimony of his first witness.

2. *Psalm cxlvi. 2*. "While I live will I praise the Lord, I will sing praises unto my God, while I have any being." "While I live," should be, as G. V. Wigram points out, *lit.* "in my life." David is not making an eschatological statement here. He does not say that "his having any being" terminates with this scene. We may put along side of this such expressions as "I will give thanks unto Thee *for ever*" Psalm xxx. 12 (see also Psalm lxi. 4; lxxxix. 1). The Psalmist is not thinking of dying at all, but of praising continually. That such a verse can be quoted as disproving conscious existence after death only shows, as Jeremy Taylor puts it, in another connection "the absence of better proof."

3. *Psalm civ. 29*. "Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust." Even if the Psalmist was speaking of men here, one hardly sees how this verse would prove "soul-extinction," as it does not profess to

say what happens to the *soul* after death. I think the context clearly shows the passage refers to the brute creation, but perhaps Dr. Bullinger wishes us to infer that we are even as they. In the case of man, however, we know that the spirit returns at death to God, who gave it.

4. *Ecclesiastes ix. 5.* "The dead know not anything." These five words are the corner-stone of Dr. Bullinger's whole edifice; with them he undertakes to overthrow the testimony of our Lord's account in Luke xvi., and other witnesses to the truth of the "Intermediate State." But in order to truly weigh the evidence of these five words, we should examine their context; for words quoted haphazard, even from Scripture, may prove nothing. By this method it would be easy to show that "there is no God," that "we should do evil that good may come," and that the true end of man is "to eat and drink for to-morrow he dies." But the context of Psalm xiv. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 32; and Rom. iii. 8 gives us God's estimate of those who speak thus. Let us quote at least part of the context in *Ecclesiastes v*: "No man knoweth either love or hatred by all that is before them." Verse 2: "All things come alike to all—as is the good so is the sinner." Verse 5: "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."

The Peculiar Character of the Ecclesiastes.

There is no book of the Bible which needs to be more carefully "divided" and read in the light of the rest of God's Word than the *Ecclesiastes*. In it we have the inspired account of the working of man's deceitful heart. "I considered in my heart" * (verse 1), and we learn the

* The words "under the sun" occur nearly thirty times in the book. "I considered in my heart," and analogous phrases, at least twelve times in the first nine chapters, and no doubt they affect the sense of their context.

utter futility of man's poor wisdom to solve the problems even of this scene, and much less those of the unseen world. The Romanist uses the first words quoted above to prove that "no man can know whether he is saved or not for eternity"; the fatalist might with equal reason quote, "All things come alike to all." The libertine, "As is the good, so is the sinner." The infidel, "The dead have no more a reward." Would Dr. Bullinger accept such statements as "the plain direct categorical" revelation of God as to the future state? Is it not special pleading to take these words, "the dead know not anything," which occur in the same context, and pretend that they are a complete and definite revelation of God on the subject of the "Intermediate State"? I think it is clear that we must read the whole passage in the light of that phrase that occurs in the book again and again. "Under the sun,"* that is, as far as the world is concerned, or as far as a man's own heart can tell. The rich man in hades knew who and where he was, he realised the present, remembered the past, dreaded the future. He remembered he had five brethren, and that as far as he could tell they were still "serving mammon," as he had done; but he knew nothing of what was actually passing in the upper world. If in verse 8 of the preceding chapter, Solomon is obliged to confess that by "applying his heart," he only knew "that a man *cannot find out* the work that is done under the sun," how, by the same process (ix. 1), would he possibly know what the condition of things is in the under world?

5. *Ecclesiastes xii. 7*, the last of the five proof texts really proves exactly the contrary to what the doctor intends. "Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it," to which our author adds the characteristic statement, "nothing is said in Scripture as to the spirit apart from the body." I should have thought it was something to know that the

"*spirit returns to God*," a statement which fits in perfectly with the last words of our Lord and of Stephen. This verse then distinctly asserts that man, viewed as a spiritual entity, does continue to exist after death. Our Lord, too, tells us something further about a spirit apart from the body, "It hath not flesh and bones" (Luke xxiv. 39). In Heb. xii. 13, we read of "spirits of just men made perfect," as actually existing apart from the body. Acts xxiii. 7 distinguishes between angels and spirits, and in 1 Peter iii. we read of disobedient spirits in prison, *i.e.*, not "angels," but "human" spirits apart from the body.

This verse, therefore, only proves that when men die the spiritual part of them does survive, the exact opposite of what the doctor wished to prove. These, then, are the proof texts which Dr. Bullinger would have us believe settle "plainly, directly, categorically, and unmistakably" the whole question of what happens between death and resurrection. Truly, "the *living* know not anything" if they can accept such feeble proofs.

The Fallacies of the System.

The whole principle of exegesis is false. Why turn from the noonday sun to the light of the dawn? "Jesus Christ has abolished death, and brought life and incorruptibility to light through the Gospel." The New Testament passages should govern the Old, not the Old Testament the New. But the testimony of the New Testament is rigidly ruled out of court by this writer, until the meaning of terms has been stereotyped from the Old. By this false method the Messiahship of our blessed Lord might be undermined. Does it not say "plainly, directly, unmistakably," in Genesis iii. 15 that the true Messiah would meet his death by a wound in his heel, therefore it would be impossible for one who died by crucifixion to be the true Messiah. This is Dr.

Bullinger's style of argument. He tries to fix his terms inflexibly from the Psalms and the Ecclesiastes, and when he comes to the chief witnesses—the New Testament passages—he discredits their testimony, and says they cannot mean what they seem to mean, because "the dead know not anything." But the "preacher" tells us in the previous chapter that "a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat and to drink and be merry" (viii. 15). Are we therefore to set aside all the teachings of our Lord and His apostles as to holy living? Yet this would be the logical outcome of Dr. Bullinger's reasoning if applied all round.

Does not God mean what He says?

On page 7 Dr. Bullinger tries to make capital out of the evident truth that when God wishes to say one thing He does not use the opposite word. But why, then, if death means soul-extinction does God call it "sleep"? Why does the Spirit speak of a man becoming "unclothed" if He meant "non-existent." The word "unclothed" predicates someone in the unclothed state. Sleep well *describes* death. A person asleep is for the nonce cut off from outside relations, as the dead are cut off from their old friends, associations, earthly rewards, &c.

If we are "traditionists," then we are in good company. Paul spake of being "unclothed" (2 Cor. v. 4), of his "departure" (2 Tim. iv. 6), Peter of "putting off his tabernacle." Does a traveller become extinct when he strikes his tent? The very term, "put off," suggests someone who is no longer in the tabernacle. We do not say, as Dr. Bullinger affirms we do, that "death means life," or that "falling asleep" means "waking up," but we do deny that death means extinction, or falling asleep "non-existence." In fact we appeal from Dr. Bullinger, pamphleteer, to Dr. Bullinger, lexicographer, and we

find that a man can exist without living and so cease to live without ceasing to exist. The believer viewed in connection with his body is asleep, in connection with his Spirit he is "with Christ," he is "present with the Lord," but not in the full enjoyment of what he will possess at resurrection.

CHAPTER IV.

FALLACIES AND FANCIES EXPOSED.

Dr. Bullinger next asks, "What is life?" and quotes Genesis ii. 7, as an answer "God made man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath (n'shamach) of life (plural) and man became a living soul."

What is Life?

This verse does not tell us what life is, nor does it profess to give an analysis of man's psychology. It is important to notice that no reference is made in the verse to spirit (*ruach*), and yet according to Dr. Bullinger's teaching which he deduces from this verse, it is the spirit (which is not mentioned) and the body which make the soul, an unscriptural notion propounded previously by Roberts, the Christadelphian writer.

Man and the Brute—Different!

This verse presents to us an account of man's creation which leaves no doubt as to the essential difference between man and the brutes, as originally constituted, a distinction which Dr. Bullinger and his friends persistently minimize, as witness all the quotations which follow. He inveighs against the translators of our Authorized Version for not always translating *nephesh* (soul) by the same English word, and this they do, he complains, "to suit the exigencies of traditionists" (*sic*).

They ought, I suppose, to have translated Leviticus xx. 1, "going into a dead soul," or Numbers xix. 11, 12: "Whosoever toucheth the dead soul of anyone that is dead." The translators and revisers were not mere amateurs, but knew Hebrew and the primary and secondary meanings of words. At any rate I am sure we may absolve them from any conspiracy against Dr. Bullinger and his views. Would he have them translate Genesis iii. 8: "The Lord God walking in the garden in the *Spirit* of the day," because it is the same word translated in Genesis i. 2: "The *Spirit* of the Lord moved on the face of the waters"?

Dr. Bullinger complains that only once, in Genesis ii. 7, is the Hebrew phrase "nephesh chayah" translated "living soul," "as though it there meant something quite different altogether." And so it may well do, seeing that God said words and did acts at the creation of man which clearly emphasize the immense difference between it and that of the brutes. "Let us make them in our own image" was never said of these latter, nor did God breathe into their nostrils the breath of life. As the late W. Kelly says: "All animals were living souls, but they lived when made. Not so man; the outer vessel was formed by God for man, and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Man alone had the wondrous privilege of God's inbreathing . . . derived his very soul from the inbreathing of God. This is the ground of his special relationship with God."*

We read in 1 Cor. xv. 39 that "all flesh is not the same flesh," and we know that all spirits are not the same spirits, though the same Hebrew word is used of the Spirit of God, and the spirit or breath of a beast. In the same way, all souls are not the same souls, though the same Hebrew word is used throughout. In 1 Peter iii. 20, we read that, "few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

* W. Kelly, in "Soul neither Mortal nor to Sleep."

The scores of brute souls in the ark are left out of account, as incomparably lower in the scale of creation than Noah and his family.

As a matter of fact, *nephesh* (soul) has varied meanings, as for instance, (1) the vital principle in animals; (2) a person possessing such a life; (3) one of the spiritual parts of man's tripartite being, and may be translated (1) creature; (2) person (*e.g.*, "all the souls"); (3) soul.

The Soul not Mortal.

The Conditionalists never tire of repeating that the soul is nowhere said to be immortal. Will they find a passage where it is said to be mortal? The eternal existence of the soul is never called in question in the Word of God. As W. Kelly again says, "Man's body only is treated in Scripture as mortal (Rom. vi. 12; viii. 11), never his soul or his spirit. So we read in 2 Cor. iv. 11 of 'our mortal flesh.' Again 2 Cor. v. 4, 'what is mortal' applies only to the body which will be swallowed up of life at Christ's appearing."* "God only hath immortality," that is essentially, but He communicates it, as we have seen, to angels and to men.

Man Tripartite.

The Christadelphian conception of man's psychology, namely, that the spirit and the body together form a third thing, a living-soul, is one that appeals strongly to Dr. Bullinger's imagination. He adorns it with a wealth of illustration. "There is the *barrel* and there is the *stock*, but together they form and are called a *RIFLE*. Neither is the rifle separately. *Oxygen* and *hydrogen* are two separate and distinct elements, but when they are united we call them *WATER*. So also we have the *case* and the *works*, but together they form what we call a *watch*: neither is the

* W. Kelly, in "Soul neither Mortal nor to Sleep."

watch separately." One always thought a rifle was made up of *lock*, *stock*, and *barrel*. A rifle without a lock would be as poor an affair as a man with the hybrid soul of Dr. Bullinger's fancy. According to this conception "soul" is merely a *name* for the whole, of which spirit and body form the parts, or a sort of chemical composition of spirit and body. But is this how Scripture views it? Let 1 Thess. v. 23 answer: "I pray God your Spirit and Soul and Body be preserved entire until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (R.V.). This prayer will not fit by any ingenuity into the "stock and barrel" theory. Fancy taking a parcel to a gunsmith and begging him to keep "the barrel, and the rifle, and the stock" entire until you return. He would certainly expect to find three articles in the parcel, and would think you a very strange customer if he found only one—a rifle. What a misleading way of speaking it would be to say I had lost my "works, and my watch, and my case," if I only meant my watch; but not more misleading than for Paul to say, "spirit and soul and body," had he only meant soul. Were the order of the words different, say, "soul, spirit, and body," it might be contended that "spirit and body" were merely explanatory; but the actual order of the words precludes this, and proves man tripartite.

The only attempt Dr. Bullinger makes to prove that the body and the spirit make the soul, is by the quotation of Genesis ii. 7, which says nothing about it ("spirit" (*ruach*), as we have seen, being not even mentioned in the verse), and by the illustrations referred to above, which only beg the question, and yet he does not hesitate to say at the bottom of page 9: "*The teaching of Scripture (sic) is (as we have seen) that man consists of two parts: body and spirit, and that the union of these two makes a third thing which is called 'soul' (my italics). . . Hence the word 'soul' is used of the whole personality*" (Dr. Bullinger's italics). Are we not justified in affirming that Dr. Bullinger's

teaching is that the soul ceases to exist when spirit and body are separated in death, and that this does entail extinction of the personality. The above sentence well illustrates the absence of accuracy and of logical sequence complained of on page 7 of the present pamphlet.

The Personality of Man.

(a) Of course the figure of speech (metonymy) by which a part is taken for the whole is common enough. In China, where the commissariat problem is an unusually pressing one, people are reckoned as "mouths." In factories, shipyards, &c., where the great question seems often to be how much work can be got out of men, they are called "hands"; but in the Scriptures, where man is viewed specially in relation to his eternal destiny, persons are spoken of as "souls." But to argue from this that therefore the soul is always regarded in the Word of God as the seat of the personality is going, I believe, much too fast and too far.

The personality is constantly associated or identified in the Scriptures, as well as in ordinary language, either with the whole being of man or with the separate parts of his being. An illustration may help to make this clear. Before the Married Women's Property Act of 1870, if property were given to a husband and wife jointly, they were regarded as taking it by "entireties"—that is to say, all was held to belong to each. During their life the property might be viewed as altogether the husbands', or altogether the wife's. They were, in other words, looked upon legally as one person. So we may say that the personality is reckoned by "entireties," and is sometimes identified with the spirit or soul, and sometimes with the body. If we refer to the decease of a Christian, we say he is "with Christ"; but we also speak of burying *him*, and of *his* grave, *his* will, &c. We do not mean that his

body is with Christ, any more than that his spirit is in the grave. Lazarus' body was not in Paradise, nor was the rich man's spirit in his grave. When Stephen "fell asleep" we read that "devout men carried him to his burial" (here his personality is viewed as still linked with his remains), but Stephen viewed in a higher relation was not there, but with Him to whom he had prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit."

What Happens at Death?

(b) At death the spiritual or immaterial part of man is separated from the body, but does not for all that cease consciously to exist. "The body without the spirit is dead;" but it does not say, "The spirit without the body is dead," which would have fitted in better with the parallelism of the verse had it been possible to say so (see James ii. 26). "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." This is the broad statement. We have to come to the New Testament for fuller details as to place and condition.

Soul and Spirit never Divided.

Though soul and spirit are clearly distinguished, they are never spoken of as being divided, except in a figurative sense. We read in Hebrews iv. that "The Word of God . . . pierces even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." Its capacity to do this is given as a supreme proof of its probing and separating character. Spirit and soul together represent the two sides of the immaterial part of man, as one has said, "The Soul is the external aspect of the Spirit, and the Spirit the internal aspect of the Soul."* This spiritual part of man is sometimes spoken of as the Spirit (Eccles. x. 11); sometimes as the Soul (Matt. x. 28).

* F. Delitzsch, "System of Biblical Psychology" (Wallis), page 179.

Soul and Spirit Distinguished.

(c) "*How is the Spirit distinguished from the Soul?*"* All men have a spirit. "God formeth the spirit in man" (Zech. xii. 1). "And man became a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7). It is the spirit in man that apprehends, understands, &c., "What thing knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him" (1 Cor. ii. 11). The soul is that which desires, loves, sorrows. "My soul is cast down within me" (1 Psa. xlii. 6). "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David" (1 Sam. 18. 1; see also Num. xxi. 4; 2 Sam. v. 8; Psalm xlii. 7). Dr. Lightfoot says, "The soul includes the feelings and impulses, but the ruling faculty is the spirit, by which alone communication is maintained with God."† "They that worship Him must worship Him in *spirit* and in truth" (John iv. 23).

(d) *Distinction between the soul and the body.* It would hardly seem necessary to discuss anything so self-evident, but the two are confused by some.

They are, however, carefully distinguished in Matthew x. 28: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Is it not abundantly clear that here the body and soul are contrasted? Man can kill the body, but cannot touch the soul. The soul does not die with the body. God can destroy ‡ both soul and body in hell. Dr. Bullinger inserts "the personality" after "the soul" in the first part of this verse, and "the whole personality" after "soul

* See F. W. Grant, "Facts and Theories of a Future State," page 67.

† "Notes on Epistles of St. Paul," page 88.

‡ The word "destroy" (*apollumi*) does not mean "to annihilate" either in English or Greek. Mark ii. 22: "the bottles are marred" (*apollumi*), that is, become useless for their original purpose. Cf. also Matt. x. 6, 39, 42, where the same word is used. Also Hosea: "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in Me is thy help." In Deut. xxviii., Israel is said to be destroyed seven times (verses 20, 24, 51, 62, 63), and yet after this seven-fold destruction, the Lord says He will "scatter them." If destruction meant "annihilation," there would be nothing left to scatter.

and body" at the close of the verse; though how this helps his case, and what the difference between "the personality" and "the whole personality" is not plain. Has a man two personalities? Has he even one-and-a-half? No, he only has one, and that the whole one.

The spiritual part of man will survive the sword or the flames of man's judgment, but the body and soul of him who fears not God, but man, must endure the judgment of God in hell.

(e) *The survival of the soul* is taken for granted throughout Scripture, and is directly proved in many passages. For instance, the story of the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii.) shows us Samuel not in resurrection, but "ascending out of the earth" in immaterial form, for he was visible only to the woman who had the familiar spirit. I think it is quite clear that Saul only recognised Samuel by the woman's description of him (verse 28). The whole thing was so different from her ordinary spiritualistic séances, that she herself cried out from fear. She was not deceived. She knew she was in the presence of something far beyond her powers. It was the power of God causing Samuel to appear to her. The souls seen by John under the altar are another instance. "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God . . . and they cried with a loud voice" (Rev. vi. 9-10). We shall be told that this is a figure. Well, a figure of what? Of something which, according to Dr. Bullinger, could not possibly occur. I prefer to believe, if it was a figure, that it was used to illustrate a reality, not an impossibility. Man had wreaked his vengeance on these faithful men. Their bodies had been slain, but they to God were living.

What is Life?

Dr. Bullinger's answer to this question on pages 8 and 9 is even more unsatisfactory than his definition of death.

After quoting some verses to show that animals have, or are, living souls (*e.g.*, Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 30; ii. 9; ix. 10, 12, 15, 16; Lev. xi. 10, 46), he proceeds thus, page 9: "This, then, is God's answer to our question, What is life." This is another flagrant instance of Dr. Bullinger's baneful habit of inaccurate statement and confused reasoning. Look up the verses in question. They speak of life, it is true, but contain nothing approaching to a description or a definition of it. He says they are "God's answer to the question," but they contain no answer whatever.

Dr. Bullinger's loose reasoning is bad enough; but to make God a party to it by imputing to Him what He has not said is far worse.

Is Hades "a Place of Silence."

We are asked to believe that "Hades is a place of silence." To prove it we are referred once more to this author's favourite chapter, Ecclesiastes ix. But the verse 10, to which he refers, simply enjoins us "to do with our might what our hands find to do," for, once in the unseen world, our time to work is over, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave where thou goest"—in other words, "the night cometh when no man can work." The rich man might have warned his five brethren when he was with them; now it is too late. He is helpless, and the result of his prayer to Abraham shows it; but the conversation narrated in Luke xvi. proves to anyone, who has ears to hear the words of Christ, that Hades is *not* a place of silence. Really Ecclesiastes ix. if pressed literally, as Dr. Bullinger would press it, is in favour of those who deny a future life at all. The words, for instance, "no more a reward" in verse 5, or "no more a portion for ever" in verse 6, might thus be made to negative all future reward or even resurrection.

Does Dr. Bullinger deny any share in the millennial reign of Christ to saints who have died? "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" (Rev. xx. 4), are words which prove they will have a portion in it and a sure reward. Again, there are passages in the prophets which present to us "Hades" as the very contrary of a place of silence. "Sheol from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming. It stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth. All they shall *speak*" (Isaiah xiv. 9). This does not represent a condition of unconscious slumber or silence. Again in Ezekiel xxxii. 21 we read: "The strong among the mighty shall *speak* to him out of the midst of Sheol." The objection that these are poetic fictions does not, as Delitzsch truly points out,* set aside their demonstrative power. Jonah too says, "Out of the belly of Sheol cried I" (chapter ii. 2). His experience was of one in Sheol, and for him Sheol was clearly not a place of silence. From the point of view of the earth, the under-world is a place of silence; the rich man could not speak *to* his brethren, but he could speak of them.

What is Hades?

When Dr. Bullinger wishes to explain "Gehenna," or 'Tartarus' in his "Critical Lexicon," he argues as to their meaning from Jewish and Mythological sources, but because the ordinary classical meaning of Hades tallies exactly with the general belief of Christians as to the Intermediate State, he wishes to rigidly exclude even a

* F. Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology.

† In his tract, "Sheol and Hades," he tries to justify this by a new, what I can only call precarious translation of Psalm xii. 6, and that in the face of our translators and revisers who give, "as silver tried in a furnace of earth, or on the earth, purified seven times." This Dr. Bullinger translates after his manner, "as silver tried in a furnace, *words of earth*, purified seven times." "The word of earth" in question being of course Hades, because its old sense favours the general belief of Christians as to an Intermediate State. "*Hopelessly far-fetched*," is the comment of a Hebrew scholar in Cambridge, a sufficient authority, to whom I referred Dr. Bullinger's translation.

shade of its original meaning. We shall see later how far this arbitrary procedure is warranted by the facts.

Does Sheol mean "the Place of Corruption"?

On page 12 Dr. Bullinger states that Hades or Sheol mean the grave, not in heathen mythology, but in the Word of God. As a matter of fact both words mean in the Word of God what Hades meant in heathen writers—"the place of departed spirits," "the unseen world." Again, page 13, he asserts that "Sheol is the place where 'corruption' is seen." Let us, however, test Dr. Bullinger's statements by the Scriptural usage of the words. The word "Hades" occurs eleven times in the New Testament. It is only once translated "grave" (1 Cor. xv. 55), and that occurrence is omitted by the revisers on good authority. Once it is translated "hell" in text, and "grave" in margin (Rev. xx. 13); in the nine other places "hell." The word is always translated Hades in the Revised Version. There are good reasons for this. When the Holy Spirit wishes to express the grave in the sense of a tomb, "a place where corruption is seen," He employs two other words closely allied to one another, but quite distinct from Hades—"mnema" and "mnemeion." These occur about fifty times (*e.g.*, Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark v. 5; Acts ii. 29).

As to Sheol* it occurs about seventy-five times in Old Testament, and is translated "grave" or "hell" thirty-one times each, and three times "pit"; *e.g.*, Jacob says:

*Statistics are proverbially deceptive. Dr. Bullinger's are no exception to the rule. For instance, he is discussing the meaning of Sheol in his tract "Hades and Sheol," and is seeking to show that "the grave" is the right translation. Then he proceeds: "Sheol is translated by 'the grave' thirty-one times, 'hell' thirty-one times, 'pit' three times—sixty-five times in all. *In the margin 'the grave' is put four times [only twice according to Wigram's 'Englishman's Hebrew Concordance'—W.H.] for 'hell' (in the text), thus neutralising four passages by reducing the total of 'hell' renderings to twenty-seven, and correspondingly raising the total of 'grave' renderings to thirty-five (sic).* It will be observed that *in a majority of cases Sheol is rendered the 'grave' (my italics).* To be exact, 54% 'the grave,' while 'hell' is 41½%, and 'pit' only 4½%." These results have been embodied in at least two other of Dr. Bullinger's works. His conception of the meaning of the word "to neutralise" is certainly original. It only shows how bias can blind a man's eyes.

Genesis xxxvii. 35: "I will go down into the grave unto my son with sorrow."

Deuteronomy xxxii. 22: "Shall burn unto the lowest *hell*."

Psalm ix. 17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."

Psalm xviii. 5: "The sorrows of hell compassed me."

Psalm xxx. 3: "Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave."

Jonah ii. 2: "Out of the belly of hell (margin, the grave), cried I."

Can anyone read these passages and not feel that something more than merely "a place of corruption" is intended?

The revisers explain the principle on which they have translated the word (*Sheol*) in their preface, which anyone can refer to. They make two noteworthy statements which I suppose Dr. Bullinger ascribes to another conspiracy against his views. "The Hebrew '*Sheol*' signifies the abode of departed spirits, and corresponds to the Greek '*Hades*,' or the under-world . . . It does not signify 'the place of burial.'" It is true that Dr. Bullinger admits in one place that *Sheol* and *Hades* signify "the grave" rather than "a grave," but this admission is discounted by his repeated assertion that *Sheol* is "the place where corruption is seen." The statement of our revisers can be easily tested by anyone having access to G. V. Wigram's "Englishman's Hebrew Concordance." We there find that there are four words besides "*Sheol*" translated grave in the Old Testament; and that when the Spirit of God wished to speak of the grave as the place of burial, or as "the place where corruption is seen," He uses not "*Sheol*," but one of the other words.

(a) The first word, "*b'gee*" (Job xxx. 24), we may leave out, as the translation is doubtful.

(b) The next word, "*shah-gath*," is important. It occurs over twenty times, and is constantly translated pit (*e.g.*, Job xxxiii. 18, 24; xxviii. 20), or grave (*e.g.*,

Job xxxiii. 22). It is also translated in certain places corruption (*e.g.*, Psalm xvi. 10; xlix. 9; Jonah ii. 6). The first and third of these instances deserve special notice. David's words, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (Sheol), NEITHER wilt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption (the pit)"; bears out forcibly, as we have seen, the distinction between "Sheol," the place where the spiritual part of man goes to, and "the pit," where the body may see corruption, but where our blessed Lord saw no corruption. From Jonah ii. there seems little doubt that the prophet had really believed himself dead. He thought himself in Sheol, and in verse 2 he tells us that he had cried from thence and been heard; but in verse 6 he speaks of another deliverance—namely, from the pit of corruption. Soul and body had in figure been saved from their respective places. Again, Psalm xlix. 9 says: "That He should still live for ever and not see *corruption*" (*shah-gath*), whence it is evident that when the thought to be expressed is the grave, "where corruption is seen," "*shah-gath*," not "Sheol," is the word used.

(c) The third word is "*keh-ver*," which occurs seventy times, and means a literal grave (*e.g.*, Isa. liii. 9, "He made His *grave* with the wicked"; Isa. xiv. 19, "Thou art cast out of Thy grave"). Genesis l. 5, Joseph reports Jacob as having said, "Lo, I die: in my *grave* which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan let me be buried." This, I think, clearly proves that when he spoke, as we have seen in Genesis xxxvii. 35, of going down into the grave (Sheol), he was not speaking of a literal grave, but of the unseen world. In the same way David speaks of "going to his dead child," who was not yet in his grave, which shows that David did not confuse, as these teachers do, the sepulchre and the unseen world. Jacob, too, thought his son had been "devoured by wild beasts," therefore never buried at all, and yet he talks of going to him when he dies.

(c) There is yet another word, "k'voorah," used four times for a grave, and ten times for burial, &c.

I think a consideration of these facts will show that Sheol does not mean the grave, "the place of corruption," but the "unseen world," a sense that fits in exactly with its New Testament equivalent "Hades." Etymologically the meaning of Hades is clear. It is derived from two words representing "not" and "to see"—hence the "unseen world."

As Dr. Bullinger is only too willing to take "Gehenna" and "Tartarus" in their Jewish and mythological meanings, by what right does he affirm so dogmatically that "Hades" must have a perfectly new sense in the New Testament, divorced from its original meaning, especially when the old sense fits so well all the occurrences of the word in the New Testament? Why should the Holy Spirit have adopted a word which etymologically and historically meant the "unseen world" of departed spirits to express the quite different thought of "a place where corruption is seen"? The only reason why we are asked to adopt this view is that the sense of "unseen world" supports the ordinary Christian belief, and the only argument that Dr. Bullinger brings forward is the precarious "home-made" translation of Psalm xii. 6, to which reference has been already made (see page 30, footnote). Really this is expecting too much from his readers!

To return for one moment to Psalm xvi. 10, the New Testament commentary on the passage, Acts ii. 29, makes it plain. The soul of Christ was in Hades. His flesh was in Joseph's tomb. At resurrection these two were reunited. But the circumstance of this reunion only emphasises the fact that the soul had been existing in Hades while the body lay in the grave. According to Dr. Bullinger's new teaching the personality of our blessed Lord must have been extinguished at His death, and there was no such person as Jesus of Nazareth existent in the

universe between His death and resurrection, just as, according to his materialistic illustration, if the stock and barrel are separated, the rifle exists no longer. It would be more sensible to say that the rifle had been divided, but existed still in its separate parts. Fancy a jeweller telling me that my watch existed no longer because he had taken the works out of the case. The works of a watch do not need the case in order to keep moving. Who has not seen the works of a watch "going" beneath a glass on a watchmaker's bench? Thus a spirit unclothed of its fleshly case does not cease to live; yet it is by illustrations of this sort that Dr. Bullinger would seek to obscure such plain scriptures as "to depart and be with Christ, which is far better," and to set on one side the testimony of Luke xvi. to the intermediate state.

CHAPTER V.

OUR LORD'S DESCENT INTO HADES.

This our author undertakes to disprove, and we are treated to an excursus (pages 14-16) on bishops, councils, creeds, which fairly takes our breath away. I do not object at all to a reference to such things. We owe a great debt to past defenders of the faith which we do well to recognise, as long as we are allowed to check their conclusions by the Word of God. But if we, poor simple folk, ventured to mention such a thing as a Church Council we should be denounced by Dr. Bullinger as "traditionists."

Dr. Bullinger quotes from Bishop Pearson* on the

* Bishop Pearson, "Exposition of the Creed." Fourth Edition. Edited 1857. Pages 402-403.

Creed to the effect that "the observation of Ruffinus, who first expounded the phrase, 'He descended into hell,' was most true, 'that though the early creeds had not in them these words, yet they had the sense of them in the words, "He was buried." It appeareth, therefore, that the first intention of putting the words in the Creed, was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of His body into the grave'." It was unfortunate that Dr. Bullinger's quotation stopped short exactly here, for the very next word is a 'but,' and *Bishop Pearson goes on to warn against the very inference* that Dr. Bullinger wishes us to draw, namely, that because the truth of our Lord's descent into Hades was not early in the creed, it was not believed in the early church. Bishop Pearson says this is a false inference, for in spite of what has gone before, he says, "*the ancient church did certainly believe that Christ did, some other way, descend beside His burial, and Ruffinus himself, though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviour's death, makes mention of His descent into hell beside and distinct from His sepulture.*"

Bishop Pearson then proceeds to prove from Psalm xvi. 10 and Acts ii. 25-31, that our Lord's descent into Hades "*beside and distinct*" from His burial, is a clearly established fact. He points out the fulfilment of David's words in Psalm xvi. 10, in our Lord's death and resurrection, "He foreseeing this, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that NEITHER was He left in Hades, NOR did His flesh see corruption" (R.V.).

What authority is there for ignoring the "neither" and the "nor," and affirming that "the two lines are strictly parallel, and that the second expands and explains the first"? The grammarians of the New Testament Greek* are opposed to any such theory. "The particles 'neither,' 'nor,' are in Greek disjunctive, and add negation to

* See Winer, Grammar of New Testament (Moulton), page 612.

negation." Two distinct deliverances are spoken of in the verse, that of the soul from Sheol, that of the body from the grave.

Really the whole of Dr. Bullinger's argument from the creeds is beside the mark. The creeds do not profess to be compendia of all that is to be believed, or that was believed by the early church. But even if they did make such a claim, we have a higher authority to which even they must bow—the Word of God.

It is regrettable that Dr. Bullinger's partial and misleading quotation from Pearson's work has no doubt conveyed the false impression to many an unsuspecting reader, that the early church did not believe in "the descent into Hades besides and distinct from His sepulture."

CHAPTER VI.

NOVEL INTERPRETATIONS CHALLENGED.

We will now consider certain passages which evidently present great difficulty to Dr. Bullinger's view, and which he seeks to accommodate to his interpretation.

The Spirits in Prison (1 Peter iii. 18-20).

"Quickened by the Spirit, by which also He [Christ] went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." The third section on page 17 of Dr. Bullinger's pamphlet is a good example of the facile way in which this writer substitutes inference for argument. That the

"spirits in prison" are angels, not men, is to Dr. Bullinger's easy mind proved by the occurrence in the next epistle of "the angels that sinned," who are "cast down to Tartarus," as if it were not permissible for the apostle to treat of different subjects in successive epistles. Why, too, should he describe them so differently if they are the same? It will be noticed that in 2 Peter ii. the destruction of the old world and the deliverance of Noah, are simply mentioned in a list of divine judgments, and are not more connected with the sin of the angels which comes first on the list than with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in verse 6 which comes third. However, this juxta-position is quite enough for Dr. Bullinger to draw inferences from, and he proceeds, "These angels . . . are thus (*sic*) identified with the spirits in 1 Peter iii. 9." Again Jude speaks of "angels that kept not their first estate," *therefore*, these too are the same angels, and the expression, "kept not their first estate" can be understood only (*sic*) by a reference to Genesis vi., "and *therefore*" it is surprising that in the face of 2 Peter ii. 4 and Jude 6, 7 anyone can be found who does not agree with Dr. Bullinger. What is perhaps more surprising, is, that he should expect us to accept as serious arguments the very flimsy inferences on which his conclusions are based.

Verse 19 then, according to our author, only means that, "In a spiritual body Christ made such a proclamation of His triumph, that it reached even to Tartarus," where "the angels that sinned" were shut up.

1. But there is not a word about Tartarus in the passage.

2. Nor about angels. The word "spirit" was the usual term for one passed into the unseen world. "They thought they had seen a spirit" (Luke xxiv. 37; Mark vi. 49). The apostles clearly believed in spirits existing in the unclothed state. It is a pure assumption, as we have seen, to say that "the angels that sinned" in

2 Peter ii. must be the same as the "in prison spirits" of 1 Peter iii.*

3. Spirits are distinguished from angels in Acts xxiii. 8, 9, and the expression "confess" in verse 8, "the Pharisees *confess* both" (*i.e.*, angels and spirits), would go to prove that Luke himself agreed with them that spirits can in fact exist in the disembodied state. The verse that Dr. Bullinger quotes in order to identify angels with spirits, "He maketh his angels spirits," refers rather to the character of their ministry than to their spiritual constitution. The Revised Version makes this clear, "who maketh His angel winds, and His ministers a flame of fire" (Heb. i. 7). Again, "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xiii. 23) are in distinction to "the innumerable company of angels" in the preceding verse. We may connect too with this the words "the Lord knoweth . . . how to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment" (2 Peter ii. 9, R.V.). The word for keep (therein) accords well with the idea of keeping in prison. (See Matt. xxviii. 1; Acts xii. 56; xvi. 23; iv. 3; v. 18.) The Revised Version shows us these men as "unclothed" spirits under punishment (*kolazomenous*). They could not be said to be "under punishment" if they were non-existent.

4. As has been pointed out Gehenna† is *the* place of suffering, but it is nowhere stated that Hades is not also a place of suffering. Indeed in Luke xvi. we see "the

* In a footnote on page 17 this author refers to the fact that in the Elizabethan edition (1562) of the "Thirty-nine Articles," the passage in 1 Peter quoted in the earlier edition of Article iii. is omitted. The inference being that therefore the editors of the article in the reign of Elizabeth had abandoned 1 Peter iii. 17-22 as proving the descent into Hades. This may or may not be the case. But it is to be noted that in the Thirty-nine Articles as now read there is not a single passage of Scripture quoted or referred to to substantiate any one of the articles, so that the omission of 1 Peter iii. 17-22 may only have been part of a general scheme to leave out all actual scriptural references. In any case if this author cites the authority of the Elizabethan editors in omitting 1 Peter iii. 17-22 to discredit the usually understood meaning of the passage, he ought also to give weight to the fact that they retain Article iii. which asserts our Lord's descent into Hades, and that all the more, seeing that as an "ordained priest" of the Church of England he is supposed to believe the Thirty-nine Articles.

† "Facts and Theories of a Future State," by F. W. Grant, p. 111.

rich man in Hades and in torments," and in Jude 7 Sodom and Gomorrha are cited as "suffering punishment" even now (see Revised Version margin). The suffering has already begun. A criminal caught red-handed is not exempt from suffering before his final judgment. A prison is a place of stern discipline and real hardship, and so far the prisoner suffers. The sinner "who believes not is condemned already," and if he dies, the awful condition he has chosen for himself, by rejecting the grace of God, begins at once. The exact degree of his eternal doom will only be known when he has been judged according to his works before the great white throne.

5. The disobedience referred to in the passage is specified as having taken place "while the ark *was a preparing*." The act* to which Dr. Bullinger refers as having taken place in Genesis vi. 2 (whatever its nature may have been) occurred confessedly some time before judgment was determined upon, and consequently before the ark was *begun*.

6. The idea that the words "He went and preached" merely mean that the "proclamation of His triumph reached even to Tartarus" is altogether inadequate. Dr. Alford says that the word for "went" (*pareutheis*) implies "local transference" in view of the preaching or heralding. Christian teachers differ as to whether the heralding took place by the Spirit in the days of Noah, or whether, whatever its character may have been, it took place between our Lord's death and resurrection. In this latter case, as Bengel truly remarks in his "Gnomon," "Those spirits were not in the tomb of Jesus: He went to them." It is, however, agreed that the spirits in prison are *the unclothed spirits of men who had been disobedient in the days of Noah*.

*I believe that our Lord's words in Mark xii. 25, "they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are *as the angels* which are in heaven," sufficiently dispose of the strange interpretation of what took place in Genesis vi. 2, which Dr. Bullinger asserts is the only key to Jude 6.

7. As to our Lord's triumph, it was on the cross that this took place, over "the principalities and powers" (Col. ii. 14, 15, R.V.). It was therefore in no sense necessary for Him to be raised again in order to make a proclamation of His triumph. As a matter of fact there is not a word in the passage as to what the subject of the preaching was. If it was His "triumph," we are in any case left to infer it.

"The Lower Parts of the Earth."

With reference to Ephesians iv. 9, Dr. Bullinger asserts (page 18) unhesitatingly that the Lord's descent into "the lower parts of the earth" only refers to His incarnation; but Alford points out "that most of the ancients, and many later (*e.g.*, Bengel and Ellicott), maintain that we have here a reference to the Lord's descent into Hades between death and resurrection," and leaves it himself an undecided point. However, Dr. Bullinger affirms the contrary, and ends up thus (page 19, footnote): "So here it (the verse in question, Ephes. iv. 9) should be rendered 'He descended into the lower parts (that is to say) the earth,'" and adds these significant words,

"If it means more than this it is not true,"

or, in other words, "If my meaning is disproved, so much the worse for the Scriptures." So much for Dr. Bullinger's constant insinuations (*e.g.*, page 1), that those who cannot accept his views rest on "tradition," "man's imagination," "ideas," &c. So much for his loud professions of allegiance to the Scriptures alone. He here plainly asserts that, if this Scripture means more than he interprets it as meaning, "IT IS NOT TRUE." Could anything be more plain? Could anything be more serious? When a man's opponents accuse him of valuing his own interpretation above the Word of God, it may or may not be the case, but

when he thus boldly avows it himself, what can one say but "let God be true, but every man a liar!"?

Satan's First Great Lie.

Dr. Bullinger, as we have seen (page 13), defines the death state thus: "The dead are the dead: they are those who have ceased to live"—that is, those who have ceased to live in the body. Now, God had said: "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" But Adam and Eve did not die in a bodily sense till centuries later. Dr. Bullinger would argue, therefore, that they did not die in any sense before then. But God's word came true in that very day*. Adam and Eve died morally the moment they transgressed. They became dead to God. Those who insist that "death means merely ceasing to live" in the bodily sense, come dangerously near affirming that Satan's lie was no lie after all. How absurd then it is to accuse those who believe in an intermediate state of saying "there is no such thing as death." We do believe in "death," but we do not confound "life" with "existence," nor death with "cessation of existence," for "to God all are alive," even the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I do not know what sort of people Dr. Bullinger has moved amongst. Men as a rule do not call death a friend, or a blessing, or a hope; but I do not think that to the true believer walking in communion with God, death ought to be a terror. I suppose that because Bildad the Shuhite called it the "king of terrors," we have "plain, direct, categorical" authority from God for thus defining it ever afterwards (see Job xviii. 14).

The Old Testament saints, as for instance Hezekiah, were "through fear of death all their life time subject to

* Dr. Bullinger elsewhere refers to 1 Kings ii. 37 to show that when God said, "*The day that thou eatest thereof,*" He meant 960 years later. Solomon had threatened to have Shimei slain the day he should leave Jerusalem. He failed to do so, not for lack of will, but for lack of power. How does this show that God did not carry out His word literally the very day that Adam sinned?

bondage," but our Lord died to "deliver such" (Heb. ii. 15), so that now the believer can say: "We are always confident and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord."

Still, death is the result of sin, and will to the end be in itself an enemy. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Man was not made to exist "absent from the body." The coming of Christ, not death, is the hope of the believer. This life is the opportunity for walking by faith, for service, for testimony, so that Paul's thankfulness that Epaphroditus was spared is quite in keeping. Some were cut off for their failures and lack of self-judgment, as in 1 Corinthians xi., "many sleep." Epaphroditus was restored for further service, and so far it was a mercy to Paul and to him.

The Special Revelation to the Thessalonians.

"Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him . . . For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout . . . the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then *we* which are alive shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 14, 16, 17).

The revelation of 1 Thessalonians iv. 15 is in perfect accord with all this. The special promise is that those who have fallen asleep will not miss the coming of Christ, and that the living will not even prevent or go before them. "Those who sleep in Jesus will God *bring with Him*," not bring from the dead. "Bring with" is not the same as "bring from," the verb that occurs in Hebrews xiii. 20—"that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ." Dr. Bullinger tries hard to convey the impression that the "bringing with" is only "bringing from the dead," but it will not do. The former is "bring together" (*ἀξεί συν ἄνθρωποις*), the latter is "bring up"

(ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν). Those who had already been with Christ will God bring with Him. How could He bring people who had been non-existent. How could He bring them *with Him, if they had not been with Him*. Some teachers, while accepting generally the above conclusions, connect the words "bring with Him" with the Lord's coming in glory. This does not now even seem to fit in so well with the context.

Paul is writing, it must be remembered, to the Thessalonians on the supposition (real to faith) that he and they were being left alive to the coming of the Lord. So that his word, "so shall we ever be with the Lord," does not prejudice the fact that the sleeping saints had already been with Christ in the disembodied state.

CHAPTER VII.

FOUR WITNESSES TO THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

On page 24, the writer begins his consideration of the passages which he admits "seem to speak with a different voice and alone stand between us and the truth" (*sic*). They are—

- (a) Matthew xxii. 32.
- (b) Luke xxiii. 43.
- (c) 2 Corinthians v. 8.
- (d) Philippians i. 23.

And lastly (e) Luke xvi., which will be considered in a separate chapter.

We are asked to discredit the plain teaching of these five passages, three of which contain our Lord's own words, and two the words of the apostle Paul, because Dr. Bullinger professes to have settled beforehand that they cannot mean

what they seem to mean. I should have judged that the wisest course would have been to revise his interpretation of the Old Testament passages in the light of the New, or better still, to fully consider these latter before coming to a final conclusion as to what "the plain, direct, categorical, unmistakable" teaching of Scripture really is. Let us consider these passages in order.

Sadducees and the Resurrection.

A.—Matthew xxii. 32 : "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," and Luke adds, "for all live unto Him" (chap. xx. 38).

In dealing with this passage, Dr. Bullinger persistently uses "dead" and "living" in his own peculiar sense of "non-existing" or "existing" (*i.e.*, in the body), a sense which we have seen by no means exhausts the Scripture use, and is contrary to Dr. Bullinger's own definition in his "Critical Lexicon," "a thing can exist without living." In Matthew xxii. 32, as indeed all through 1 Corinthians xv., resurrection of the body is referred to, and the only sufficient guarantee of this is the survival of the soul, in which the Sadducees, like Dr. Bullinger, did not believe. Now, God said to Moses, "I, the God of Abraham," &c. (which is the Hebrew equivalent of "I am the God," &c.), not "I will be at the day of resurrection," but, "I am *now* before the resurrection."

But "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead in a bodily sense, were still surviving personalities, for "all men live unto Him"—not *will* live, but *are* alive to Him. According to Dr. Bullinger the patriarchs were dead, and only dead, when Jehovah spoke to Moses. According to

the Lord Jesus they were, though dead to this world, living to God. The order of the words in the Greek is emphatic: "All to Him are alive."* It proves nothing in Dr. Bullinger's favour that the Sadducees were silenced. The question is—What was the argument that silenced them? According to him, our Lord merely affirmed "all will be raised." An affirmation of the point at issue may seem to Dr. Bullinger a logical and sufficient argument, but Sadducees are not so easily silenced, and our Lord of course goes deeper than merely to assert what He undertook to prove. He showed that the fact that Jehovah was not ashamed to call Himself the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and Jacob, proved that those of whom He spake were "to Him alive" *when* He spake, because He is not the God of the dead but of the living. Even in the second death the lost will be alive to God in the sense of continued existence, for "His wrath will abide on them" (John 3. 36). If Dr. Bullinger's soul-extinction theory were correct, then either God said to Moses what was not true ("*I am* the God of Abraham"), or else our Lord said to the Sadducees what was not true—"All to Him are living."

We have seen that this evil doctrine of soul-extinction is in serious conflict with the scriptural revelation of the Person of Christ. As if that were not enough, it would also rob Him of His pre-eminence in resurrection. In order to fit in the appearance of Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration with the theory that there is no survival

* Perhaps there is nothing more wonderful than Dr. Bullinger's controversial logic, unless it be his controversial Greek. Here is a case in point. In a footnote on page 25, in order to give colour to his theory that the words "all men live unto Him" mean that in the day of resurrection all will be raised, he translates the verb "live" (zao)—"to live again." But though this verb occurs 140 times in the New Testament, nowh-ere do our translators or revisers translate it thus. When they want to say "live again," they employ another verb, "anazao" (Luke xv. 24). When our Lord speaks of resurrection He uses another word, "egeiro," or "anistemi." Dr. Bullinger, in his lexicon, translates zao, *to live*, and for live again he gives rightly "anazao." But here, in order to reinforce his argument, he does not scruple even to contradict his own lexicon. Let my readers test—Matt. xxvi. 63; Luke ii. 36; iv. 4; John iv. 10, 11; Acts xxii. 22; Romans vii. 1—and see if zao means "live again."

of personality between death and resurrection, Dr. Bullinger is obliged so far to add to the Word of God as to teach dogmatically that Moses had been raised from the dead; but this is only inference, and the Scripture says that Christ is "the first fruits of them that slept." To this Dr. Bullinger adds one of his insidious glosses—that is, "of a future harvest." Well, certainly "first-fruits" are not usually of a past harvest. But if there was a past harvest, when did it take place, and who were the raised ones? Of course it is understood that resurrections like that of the Shunamite's son, Lazarus, &c., were of a different order from that of our Lord. They died again, but "death hath no more dominion over Him." If Moses was raised again it could only have been in the same order of resurrection as Lazarus, but of this nothing is clearly revealed, and Jude 9 does not really enlighten us. Of Christ we read not only that He was "the first-fruits of them that slept," but also "the first-born from the dead." Is it not a sufficient condemnation of a doctrine that its supporters are obliged to evade such plain statements of the Word of God?

The Dying Malefactor.

B.—Luke xxiii. 43: "Verily I say unto thee, To day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." This Dr. Bullinger desires to read thus: "Verily I say unto thee to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." It is admitted that the punctuation is not inspired, but it is not legitimate to alter it, if by so doing the sense or force of the passage is upset. The only controversialist that I can find who adopts this view is Roberts, the Christadelphian. The only translator who even suggests its possibility is Rotherham, for years editor of the official organ of "The Annihilationists." Against it are the vast majority of

translators in all times* and languages. Dr. Bullinger asserts that his translation is the only one possible by Greek usage. Is it not strange that this should have escaped the notice of our translators and revisers? He asserts that whenever *σήμερον*, the word translated to-day, is to be cut-off from the verb to say, and attached to the following sentence, there must be in the Greek a *that* (*ὅτι*). As a matter of fact it seems just as much a rule that if "semeron" (to-day) is to be cut off from what follows, it should be succeeded by a *that* (*ὅτι*) (e.g., †Deut. iv. 26; viii. 19; ix. 3; xxx. 18; Ruth iv. 9, 10; 1 Kings xxiv. 12). The change of punctuation does not prevent Dr. Bullinger doing the very thing he reproached us with and understanding a "that" (*ὅτι*), after *σήμερον*, where there is none in the Greek. Dr. Bullinger's rule is not carried out in the New Testament usage, for instance, *Matt. xvi. 23*,

"And in the morning" (ye say) "to-day it will be foul weather."

Here "to-day" confessedly belongs to the latter part of verse, and yet there is no "that" (*ὅτι*) to detach it from the verb to say. The same holds good in *Hebrews iii. 7*,

"Wherefore (as the Holy Ghost saith), To-day if ye will hear His voice."

Dr. Bullinger's rule demands a "that" (*ὅτι*) before the "to-day," and yet, though it is clearly detached from what goes before, the particle is absent, and so with

* Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, the well-known authority on New Testament Greek, writes: "Origen, Comm. Joann xxxii. 19 (Lomm. 2-482), describes the perturbation of some Christians who could not reconcile 'to-day' with 'three days and nights in the heart of the earth.' He tries to reconcile them, but it never occurs to him to suppose that *σήμερον* (to-day) could go with *λέγω* (I say). On a point of this sort bearing on Biblical Greek, Origen's evidence (none the less powerful for being tacit) appears to me conclusive."

† Dr. Bullinger gives a great array of references to Deuteronomy to justify connecting "to-day" with "say." But out of the forty I cannot find one which is really parallel to the Luke passage, either in the position of the word "to-day" in the phrase or in the character of the saying. Dr. Abbott writes, "The instances of *ἀναγγέλλω* (I announce) *ἐντάλλωμαι* (I command), repeatedly occurring in Deuteronomy have little bearing here, as the whole narrative emphasises 'this day,' and the fact that the law is being 'this day' enjoined in Israel."

Hebrews iii. 15. and iv. 7, repetitions of the same quotation. Again, *James iv. 13*,

"Go to, ye that say, To-day and to-morrow we will go," &c.

Here the "to-day" is detached from "the say," and yet there is no "that" (ὅτι) as Dr. Bullinger asserts to be indispensable. These cases will show *that there is no such rule in the Greek language as that which Dr. Bullinger puts forward to justify his change of punctuation.* Even Mr. Rotherham, referred to above, puts "to-day" in Luke xxiii. 43 between commas to show that as far as the Greek goes it is an open question to which part of the sentence it belongs. He admits, moreover—(1) "that our Lord's well-known formula, 'Verily I say unto thee,' or 'you,' in *every other* place stands thus simply alone without any other qualifying word; (2) that the sentence as usually understood corresponds exactly with our Lord's words to Zacchæus, 'This day in thine house must I abide'." (This writer absolutely ignores, it will be seen, any argument from the presence or absence of ὅτι.) (3) "*That no ingenuity of exposition can silence the testimony of Luke xvi. 23, 25* (my italics) to the conscious comfort of separate souls in Abraham's bosom" (the inference being that the words of our Lord to the malefactor fit in with this, and that as Luke xvi. must be true, Luke xxiii. 43 may well be understood as it is generally taken). (4) "That in the time of our Lord that state of waiting consolation was sometimes termed paradise, to which state therefore the believing listener might not unnaturally understand the speaker to refer."

It is not clear how the Lord's answering "Verily I say unto you to-day" could possibly mark the wonderful character of the man's faith as Dr. Bullinger affirms. It was the man's prayer that did that. The deliberate remark of a sane and usually well balanced expositor like Dr. Alford is worth consideration: "The

attempt to join 'to-day,'" he writes, "with the words 'I say unto you,' considering that it not only violates sense, but destroys the force of our Lord's promise, is surely something worse than silly." The real trouble to Dr. Bullinger about the passage as usually read is not that it violates any known rule of Greek grammar, but that it negatives his belief as to soul extinction and the nature of paradise. To him paradise is a future thing altogether. But in 2 Corinthians xii. the Apostle Paul speaks of it as a present place into which he was caught up and where he heard unspeakable words. An attempt is made to explain this as only meaning that he was caught away in spirit into some future blessed condition of things. The words of the apostle, I believe, show this interpretation to be impossible. "I knew such a man (*whether in the body, or out of the body*, I cannot tell; God knoweth); how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words." Had one of these teachers been present he would have told Paul that he could not have been caught up in his body into Paradise, because Paradise did not then exist; but clearly the apostle's idea of Paradise did not tally with this. For him Paradise was a real, tangible place then existing, into which it was not impossible for him to be caught away in his body. It is certainly inconceivable that a man could be caught away in his *body* into "a *future* blessed place"; therefore Paradise must have been a place in existence when Paul had his experience. Paul's uncertainty as to whether he was in or out of his body meets another side of the error. Dr. Bullinger asks (page 38): "How can the spirit speak or act apart from the physical organs of the body?" This presented no difficulty to the apostle. He was caught up; he was conscious; he heard, and yet all the time he did not know whether he was in or *out* of the body. We may therefore hold firmly that wherever Paradise was when our Lord spoke on the cross, it was a

real place actually existing, and that that very day the repentant robber was with Him in it.

"Absent from the Body, Present with the Lord."

C.—We now come to 2 Corinthians v. 8: "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." There are in this whole passage three alternatives before the mind of the apostle.

1. The first and the best is "to be clothed upon" with his body of glory, without having to pass through death, at the coming of Christ: "Earnestly desiring to be *clothed upon* with our house which is from heaven" (verse 2), "not for that we would be unclothed, but *clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

2. The second alternative is to remain alive "groaning in this tabernacle" awaiting the coming of the Lord: "Knowing, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord."

3. There is a third alternative namely, "to pass from this scene by death and to be at once with the Lord," and though it is not his first desire ("not for that we would be unclothed"), yet so great is his confidence in the Lord and so great his desire to be with Him, that he is ready to experience it. We are confident, I say, and willing *rather* to be "*absent from the body*, and to be present with the Lord." The Christadelphians and Annihilationists of course seek to confuse all this, and Dr. Bullinger follows them closely. He accuses us of "deliberately altering the sense of verse 8, when we quote only the words, "absent from the body, and present with the Lord." It is a pity that he does not indicate how the sense is altered. If we quote only these words it is merely for brevity sake. I think any unprejudiced person will admit that the whole verse is even stronger: "We are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with

the Lord." There were two ways of being present with the Lord. One was by the Lord's coming for him, in which case he would never know the experience of being "absent from the body." For that he was hoping. The other was by being unclothed or "absent from the body" through death, and being thus present with the Lord. For that he was willing. "Absent from the body" cannot refer to resurrection, for then the believer will be in the body.

It is impossible to divorce these last words from those immediately preceding "to be absent from the body." It would be a strange argument to say that so great was the apostle's desire to be "present with the Lord," that he was willing to be absent from the body in order to be at some later period, say after 2000 years, present with the Lord in resurrection. Why should he be willing *rather* to die, if death was in no way to hasten his being present with the Lord, and would of course, according to Dr. Bullinger's theory, deprive him of the measure of communion with Christ he then enjoyed? No; he was willing to be absent from the body *rather* than remain "at home in the body," because this would at once usher him into the presence of the Lord, which would be "very far better" than any experience down here, though not up to the full measure of bliss to be his in the day of resurrection.

Paul's Desire in Philippians i. 23.

"Having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better."

D.—Verse 21: (a) "For to me *to live* is Christ,
(b) and *to die* is gain."

Verse 23: "For I am in a strait betwixt (the) two,
(b) having a desire *to depart*, and be with
Christ which is far better.

(a) Nevertheless *to abide in the flesh* is
more needful for you."

There are two alternatives in this passage, and only two.

(a) "To live" in verse 21 corresponding to "abide in the flesh," verse 23.

(b) "To die" in verse 21 corresponding to "depart and be with Christ," verse 23.

The primary meaning of the intransitive verb "analuein" is, as translated here, "to depart." It is, according to the lexicographers and grammarians, only in its secondary sense that it means "to return," as in Luke xii. 36. The substantive "analysis" is undoubtedly used in the primary sense by Paul later, "The time of my *departure* is at hand" (2 Tim. iv. 6). Winer in his *New Testament Grammar* translates Philippians i. 23: "Having a desire after dissolution," and Wilke in his *Lexicon of the New Testament* gives for "analuein," "to depart, break up, so very often in Greek writers to depart from life." Dr. Bullinger sees a third alternative here, and would translate, "having a desire *to the return* (i.e., of Christ), and to be with Christ." I believe there are several objections to this.

1. *A reason of grammatical construction.*

The construction of the sentence demands that the subject of the verb "to depart"* should be the same as that of the verb "to be." Dr. Bullinger makes Christ the subject of the former verb, and Paul the subject of the latter.

2. *A reason of logical expression.*

After expressing his desire to depart, the apostle adds, "nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you," but the antithesis to abiding in (the flesh) is not the return of Christ, for His peoples' bodies, though changed,

*In answer to my enquiry, Dr. Jackson, O.M., Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, writes, "Philippians i. 23. If *τὸ ἀναλῦσις* were a recognised phrase for the second coming of Christ, I should think it possible, though awkward, that the two infinitives should have different subjects. But if I am right in thinking that *ἀναλῦσις* has not this special meaning, I feel confident that the ordinary translation is right." Dr. Edwin A. Abbot, to whom I also wrote, answered my query thus: "As to Philippians i. 23, I am astonished at Dr. Bullinger's suggestion, Dr. Jackson's objection, in itself, seems to me fatal."

will still be "flesh" (*cf.* Luke xxiv. 39), but of departing from this life by death. Therefore, the apostle's desire was dissolution of the body, and the immediate experience of being with Christ.

3. *A reason of scriptural revelation.*

The apostle referring to the Lord's return in Philippians iii. 20, speaks of it as a blessing in which all the Philippians would participate, "who shall change our vile body," &c. If the words, "to depart and to be with Christ," meant, as Dr. Bullinger affirms, "the return of Christ," why should it be "more needful" for these believers that he should "abide in the flesh," for they would themselves be caught away?

The words "to me" at the beginning of verse 21, by their position, govern both the members of the verse: "For me to live is Christ, and to me to die is gain." He is not speaking of some hypothetical gain to the gospel by his death, but of a certain gain to himself.

As Calvin says, "This passage is of value in setting aside the mad fancy of those who dream that souls sleep when separated from their bodies: for Paul openly declares that we enjoy the presence of Christ on being set free from the body."

As we have already seen, Dr. Bullinger's footnotes contain some remarkable specimens of controversial Greek. In order to support an arbitrary, and I believe quite inadmissible translation of 1 Corinthians xv. 29 (page 34), he lays down the rule that in New Testament Greek *νεκροί* (*nekroi*) with the article means "corpses," and without the article "those who have died." Let us test this. Did such a rule exist, then Matthew viii. 22: "Let the dead bury their dead" must be translated. "Let corpses bury corpses," for there is an article in both cases. Matthew xxvii. 64: "He is risen from the dead," would have to read, "he is risen from the corpses," for again the word has the article, but in Matthew xxviii. 4 there is no article, and we must translate according to Dr. Bullinger's rule, "they became as those who have died," where clearly the sense is, "they became like corpses." So much for this attempt to make 1 Corinthians xv. 29 favour the soul-extinction doctrine.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

(Luke xvi.—see page 4).

At last we come to the passage which gives its title to Dr. Bullinger's book. "We must not," he writes, "explain the passage apologetically as though we wished it were not there." In spite of this assurance the general impression will remain that Dr. Bullinger does wish it were not there. Why such hesitation and reluctance in coming to the point? Why nearly forty pages of preparatory matter before attempting his explanation? Why such increasing recapitulation and reiteration as the crucial moment gets nearer? * Is it not that he feels himself that his explanation is unnatural and far-fetched, and that a certain habit of thought must be induced—a kind of intellectual atmosphere created—to make its reception possible by Christian people? Nor does the way he approaches its consideration argue a very judicial frame of mind. "It is absolutely impossible" (*sic*), he writes, "that the traditional interpretation of this can be correct, because, if it were, it would be directly opposed to all the other teaching of Scripture." I trust my readers are in a position to take such a statement at its true value. What Dr. Bullinger calls the "traditional interpretation" is really no interpretation at all, but the plain straightforward meaning of words in which the Christians of all ages have understood the passage. Why cannot the passage be left to mean what it says? Only because it teaches unmistakably conscious existence in the "Intermediate State." Dr. Bullinger will not have

* It reminds one irresistibly of a country fair doctor who has promised some wonderful exhibition of his powers, but who seeks to put off the crucial test as long as possible, and to create a diversion in his favour by floods of talk.

this on any consideration. So he asks us to believe that our Lord did not intend His words in Luke xvi. to be taken as the expression of the truth, but that He was only condemning the Pharisees by taking into His own mouth one of their traditions. I should have thought this would have served well to build them up in their traditions, especially as our Lord gave no hint to them that He did not believe what He said. I am sure the Pharisees may be excused for taking His words seriously.

Dr. Bullinger says: "A parable (*sic*) of this kind need not be true in itself or in fact, though *it must be believed to be true by the hearers* IF NOT BY THE SPEAKER"—that is to say, according to this teacher, our Lord in order to condemn the Pharisees was taking advantage of their ignorance to overwhelm them with a story which He knew all the time to be false. Is it not a solemn thing thus virtually to impugn the veracity of our adorable Lord by ascribing to Him a method of argument which no conscientious man of the world even could adopt. And then we are asked to believe that though our Lord knew perfectly that Abraham was dead, and according to this theory non-existent, He nevertheless puts His own words into his mouth, as if he was an existing personage. The whole passage becomes a hideous jumble of truth and falsehood, which it is positively shocking to impute to Him, who was the very expression of Eternal Truth, whose every word came direct from the Father, and was uttered in the power of the Holy Spirit. It is not even as if the Pharisees had brought up the story, and that our Lord had condemned them out of their own mouths. There is no hint in the New Testament that the Pharisees held such traditions at all, and yet Dr. Bullinger does not scruple to close his booklet with the words: "*No previous knowledge of Pharisaic traditions is necessary for the gathering of this scope*" (my italics). How would it be possible for anyone to know that our Lord was referring

to a Pharisaic tradition if he did not know that such traditions existed?*

The present writer, and millions more, have read "The Rich Man and Lazarus" again and again without once suspecting that it was anything but sober truth. It needed a Dr. Bullinger to arise to tell us the whole thing was a Pharisaic tradition. We may console ourselves with the words of the Apostle John: "The anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him" (1 John ii. 27).

On page 37 our hopes are again raised by the words, "We now come to the so-called parable itself." Now at last we are to get the explanation, but once more we are disappointed. We are invited to "look first at some of the inconsistencies of the traditional interpreters."

1. Dr. B. objects to the account being called a parable, though I should have thought he would have preferred this, and he does actually call it so himself (page 42). However, I am quite willing to admit it is a real uplifting of the veil, affording a vivid glimpse into the "unseen world."

2. He finds a difficulty in the expression, "Abraham's bosom," but there is none in reality. Abraham was in Paradise. His bosom represents the place of special privilege (see John xiii. 23). The once despised Lazarus, counted unworthy to sit down with the rich man on earth, finds the best place in the unseen world.

3. He raises what I can only call quibbles about the burial of Lazarus, that, because nothing is said about it, we must, if we take the story literally, believe he was never buried at all. It would be as reasonable to argue that neither he nor the rich man had a last illness, because nothing is said of it. No one in his senses

* The majority of Christians have never set eyes on a Talmud.

would say that Lazarus' body was carried to Paradise, nor assert that the rich man's body was in Hades. His body was buried in the grave, "the place where corruption is seen." His soul was in hell (Hades), the place of conscious suffering, and that of Lazarus in Paradise, the place of conscious blessing.

4. Then, as we have already seen, Dr. Bullinger objects that a spirit could not speak or act apart from the physical organs. How does he know? God is a Spirit. Cannot He speak, and act, and hear? I refer again to Samuel. His body, dead years before and buried at Ramah, had seen corruption. At Endor, fifty-five miles from Ramah as the crow flies, Samuel in the disembodied state meets with Saul. He hears, he remembers, he knows, he speaks, but he was not raised from the dead, for he was invisible to all but the witch herself. He had not come up from the distant grave, but from Sheol, the place of departed spirits, and he knew that Saul and his sons would be there on the morrow. It must be admitted that far from "not knowing anything" the dead Samuel knew a great deal more than the living Saul. It is really surprising that Dr. Bullinger has not made the discovery that the whole story of the witch of Endor is only a tradition of the Pharisees interpolated by them as an argument against the Sadducees. Such a theory would have as much ground as the one here combated.

5. Dr. Bullinger next raises what he calls a moral difficulty, namely, that "Lazarus' only claim to Paradise was his poverty; the rich man's only sin, his enjoyment of good things, and his neglect of Lazarus." But with all respect to Dr. Bullinger, I suggest that he only feels this difficulty, because he has failed to grasp the import of the whole discourse of our Lord included in Luke xv. and xvi.

The best answer to all these human reasonings is to read the entire passage. It seems clear that Luke xv.

and xvi. form but one discourse on the words of the Pharisees as its text: "This Man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." There are five sections in the discourse: of these the first three were addressed to the Pharisees in the presence of the rest, the fourth specially to the disciples in the hearing of at least the Pharisees, and the fifth, with which we are more specially concerned, to the Pharisees. In each section we have that which corresponds to the repentant sinner who "heard the Word"—the lost sheep, the lost drachma, the lost son, the debtor, and Lazarus. In each, too, we have that which sets forth the self-righteous Pharisees "who murmured at Him"—the ninety-nine sheep, the nine drachmas, the elder brother, the unjust steward, and the rich man. In the first three sections we see the Pharisee in his self-righteousness "never transgressing the commandments of the Father"; in the fourth, in his unrighteousness; and in the fifth we have a glimpse of him in the intermediate state awaiting the righteous judgment of God. No doubt the Pharisees knew that our Lord spake these words against them. They also knew the Old Testament from beginning to end. Had they been able to turn the tables on Him by quoting "the dead know not anything," or "their thoughts perish," as Dr. Bullinger does so constantly, they would doubtless have been glad to do so, but they understood the whole drift of Scripture far too well. It is a fallacy to assume that because the Pharisees were wrong in some things they were wrong in all. They never failed, when appealed to, to give correct answers to questions concerning the letter of Scripture (*e.g.*, Matt. ii. 5; xxii. 42). In Matthew xxiii. 1, 2 our Lord distinguished between their words and their works, "Do what they say, but do not after their works"; but when it was a question of their tradition He never for an instant truckled to it, but exposed its hollowness, and charged them with "making the Word of God of none

effect." There is not a scintilla of proof that our Lord was in any way accommodating Himself to the tradition of the Pharisees in Luke xvi. Dr. Bullinger on pages 41, 42, in order, I can only suppose, to give a semblance of plausibility to his explanation, inserts the word "tradition" four times in what he calls his paraphrase of our Lord's words (verses 13-18). But our Lord does not once directly or indirectly mention such a thing as tradition, so that this is quite a gratuitous addition to His words on this author's part. All Dr. Bullinger's fantastic quotations from the Talmud may impress the unlearned and confuse the issue in some minds unaccustomed to weigh evidence, but they in no way invalidate our Lord's sober narrative of the "rich man and Lazarus." It would be as good reasoning to pretend that because the Romish Church has embellished the scriptural doctrine of hell that therefore there is no such place, or that because men have invented fairy tales there is no spiritual world at all. The story of the rich man and Lazarus forms a fitting ending to our Lord's whole discourse. The Pharisees could see their portrait in the unjust steward, and "they derided Him." Popularity and gain were their objects in life. Could they but satisfy their own requirements, they made but little count of God's. Like the self-righteous brother of chapter xv., they "needed no repentance," and resented the prodigal's return to the father's home. Had they had their way he might have stayed outside for ever, and outside in a sense we find him in the closing section of the discourse "lying at their gate," while they, the rich self-satisfied ones, were "faring sumptuously every day." But shortly God would reverse all this. Their little day would soon be past. They would find themselves outside, and see afar off the despised Lazarus in the bosom of him whose sons they claimed to be. They would then have "judgment without mercy who had shown no mercy."

The rich man, who represents them, was not lost merely because he was rich, but because he served mammon and heard not "Moses and the prophets." Nor was Lazarus saved because he was poor. He represents the lost sheep found by the good Shepherd—the son once lost now found again—poor in this world's goods but "rich in faith." What was the crowning sin of the Pharisees? That of the religious world to-day—self-seeking, self-righteousness, and a rejection of Him who is the only Way, the only Name. The rich man had had "Moses and the prophets" like his surviving brethren and the Pharisees themselves, but had rejected their testimony. Neither he nor Lazarus was asleep now, much less non-existent. The one was already enjoying in the unclothed state the blessed results of having "heard His Word"; the other was already reaping the bitter harvest which, through rejecting that Word, he had sown in Time. Truly, "no ingenuity of interpretation can silence the testimony of our Lord's words in Luke xvi.," for as He testified Himself—"HEAVEN AND EARTH SHALL PASS AWAY, BUT MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY."



PRESENT-DAY PAMPHLETS

ON SUBJECTS OF PERTINENT AND PERENNIAL INTEREST.

By David Anderson-Berry, M.D., F.R.S. (Edin.).

Seventh-Day Adventism. Whence it is—What it Means—Whither it Tends. An Exhaustive Examination of their Doctrines and Writings, with introduction by J. R. Caldwell, Editor of *The Witness*. 96 pages. Cloth, 1/. Papers Covers, 6d. net (7d. p.f.).

After Death: or, the Destiny of the Soul. Deals with Man's Creation—Body, Soul, Spirit—Immortality—Sheol, Hades, Paradise—Christadelphians and Seventh-Day Adventists—Annihilation and Universalism, &c. 64 pp. clear type, 2d. 6 for 1/, p.f.

By William Hoste, B.A., Brighton.

Pentecost—and After; or, The Dispensational Bearing of "The Acts" in view of Modern Theories. 72 pages. 3d. net; by post, 4d.

The Service of Sisters: its Sanction and Scope. With special reference to "The Ministry of Women," by the late A. J. Gordon, of Boston. A searching Scriptural enquiry. 2d. 12, 1/6; 50, 5/6, p.f.

In His Hand; or, Can a Christian Fall Away and be Lost? An Exhaustive Examination of this important Enquiry. 48 pages clear type. Art Cover. 2d. each. 1/9 per dozen; 50 for 5/6, p.f.

Baptism: Its Uses and Abuses. A new addition to the Booklets on this important theme is now ready. 2d. each. 1/6 dozen, p.f.

The Coming of the Comforter. Characteristics of the Day of Pentecost compared with the character of the last days. 32 pages. 2d.; 1/6 per doz., post free.


The Intermediate State. A reply to Dr. Bullinger on "The Rich Man of Luke 16." Deals with Soul-sleep, Non-existence, Annihilation, Re-creation, &c. 6d., post free.

By C. J. Baker, Kansas City, U.S.A.

The Two Roads and the Two Destinies; or, The Future of the Human Race, as revealed in the Bible. Illustrated by a diagram in colours. 34 Pages. (233rd thousand.) 2d. net (post, 2½d.), 6, 1/.

Life, Death, and Immortality. Where is Hades or Sheol? Have all men Immortal Souls? &c. With original chart in colours. 36 Pages. 120th thousand. 2d. net (by post, 2½d.), or 6 for 1/.

The Things Which Are. A Key to the Chart on the "Times of the Gentiles, and the twice sevenfold prophecy concerning this age as revealed in the seven parables of Matthew, and seven epistles of Revelation." With large original chart in six colours. Fifth Edition Revised. 88 Pages. 6d. net (by post, 7d.), or 6 for 3/.

 The three "**Baker Books**" post free to any address in the world for 1/.

By Philip Mauro, Author of "The World and Its God," &c.

Three Letters to a Christadelphian regarding their "caricatures of the Bible teachings concerning God, Satan, Christ, the Atonement, and the Gospel," &c. 1d.

Could Christ Have Died in Gethsemane? Current teachings about the prayer of the Lord Jesus in Gethsemane examined. 1d.

Pickering & Inglis, Glasgow A. Holness, London D. T. Bass, New York

PRESENT-DAY PAMPHLETS (contd.).

By Robert M'Murdo, Evangelist and Teacher.

- The Church of God in Testimony.** Vital Truths, Constitution Difference of Judgment, Personal Testimonies, &c. 1d. 1/ doz., p.f.
- Eternal Punishment:** its place in Scripture, its relation to the Person of Christ, its importance in the present testimony. 2d.
- The Sleep of the Soul,** or, is there unconscious existence between death and resurrection? Modern plausible theories refuted by the Word of God. 2d. each, 1/9 doz., post free.
- The Shammahs of Modern Times.** Who are they? What are they fighting for? 1d.
- The State and Abode of the Dead.** Does Sheol or Hades mean the grave? Is the "Rich Man" fable or fact? 1d.; 1/ doz., p.f.

By ACCREDITED AUTHORS on the Special Subjects.

- Benefactors or Blasphemers?** or, The Higher Critics, which are they? By Sir Robert Anderson, LL.D., K.C.B. For circulating in thousands amongst Critics, Agnostics, Sceptics, Doubters, &c. 1d. 1/ per doz.; 7/6 per 100, post free.
- Roger's Reasons:** A dialogue between Roger and a Modern Agnostic as to Creation, &c., &c. By John Urquhart, author of "The New Biblical Guide," &c. Answers most Infidel Objections. 1d. 1/ per dozen, post free.
- More Roger's Reasons.** Series II., a continuation of the Marvellous Answers to Modern Cavils. By John Urquhart. 1d. 1/ doz., p.f.
- Present-Day Christianity.** What is it? Whither is it going? The Lord's Reply as given in Rev. II. and III. By J. Urquhart. 1d.
- What are the Doctrines of Millennial Dawn?** Their startling theories (with verified quotations) ably compared with the Scriptures. By John M'Donald. 32 pp. 2d.; 1/9 per doz., p.f.
- Can a Christian be a Socialist?** An eye-opener to any truly "born again" person who has leanings towards Socialism. By W. Robertson. 1d.; 1/ dozen, post free.
- Is there a Hell?** Are we still to believe in it? By John Ferguson. With introduction by J. R. Caldwell. Simply and Scripturally answers this vital question. 1d.; 1/ dozen, post free.
- Is Household Baptism Scriptural?** An Examination in the light of God's Word of the arguments and ideas for same. By J. R. Caldwell. 3d. 6d. per dozen; 3/6 per 100, post free.
- The Church of God on Earth and the Reception of One Another.** A Scriptural Enquiry. By F. C. Jennings, N.Y. Review of "R.T.H." Position and "Church of God" Theories. 1d.
- Women and Church Ministry — SCISSORS OR SILENCE.** An Exhaustive and Able Analysis. By Dr. West, Washington, U.S.A. 44 pages. Paper, 4d.; Cloth, 1/ post free.
- A Plea for Unity** among the People called Brethren, with a *Resumé* of the Devonshire House Conference. By H. C. Crawley. 23 pages of interesting information. 2d. each; 1/9 doz., post free.
- Can God Bless Our Meeting?** A question for Christian workers. J. F. Clark. Effort to solve problem of non-blessing. 1d.; 1/ doz., p.f.
- The Glorious Appearing;** or, The True Hope of the Child of God. The "Who," "When," and "Why" of the Second Coming. By H. W. Figgis. 1d.; 1/ per dozen, post free.

The following Volumes are

SPECIALLY RECOMMENDED

As treating more fully some of the points dealt with in this booklet.

- Endless Being; or, Man Made for Eternity.** By J. H. BARLOW. The standard work on the future state of mankind. 2/6, post free.
- The Book of the Revelation.** By Wm. Lincoln, of Beresford, London. Enables the reader to grasp the spiritual import of this wonderful book, as well as to have a comprehensive view of coming Great Events. 400 pages. 2/6 net (2/9, post free).
- "I am Coming:"** a Book of that Blessed Hope. The standard work on this important truth. By Dr. JAMES H. BROOKES. 2/6 post free.
- Coming Great Events; or, "Things to Come."** By A. C. Gaebelein. Deals with fulfilment of N.T. predictions; events following the Coming; Manifestation of the Lord; The Millennium. 1/, p.f.
- Foundations of the Faith** Once for all delivered to the Saints. By J. R. Caldwell. Chapters on Inspiration, Atonement, Justification, Regeneration, Sanctification, Sonship, and Punishment. Paper 6d., Cloth 1/, post free.
- God Spake All These Words:** a noble Defence of the Inspiration of God's Word. By Dr. JAMES H. BROOKES. *His last book.* Paper 6d., Cloth 1/, post free.
- Things to Come:** Some Great Events of Prophecy. By John R. Caldwell, Editor of "The Witness." Paper 6d., Cloth 1/, p.f.
- Christ's Atonement,** and what the Scriptures teach concerning it. A book for to-day. By F. E. Marsh. Square shape. 1/6, post free.
- From the Cross to the Kingdom.** The Lord Jesus Christ Crucified, Risen, Living, Coming, Reigning. By J. R. Caldwell. 1/6 post free.
- The Coming of Christ:** What is it? Will all saints be caught up? Will it be Before the Great Tribulation? By J. H. Burridge. 1/6 post free.
- God's Chosen People.** A Historic and Prophetic Outline of God's Ways with Israel. By J. R. Caldwell. Confirming the Authenticity of the Bible, and adducing many incontrovertible Christian Evidences. 1/6 post free.
- The Course of Time.** An Outline of Bible History and Events, with Explanatory Chart. By Walter Scott. Paper, 6d. Cloth, 1/, Post free.
- The Atonement.** Its Necessity, Nature, Scope, &c., from a Bible Standpoint. By J. R. Caldwell. 6d. post free.
- The Millennial Reign and Everlasting Kingdom.** When, Where, How, What does it mean? By T. Newberry, Editor of "The Englishman's Bible," &c. 6d post free.
- Coming Glories; or, Plain Answers to Prophetic and other Questions.** The Lord's Second Advent and Glorious Reign. By Walter Scott. 6d. post free.
- The Inspiration of the Scriptures:** A Simple and Trenchant Pocket Guide to this Foundation Theme. By J. R. Caldwell. 6d. p.f.
- A Concise Chart of Time's Course:** showing the Dispensations, and Coming Events. By J. H. Burridge. 20 by 30, 1/ post free. Small size for fixing in Bibles, &c., full colours, 3d.

Orders of 1/ or more post free to any address.

Pickering & Inglis, Glasgow A. Holness, London D. T. Bass, New York

P. & I. LIBRARIES.

- The Beresford Books,** - - - - 2/6 each
23 Volumes Uniform Size, Style, and Price.
- Handfuls on Purpose,** - - - - 3/6 each
Vols. I., II., III., IV., V., VI., VII., 3/6 each.
- The Saphir Library,** - - - - 2/6 each
7 Vols. of Devotional Exposition by ADOLPH SAPHIR.
- The J.R.C. Library,** - - - - 2/ each
9 Volumes. Half Morocco. Gilt Edges.
- The Believer's Library,** - - - - 1/6 each
28 Volumes. Blue Cloth. 352,000 Copies issued.
- Boys and Girls Library,** - - - - 1/6 each
18 Volumes. Square shape. Illustrated.
- "Head and Heart" Books,** - - 1/- to 2/6 each
10 Kinds. Profusely Illustrated. Eyegate Objects
and Blackboard Lessons.
- Helpful Half-hours,** - - - - 1/ each
27 Vols. Half-bound style. Various Subjects.
- "Hints and Helps" Series of Bible Helps,** 1/ each
10 Kinds. Outlines, Studies, &c. *Multum in parvo.*
- The Gospel Library,** - - - - 1/ each
20 Volumes. Large size. Profusely Illustrated.
- "Gospel Bells" Library,** - - - - 9d. each
8 Volumes. Cloth Bound. Full of Pictures.
- "Pocket" Helps for Bible Readers,** - 6d. each
30 Volumes. Limp Cloth. Round Corners
- Royal Banner Series,** - - - - 6d. each
14 Kinds. Gospel Volumes. Profusely Illustrated.
- Sixpenny Editions of Standard Volumes,** 6d. each
14 Vols. in strong flexible covers for pocket use.
- Present-Day Pamphlets,** - - - - 1d. each
12 kinds. Tinted Paper. On "burning questions."
- Penny Library of Remarkable Books,** 1d. each
15 kinds. Crown 8vo. 3,600,000 issued.

Full List of Titles and Authors post free.

GLASGOW:

PICKERING & INGLIS, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS.