

The Immortality of the Soul

A DEBATE

BETWEEN

G. C. BREWER

AND

DR. STEWART J. SPENCE



F. L. ROWE, PUBLISHER
CINCINNATI, OHIO
1916



G. C. BREWER



DR. STEWART J. SPENCE

PREFACE.

PSYCHE

BY CHAS. BREWER.

Tell me, thou strangest and unfathomed mystery—
Tell me, I pray—
Whence thy beginning? What is thy history?
Where dost thou stay?
What of the pilgrims through thy domain trav'ling?
Tell me I pray thee this mystery unrav'ling.
Body and spirit held fast in thy keeping.
And end but in sleeping
'Mid sorrow and weeping—
Why such an ending of the mystic day?
Tell me the secret of thy short abiding.
In body with breath
And then, in a moment so swiftly dividing
Thy portion with death,—
Where shall I be the time intervening?
Tell me, I pray thee, this mystery explaining;
Tell me the secret,—Oh! tell me the meaning
Of Life and her twin sister Death.

The Immortality of the Soul

G. C. BREWER'S FIRST ESSAY.

Man is a composite being and possesses an element in his nature—usually designated as soul—that is immortal and may exist independent of the physical organism. This is my belief and this is my affirmation in the present discussion. Viewed from a psychological standpoint this is purely a metaphysical question and is, of course, attended by all the difficulties of such questions. No thinking man, however, can believe any proposition without some evidence upon which to base his faith, and since the doctrine of immortality has been believed by the vast majority of thinkers of all ages, naturally the presumption is that there is strong evidence in favor of it. But the belief of this comforting tenet has not been confined to the wise and the learned. Nay, it has been well-nigh universal. As natural and almost as general as the belief in the existence of gods and as inherent as the desire to worship has been the hope of immortality in the heart of man in all stages of civilization. Today it is the cherished hope of all the races of the suffering sons of men that after life's fitful fever we may enter into a nobler existence; into a life that is free from the afflictions and toils and trials of this earth life. The desire for immortality is almost an instinct, and is itself an argument in favor of the belief. Emerson said, "The impulse to seek proof of immortality is itself the strongest proof of all." Another great philosopher has said that "immortality is but the will to live." This idea also has the indorsement and sanction of no lesser light than John Fiske.

Other men have sought to sustain the belief in immortality from the imperfections of man's present existence. Man's realization that his present condition and character are not the best and his aspiration to a higher plane of living and to more ideal environments argue that he was not created for this life alone. Out my good friend who is the respondent in the discussion of this proposition wilt possibly suggest that he himself believes in a future and eternal life for the righteous. Perhaps he does, but he does not believe that the possibility of such life is in man or can ever be without a miracle equal to creation, hence, he can not admit the plausibility of this reasoning.

Still another argument for immortality is based on the affections. This is the reasoning used by Tennyson in his *In Memoriam*. Love protests against the severance by death and claims continuance in another world.

Another and still stronger method of reasoning is that which argues from the incompleteness of this life. He who lives for fame or wealth may

be satisfied with this life, but he who lives for improvement, (or ideals of truth and goodness can never be satisfied with his present existence, (or the more he sees and learns and discovers the more keenly he realizes the incompleteness of his development. Each new discovery admits him to mysteries more deep and dark. He may explore the regions of earth and sea and air; he may weigh the sun and measure the constellations, calculate the movements of the planets and foretell the approach of a celestial wanderer in ethereal space, yet the wisest sage that ever photographed the heavens, like the little child, looks up at the Mars and sings yearningly

Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I WONDER *what you are.*

And when death cuts short his work he closes his eyes still wondering what they are, but hoping, aye, believing, that he will now be freed from human limitations and that he will *know* these mysteries that have bewildered him and baffled every human effort at solution. Do you tell me that we will never know these things? Did the Author of all the phenomena of nature give us intelligence enough to appreciate the vastness of the work and to want to understand these things, and yet make it impossible for the desire to ever be realized?

Or will the mind that has searched out the secrets of nature and pondered the glories of the visible creation cease to be at death? I can not believe it. Oh, but my friend will say it will again be called into existence at the resurrection. Does this seem credible to you, my brother? Will the mind at that time be given the advantage of its growth and attainments in this life or will it be as the mind of a newborn child? No. I do not believe that death is the cessation of the human mind in any sense. Rather, it is the emancipation of the mind. The chrysalis is burst, the shell is outgrown, and the caged creature has gone into the freedom of a higher life. The development here only shows the possibility of greater growth and wider usefulness. The wings of a bird, before it leaves the shell, are predictions of a higher life. So the faculties of the soul capable of infinitely more than this brief life can accomplish are prophetic of a future, and hence an endless life.

While the belief in the immortality of man's spirit has been, and still is, held by the majority of men, there are objections advanced against it from the standpoints of materialism, naturalism, pessimism and pantheism.

Pantheism argues that the soul is reabsorbed in the universal life; that, individuals are so many drops of water which flow back into and become a part of the great ocean. But a belief in a personal existence in the society of God and other redeemed spirits is far more reasonable and beautiful, to me at least.

Pessimism says that man's life here is not worth living and certainly continuance is not to be desired. Hence it speaks of "the restful rapture of the inviolate grave" and sings the praises of "*death and oblivion?*"

Naturalism seeks to explain man as a product of the process of nature Man is so infinitesimal compared with the mighty forces of nature, his home but a speck in space and his life but a span in time, that it would

seem an arrogant assumption for him to claim exemption from the laws of evolution and dissolution. This view, however, ignores man's intellectual worth and ability; his ideals of truth and right.

Materialism contends that life depends on a material organism; thought is the function of the brain and the soul is the sum of mental states. Therefore, the dissolution of the body carries with it necessarily the cessation of consciousness. This is the view my opponent holds if I understand him. He is not a materialist in the common use of the term, for he believes in the superiority of mind over matter and in the existence of God and other spirit beings, I opine, but he is in agreement with materialistic view of the dependence of the mind upon the brain. This idea has been taught by some radical, one-sided psychologists in the last few decades, but it was not generally accepted and is now repudiated by the best scientists. (See article in the *North American Review*; for January, 1915, by Professor Hugo Munsterberg, Harvard Professor of Psychology.) The renowned Professor William James admits the law that thought is the function of the brain but distinguishes *productive* from *permissive* or *transmissive* function. He denies that the brain produces thought, but argues that it transmits thought. In our present condition it is an organ of expression. The soul has no other way of manifesting itself, but that the functions of the mind cease with the physical organ has never been scientifically demonstrated. On the contrary, it is clear that (1) man does distinguish himself from his body; (2) he is conscious of his personal identity through all the changes of his body; (3) in the exercise of his will he knows himself not controlled by but controlling the body; (4) his consciousness warrants his denying the absolute identification of himself and his body.

After all, however, we are dependent on revelation for our proof of the immortality of the soul, and I am glad that the brother who represents the negative side of this proposition, strange as it may seem, believes the Bible. To it then we shall appeal our case and its utterances with us shall be final. But as we begin to search the Scriptures it becomes necessary to define clearly what we mean by the terms of our proposition. In affirming that man is a composite being I mean that he is neither wholly flesh nor wholly spirit; neither wholly body nor wholly soul, but there are at least two elements in his being and that one element is immortal. This immortal element is in common usage called soul, but is not often so designated by the Bible. When I say the immortal part of man is usually designated as soul I mean that is the way we most frequently speak of it. The Bible, however, uses another term, and I will here and now save my brother the trouble of searching out and showing us that what the Bible speaks of as soul is not a conscious entity. Though in a few cases it is. Perhaps it would be well to give the Biblical use of the word.

In the Hebrew the word is *Nepesh*, and in Greek *Psyche*, and in English soul. This word occurs many times in the Bible and has a variety of meanings. Souls are ascribed to both animals and men. Souls are said to die and perish, etc The word soul is very often used to designate a person, as, "Fear came upon every soul;" "Eight souls were saved by water;" "There were added three thousand souls;" "Three score and fifteen

souls." and when God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and "man became a living soul," i.e., a *living creature* or living person. The spiritual or immortal part of man is not here designated. The word *Psyche* or soul is never applied to God or angels and rarely to the human spirit. It occurs in the Greek New Testament one hundred and five times and has various meanings. In a few instances it is used as equivalent to the word spirit but is *never translated spirit*. Spirit is the word that designates the immortal element, the conscious Ego, the Self, the part of man that reasons, thinks, and dictates the actions of the body. In the Hebrew the word is *ruach*, and in the Greek *pneuma*, and in English Spirit. The word of God divides between the soul and spirit and distinguishes them one from another. (Heb. 4:12; 1 These. 5:23.) Of the creation of this spirit Moses gives no account except that man was made in the image of God. "*The Spirit is something higher than the soul. In the spirit is the unity of our Wing, our true Ego. The soul is but an element in its service. At death the soul passes away, the spirit ripens to a new existence*" (Lotze). The word spirit in some translations is a few times substituted for *soul*, but these terms are never interchanged in the original versions. The soul is said to die, *but it is never said that the spirit dies*. The dead are spoken of as spirits (Luke 23:37; Acts 23:8; Heb. 12:23; 1. Pet. 3:19). but the living as souls. The most important difference in their uses is that the soul is applied to the individual, but the spirit is never so used. *Mortality, or death, or destruction is never affirmed of a spirit—any spirit, good or bad.*

The word *pneuma* occurs three hundred and ninety-three times in the New Testament and *Psyche* one hundred and five times, yet *pneuma* is never translated soul and *Psyche* is never translated spirit. Let us not then, confound these terms and when we read that the soul dies imagine that we have found proof of the mortality of the spirit. "*Spirit is never said to die, to be destroyed or to cease to exist.*"

Of the whole number of occurrences of *pneuma* in the New Testament, it is applied to the *spirit of God* two hundred and eighty-eight times; to evil spirits thirty times; to the human spirit forty times; and, figuratively, to indicate *disposition* seventeen times. It is also shown from the analysis of the occurrences of this word *spirit* that when any one in dying gives up or commends himself to the Lord, or to the Father, in such words as "He gave up the ghost," or "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" or "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," the word *Psyche* or soul is *never used*. This shows clearly that the terms are different and that the soul is merely the animal life while the spirit is the vital principle, the rational being that outlasts death.

It would be of interest to us to know what it was that Jesus committed into his Father's hands when he cried with a loud voice and gave up the ghost if the spirit is not a conscious entity. Coming from the lips of the dying Savior these words are significant. What was it about which he was so concerned? If Christ were wholly mortal he *knew* it, and if there was nothing of him when he ceased to breathe but a lifeless body, why these words? But here is another thought: If this were the first and only time

such an expression was ever heard from a dying person we might well wonder what it meant, but this was common. What then did people usually mean in such cases? No one will be rash enough to deny that it was the popular idea that the Spirit left the body at death and continued to exist in a conscious state. Christ's words were in harmony with this idea and gave it the sanction of Him who now holds the keys of death and Hades. Our Savior's language to the penitent thief is another strong proof that man does not cease to exist at death. "Today shall thou be with me in Paradise" were his words. They both died that day and their pulseless bodies were taken from the cross, yet *that same day* they were together in some other state. While their mutilated bodies were being disposed of their liberated spirits were in holy communion in the garden of God.

DR. SPENCE'S REPLY TO BREWER'S FIRST ARTICLE.

My opponent in debate and brother in Christ, the Rev. G. C. Brewer, affirms that "Man is a composite being, and possesses an element—usually designated as soul—that is immortal and may exist independently of the physical organism." which I deny, and affirm that "Man is wholly mortal, and has no conscious existence from death till the resurrection." To this I may add. no conscious existence after the second death; for this is the consideration which gives importance to my contention.

This is one of the greatest Questions that can exercise the mind of man; for if man is immortal, and if therefore the greater part of mankind will live forever in misery, all other subjects sink into insignificance before this one. It is also a great subject because its roots run out into almost every other doctrine of Scripture, so that if a man is wrong on this point he is likely to be more or less wrong on almost every other.

The question is, Did the Creator make man immortal by the first creation, or will He make him immortal by a second creation? Is man immortal through Adam, the life-giver (under God) of the Old Creation, or will he be made immortal through the Last Adam, the risen Christ, the life-giving spirit of the New Creation? Does man "put on immortality" by generation, or by regeneration? Is man a never-dying being when he issues from the womb, being "born of flesh," or will he become a never-dying being when he issues from the tomb, being "born from the dead"—"born of spirit?" Was man made a spirit by the Old Creation, or will he (if saved) be made a spirit by the New Creation?

According to the Scriptures, all the things of the Old Creation are to be made new—that is, all of them that will remain; for it is written. "And he that sat on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new." And again: "As the new heavens and new earth which I shall make shall remain before me, so shall your seed and your name remain." Again: "We look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And again: "Evildoers shall be cut off, but they that wait on the Lord, they shall inherit

the earth." These scriptures teach "the removal of those things that may be shaken, as of things which are made, that the things which cannot be shaken may remain," and imply that there are some things now existing which will remain forever by being re-created, and that other things now existing will not remain, but be "cut off." Among the things that belong to the New Creation is the risen body of our blessed Lord, for we read that after his earthly House of tabernacle had been put off, he, "by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." He, therefore, is one of those that will "remain." Others that will remain are those that are in Christ, for "if any man be in Christ, there is a new creation, the old things are passed away; lo, they have become new." Paul could not have meant that all of the things of the old creation are already passed away, for it is clear that our bodies are part of these old things, and it is clear they have not yet passed away; but he was speaking of what we are destined to become through Christ, and of what the risen Christ, as our representative, is already for us; that is, a new creation. Now it follows that if all things destined to remain forever must be made new, man's body included, then if man ever received by creation an immortal spirit this spirit must also be made new, being part of "all things," For God has said, "Behold, I make all things new."

But my opponent in debate says that the spirit is immutable and immortal, knowing neither change nor death, being as undying as the eternal God himself, and therefore needing no new creation in order that it may live forever. If my opponent should try to evade my conclusion by saying that the spirit is no part of the old creation, and therefore not included in the all things that must be made new, then let him tell us how it came into man, and (seeing that it cannot have descended from Adam by passing from father to son, if it be no part of the old creation), how it comes to be in every newborn babe? Nor can he evade my conclusion by saying that the spirit is created anew at conversion, for this would be to grant my contention, namely, that man has no immortality of spirit by birth and nature, and that immortality comes only to those who become new creatures through Christ Jesus. The sinner's spirit, therefore, even if he had something inside him that could remain alive and conscious between death and resurrection, and until the judgment, would nevertheless be compelled to pass away by the second death. The loving disciple John wrote, "The world *passeth away*, and the lusts thereof; but he that doeth the will of God *abideth forever*." What does this mean? By "world" he doubtless meant the world of ungodly men, not the earth itself, for the latter could not be said to have "lusts"—desires— while this is eminently true of mankind. And by saying that this lustful world *passeth away*, John could not have meant merely that ungodly men pass away temporally by dying, for that would be true also of the righteous, and in such case there would have been no contrast between them; but he must have meant that the world *passeth away forever*, for he sets their fate in contrast to that of him that "abideth forever." His meaning must have been that the world of the ungodly shall pass away forever in the sense of not abiding forever; and that also even their desires shall pass away.

which latter could certainly not be said of sinners in hell. That John says "abideth" instead of "*shall* abide," does not at all disprove my interpretation of his words, for nothing was more common with John than the use of the present for the future tense. For instance, he quotes the words of the Psalm which says that the Messiah "*shall abide* before God for ever," as "*abideth* for ever." It was where the Jews argued that Jesus could not be the Messiah if he were going to be lifted up on a cross and die, for their Scriptures had foretold that the great king should receive from God the gift of "length of days for ever and ever," and that God would "preserve the King's life and his years as many ages: he shall abide before God for ever," To abide for ever, therefore, meant to them to not die literal death. They were correct in thus interpreting the Psalm, but erred in not seeing that the endless life of the Messiah should be entered through the door of death and by putting on immortality at resurrection. Therefore when John said that "he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever" he meant that he should enjoy for ever the opposite of *literal* death. (I use the word "literal" as opposed to that imaginary "*spiritual* death" which nearly all spirit immortalists believe in. No such term is in Scripture.)

Now, as the word "abideth" is, in the Greek, the same word as "remaineth," John was as good as quoting that prophecy where God said. "For as the new heavens and new earth shall remain before me, so shall your seed and your name remain." You can not force on this word "remain" a spiritual sense, such a* it is common to force on the word "live" when used in Scrip-lure, for it would be an absurdity to say that the new heavens and new earth shall *spiritually* "remain"; and this bring so, it is clear that the rest of the passage, "So shall your seed remain," cannot be interpreted as meaning anything else than *literally remaining*. And to say that the righteous shall abide for ever and remain as the new heavens and earth shall remain, is to imply clearly that the unblest shall not remain; and therefore they wilt not be alive for ever in hell; for in such case they would certainly be remaining. That only the blest will survive the deluge of fire of the last day is also beautifully shown in figure by Noah and his saved family descending from the ark to inherit the (figuratively) new earth and new heavens after the Flood; for Genesis says, "Every living soul was destroyed, both man and cattle; and Noah only *remained*, and they that were with him in the ark." So also only Christ, and the family which God shall have given him as the Last Adam, will survive the last deluge and come forth from their place of safety to "inherit the earth, and dwell therein for ever." Ps. 37.

Having thus answered in a general way Brother Brewer's contention that man is immortal by nature, I now pass on to consider his statements seriatim.

I thoroughly agree with him that God has implanted in man a desire to live, and not only to live now, but also hereafter. This "pleasing hope, this longing after immortality," distinguishes man from the brutes, to whom the Creator has given no power to think beyond the present lifetime. If God had not destined man for immortality, it would have been cruelly tantalizing to thus hold it out before him by giving him brain capacity to think of it. With the thought of it, of course, came the hope for it. But why man's hope for immortality should be an evidence to Brother Brewer that man already

possesses it, I utterly fail to see. Indeed, it seems to me to prove just the opposite; for, as said Paul of salvation, "What a man seeth (that is, possesses), why doth he yet hope for?" But that the hope of immortality is given us to spur us on to attain it, is reasonable; for, as Paul goes on to say, "If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it"; and attain, "God will render unto every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing *seek for* glory and honor and *immortality*. he will render eternal life." I am aware that the word here translated "immortality" ought to have been translated "incorruption," but I claim that this does not materially change the sense, for both go hand in hand, as we see by Paul's other words where he said, "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality," etc.

Thus we see that a great apostle of Jesus Christ says that God's people will put on immortality at the resurrection, when "the dead shall he raised incorruptible." Not only so, but he calls this "awaking out of the dust of the earth to everlasting life" (Dan. 12:2) by no less a term than "The Hope of Israel." When the brethren met him as he arrived a prisoner at Rome, he said to them, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain." It was the high-priestly party of Sadducees ("who say there is no resurrection") which had caused his imprisonment, being grieved that he (as the other apostles had done) taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead, and therefore he could truly say, "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." A little later on, he said to Agrippa, "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers; unto which our twelve tribes, instantly serving God night and day, hone to come; for which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused by the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Here Paul utterly ignores the immortality of the spirit and solemnly declares that the resurrection of the dead was the hope of Israel, saying that this hope was based on the great covenant promises made of God to the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In his epistle to Galatia he calls these covenant promises "the Gospel," saying that "God preached the gospel aforetime to Abraham"; and in his great sermon recorded in Acts 13 he said to a little band of Abraham's scattered children, "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise made of God unto the fathers, he hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in *that he hath raised up Jesus*"; and in 1 Cor. 15 he again calls the resurrection of the dead "the gospel," saying, "Brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you"; and then he declares unto them the glad tidings of the resurrection of the dead, throughout a long chapter. Let me ask, Would Paul have thus declared the resurrection of the dead to be the gospel, the blessing promised by eternal covenant to Abraham, and the hope of Israel, if resurrection were so insignificant a thing as it must be if man has within him an immortal spirit? Of course he would not.

Brother Brewer says, "Will the mind that has searched out the secrets of nature and pondered the glories of the visible creation, cease to be at death?"

I can not believe it. 'Oh, but,' my friend will say, 'it will be called again into existence at the resurrection.' Does this seem credible, my brother?"

I reply: Perfectly credible, my brother. And why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?

He goes on to say: "Will the mind at that time be given the advantage of its growth and attainments in this life, or will it be as the mind of a new-born child?" I reply: It will be the mind of the fully-grown man that died, otherwise it would not be a resurrection of *the dead*. Indeed, it is doubtful if it could in such case be called even a resurrection of the body; for as the brain is a part of the body and the seat of the mind, to resurrect the brain would necessarily be to resurrect the mind belonging to it. (I assume that Brother Brewer believes in the resurrection of the body.) If God can cause much of man's character of mind and shape of body to descend from father to son through an almost imperceptible seed, cannot he carry a man's whole character through the tomb? And if even feeble man has found a way to preserve the tones of a man's voice so as to reproduce them at will long after the man is dead, as we do by the phonograph, can not the mighty God find a way to reproduce the whole man? Certainly this is far easier to believe than that God could raise up children unto Abraham out of the stones on the banks of the Jordan.

Brother Brewer's reference to the chrysalis is unfortunate, for it supplies me with an argument against him drawn from nature, while not so supplying him; for man is *not* now in the chrysalis state, but in the caterpillar state; between the caterpillar and the butterfly states lies the long wintry sleep of the chrysalis, just as the death-state lies between our present worm-like condition and the glorious resurrection of the dead. It was of this intermediate state that Paul said: "We groan, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon; that mortality may be swallowed tip of life." Strange that Paul should not have desired the unclothed state lying between death and resurrection if death will, as my opponent asserts, "let the caged creature into the glories of a higher life"!

Brother Brewer further says, "It is clear that man does distinguish himself from his body." I reply, It is clear that the Scriptures do not. Let me prove this by a few quotations: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into *his* nostrils the breath of life." Again, "Because *thou* hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, *Thou* shalt not eat of it, ... in the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread until *thou* return unto the ground; for out of it wast *thou* taken, for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." Here the Lord God does *not* distinguish man from his body, for it was the same "thou" that harkened unto the voice of his wife that was to "return to dust." Listen again: "He knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." If man were partly dust, but mainly immortal spirit, where is the force of this passage? Again: "He touched the bier, and said, Young matt, I say unto thee, Arise." Here Jesus calls a dead body "man." Again: "'Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, *Lazarus*, come forth! And *he* that was dead came forth." Evidently Lazarus was in that tomb, though dead. Again: "And Joseph took *him* down from the cross, and laid him

in a sepulcher." Again: "They have taken away *my Lord*, and I know not where they have laid *him*." Here Mary calls the dead body of Jesus her "Lord". Paul says. "Christ died for our sins, and *he* was buried, and *he* rose again the third day." Thus the same person that died was buried. Again: "*He* poured out his soul unto death." Thus "he" was the actor, and the soul was something acted on. Again: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this, *he* gave up the spirit" ("Young's Literal Translation puts it, "He breathed forth the spirit") Again: "He took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And her breath (or spirit) came again." The Lord did not distinguish between the dead body and the "maid." If an immortal spirit had passed out of the body of that girl, why did Jesus take hold of the dead body and address it and not call upon the spirit to return? And if an immortal spirit passed out of the body of our beloved Lord when he died, could not it have taken care of itself just as well after dying as before? And if so, why did he need to commit it to his Father's keeping? Again: "They stoned Stephen, catling upon God. and saying. Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." As the term, "spirit of life," or "breath of life," was sometimes used in Scripture as meaning the life itself. this was a prayer that Jesus would take care of his life and restore it to him at the resurrection. "And devout men carried *Stephen* to his burial, and made great lamentation over *him*," Therefore Stephen was still on earth, and. like David, "had not ascended into the heavens." Indeed, "no *man* hath ascended into heaven, save the Son of Man"; and therefore the spirit, even on the supposition of its having ascended into heaven, is not the "man." Here are many scriptures where the body, even when dead, is called the man. Brother Brewer can not quote a single passage from all the Scriptures where the spirit is called the man or spoken of as "he" or "him," or described as a disembodied spirit—except, of course, in the parable of the imaginary Dives and Lazarus in the imaginary Hades of the Pharisees. In Scripture the word translated "spirit" usually means the breath, sometimes the life, sometimes the mind, but never the man. Its original meaning was wind. Neither the terms "immortal spirit" nor "never-dying soul," nor any such terms, ever appear in the Bible in all the nearly three thousand times in which the words translated soul and spirit appear there. This fact of itself, is positive proof that the writers of the Scriptures did not believe in the immortality of the soul or spirit The word spirit is also used of demons, as where the apostles "were affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit," when Jesus came to them walking on the waters, and also when the risen Jesus suddenly appeared in their midst in that upper room, though the doors were shut; and it is used of angels, as where they are called "ministering spirits"; and of risen men, as where Paul says that by resurrection Jesus "became a life-giving spirit"; and again: "Deliver such an one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus"; which spirit-immortalists must admit does not mean the (supposed) immortal spirit, seeing that such would, on their theory, be saved at death, not "in the day of the Lord Jesus"; and again: "We are come (under the terms of the new covenant) to ... the spirits of Just men made perfect"; which again could not mean the supposed immortal spirit of the

old creation, because Heb. 11:39,40, together with Heb. 10:36,37, show that men will not be "made perfect" until "He that cometh shall come."

In my next paper I purpose to discuss Brother Brewer's assertions that the sacred writings never speak of the spirit dying; that the consciousness of the spirit in the death state was the popular idea of Biblical times and that this consciousness was implied in our blessed Lord's gracious answer to the penitent thief, which discussion space forbids at present

O Lord, grant us in this age knowledge of thy Truth, and in the age to come life everlasting.

G. C. BREWER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE ARTICLE..

Before advancing further arguments in support of the proposition which I am affirming, I wish to notice my opponent's review of my first article.

He says that one of the consequences of the doctrine of immortality is a belief in eternal punishment, and that seems to be his greatest reason for denying the proposition, But this is not a necessary consequence of the doctrine. Universalists, Spiritualists, Christian Scientists and others believe in the immortality of the soul, but do not believe the doctrine of eternal punishment. It is clear, therefore, that this doctrine is not included in this proposition and should not be, lugged into this discussion.

After some discussion of the old and new creations, my brother concludes that man's spirit must be made new, and is therefore not immortal. His premises do not justify either one of these conclusions. In the first place, why say that the spirit is among the things that are to be re-created? Why, he says *alt things* that remain are to be made new. But this is too broad a statement, for God and the holy angels are to remain, and of course he does not believe that they will be made new.

Secondly: My friend incorrectly assumes that to "make new" necessitates the extinction of that which is made new. He says to say that the spirit is made new in conversion is to admit that the spirit is not immortal, but the fallacy here is apparent. A Christian is a new creature in Christ in this life. Christ made of the Jews and Gentiles "one new man," Eph. 2:15. The child of God passes out of a death state into a life state by conversion, John 5:24. He has a life superadded to that which the sinner has. now, not after the resurrection.

But we are asked how the spirit enters the man. God is the Father of our spirits, Heb. 12:9. The spirit comes from Him and returns to Him, Eccl. 12:7. He creates the spirit or forms the spirit in man, Zech. 12:1.

"The world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." Brother Spence is wrong in saying that "world" here means ungodly men. The word in the Greek is *Cosmos*, and is used several times in this passage. It means the material world with its things for which men lust. In the same connection John says, "If any man love the world (same word) the love of the Father is not in him." This, of course, does not mean that a man can not love sinful men. for if it means

that, the love of the Father was not in Christ or Paul. This language proves too much for our brother's contention. According to his view, instead of Paul and John and others who did the will of God "abiding forever," they have been non-existence, for nearly two thousand years, and may be for many thousands yet to come.

His point on Noah and the deluge is correct only in part. That none but Noah and his family lived on the earth after the flood is correct, and that none but Christ and the redeemed will live upon the rehabilitated earth is entirely correct; but to conclude, therefore, that the wicked will not exist *anywhere* is to assume the very point to be proved.

My brother agrees that man desires to live forever, but can not see that this is evidence that he possesses an immortal spirit. Why, if he had not the capacity, the possibility, to live, he would not, nay, he could not, hope for life. Does a blind man hope to ever see the beauties of this world? No, he possesses not the sense of sight. Does a deaf man hope to hear while in this life? No, for he possess not the possibility. If the negative of my proposition is correct, man has no immortal element in his nature and has not the possibility of eternal existence in his present being and will never have without a re-creation.

It was rather ingenious in my brother to try to turn this point into his favor. He says man could not hope for immortality if he possesses an immortal spirit. But he has forgotten that I defined man as being neither wholly mortal nor wholly spiritual; neither wholly body nor wholly spirit. Man hopes for life free from the sin and sorrow and sickness and death that belong to his life in this mortal clay. In this we groan and travail in pain, but blessed be God, this mortal shall some day put on immortality. This idea answers much that was said in the article under review. In this sense, we seek for immortality and put on immortality, etc

The contention that the hope of Israel, the covenant promises and the gospel is only the resurrection from the dead, is not true. That is part of the hope of the gospel. The life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and all consequent blessings are included. When Paul said to Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" he evidently referred to His raising Christ from the dead, which, of course, was essential to the general resurrection.

Rut that my position makes the resurrection insignificant shall be shown erroneous in an affirmative argument which will be made in this article. My opponent's view makes the resurrection impossible; it demands a re-creation.

I did not ask if it seems incredible that God should raise the dead. No, I believe that; but that man's mind should cease all its functions and become *non est*, is a thing incredible to me even if you do say it wilt be re-created.

Dr. Spence's points of analogy on the chrysalis illustration are not accurate. I would have thought him too much of a naturalist to commit that blunder. Certainly, the caterpillar is *non-existent* during the stages of its metamorphosis. On the contrary, it has life; it is a living organism in a state of development. This is our condition exactly. What can our brother

say for this life? If man is not on probation, and can not be converted in this life, what is the good of this life according to his philosophy?

In reply to my statement that man distinguishes himself from his body. Brother Spence says if man does, the Scriptures do not, and he then quotes several passages which speak of dead bodies as persons; of the man as returning to dust, as being made of dust. etc. Yes. such terms are common. They are accommodated expressions, however. It is difficult to speak of immateriality in terms of the material. But just here our brother makes a rather sweeping statement which if true would indeed be a point in his favor. Here again he just assumes what he wishes to prove. He says, "Brother Brewer can not quote a single passage from all the Scriptures where the spirit is called the man, or is spoken of as 'he' or 'him' or is described as a disembodied spirit." He then excepts Dives and Lazarus and seeks to forestall any argument upon the language concerning them by pronouncing them "imaginary." In fact, the whole thing is a myth, is it not, beloved? Well, I would encourage him not to let these mythical characters trouble him before the time. But it is a demonstrated fact that the Bible speaks of both the flesh and the spirit as the man and distinguishes one from the other in the clearest terms. If I can prove this I will not only prove my brother's statement incorrect, but I will have established my proposition beyond doubt, hence ! shall treat this statement at some length. In the following Scriptures, the spirit—the inner man—is called *man*. and is contrasted with the flesh man, outward man, the body.

"For I delight in the law of God after the *inward* man," Rom. 7: 22. "But though our outward man is decaying, yet our *inward man* is renewed day by day," II. Cor. 4: 16.

"That ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the *inward man*; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith," Eph. 3:16-17.

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I can not tell; or whether out of the body, I can not tell; God knoweth); such an one caught up to the third heaven." II. Cor. 12: 2.

With Paul a *man* is a man whether he is in the body or out of the body. The man is not dependent upon the body for his existence. Hear him again: "For I know that in *me*, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7: 18. Paul was not all flesh, there was a Paul in which good did dwell. In the ninth verse of the twelfth chapter of Hebrews Paul names God as the Father of our spirits and contrasts Him with the fathers of our flesh, and if this does not distinguish the elements of man's nature and attribute them to different sources, I confess my inability to reason on this question. In corroboration of this idea James says, "The body without the spirit is dead," but where is the intimation from either prophet or apostle that the spirit without the body is dead? And if man is all body and there is no such thing as a separation of body and spirit what sense is there in this language? Christ existed before he had a material body and when he came into the world he said, "A body thou hast prepared me." and when his body was laid limp and lifeless in Joseph's new tomb, his spirit went away into Paradise.

While it is true that the dead body is sometimes spoken of as the *man* it is also true that they are often called *dead bodies*. The Bible uses these expressions about as we do today. See the following:

"The *dead bodies* of thy servants," Ps. 79: 2.

"Together with my *dead body* shall they ante," Isa. 26: 19.

"Cast his *dead body* into the grave," Jere. 26: 23.

"Their *dead bodies* shall be for meat," Jere. 34: 20.

"His *dead body* shall be cast out," Jere, 36: 36.

"And their *dead bodies* in the street," Rev. 11:8.

"They shall see their *dead bodies*," Rev. 11:9.

The Bible manner of speaking of the dead is clearly illustrated in the case of Dorcas' death and restoration to life as it is told in Acts 9: 36-43. Here both terms are used. Dorcas died and they washed her and laid her out—meaning her body, of course. Peter came and the sorrowing widows took him into the room where Dorcas was and showed him the garments that Dorcas had made while *she was yet with them*, and yet, she, that which they washed and laid out, was there in the room. What was it that was not with them? Peter put the women out of the room, prayed, and "turning to THE now," said, "Tabitha, arise." Now, I have not only shown the spirit or inward man is called man but here it is called "she." They showed what Dorcas did while "she" was with them. Inevitably, then "*she*" was gone, though her body was then in the room. I have done what was said could not be done.

But my brother says I can never find the expressions "immortal soul," "never-dying soul," etc., in the Bible. No, I can not, but that is a point in my favor, for the spirit being an immaterial, immortal being such expressions are redundant. You would as well say a man bought some cold ice, or that it snowed *white snow*. How often do you find the heavenly beings spoken of as immortal angels or never-dying spirits? Do you ever read of *mortal spirits* or *dying spirits*? *Never; neither death nor destruction is ever alleged of a spirit*. They belong not to the precincts of mortality. This speaks a volume in favor of my affirmation.

My brother gets his statements somewhat confused in his efforts to give us the Bible use of the word spirit. He says the word is often applied to demons, which is correct, but he then says, as when the disciples saw Jesus walking on the water and as when he appeared to them in the upper room. They did not think Christ a demon, and Brother Spence would not have to so construe the language if, like the Pharisees of old, he would *confess* the existence of both angels and spirits. The word in Mark 6: 49 when they thought they had seen an apparition is not *pneuma*, but *phaniasma*.

Now, I briefly state a few arguments that I think favor my proposition:

First—Christ's language to the penitent thief. This has not been noticed by the negative.

Second—Christ commends his spirit to the Father. The brother connects this with Stephen's dying- words and tries to answer both. But there is absolutely no sense in the expression, if my brother's idea is correct. What was it that Christ was so solicitous about? Why so solemnly commit his

spirit into the hands of the Almighty if the spirit is but wind, a nonentity, nothing? But we are asked why the spirit could not take care of itself as well after death as before. Possibly it could. It was no uncommon thing for Christ to invoke the Father's help, and blessings before his death.

Third—Stephen's dying prayer.

In the tragic death of Stephen he had a vision that is not given to ordinary men. As the infuriated mob pelted his exposed body and as the crimson stream of life followed the jagged stones away, he looked up and saw Jesus standing at God's right hand and grayed. "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," and fell asleep. Devout men buried his body, but who will say that his spirit was not cared for by the Savior? But our brother said he wished the Lord to receive and care for his life. But his life became extinct according to his views. There was *nothing* for the Lord to receive.

Fourth—I now call attention to the spirits in prison, mentioned in I. Peter 3: 19. Peter here speaks of the antediluvians as being now in prison. Both my opponent and I will agree, I think, that Christ preached to these persons through Noah while they were disobedient, but that does not change the fact that they are now spoken of as spirits—not persons—and are said to be in prison. Like the wicked angels, they are being reserved until the judgment of the great day. Jude 6, 2 Peter 2:4. It has been many thousand years since they lived on the earth, but they still exist.

Fifth—My fifth argument is based on Christ's answer to the Sadducees, as given in Matt. 22:32 and Luke 20:37-38. Jehovah is "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead but of the living: *for all live unto Him.*" Abraham and Isaac and Jacob had been dead many hundred years when this language was first used yet they were not extinct or else God is the God of the dead in the Sadducean sense. He is the God of *nothing*. God is not the God of what *was* but of what *is*, hence, the patriarchs still live somewhere. How would the fact that these men still live prove the resurrection? I win here quote front McGarvey's Commentary on this point:

"The thoughtful reader may have observed that the conclusion of this argument falls short, in its terms, of the demands of the subject. The subject is the resurrection of the dead, white the conclusion affects only the question whether the spirits of the dead are still alive. We can not escape the difficulty by supposing, as some have done, that the resurrection spoken of is that of the spirit, not that of the body; for there is no such thing as a resurrection of the spirit. The spirit does not die, and therefore it does not arise from the dead. It leaves the body as the latter dies, its departure is the immediate cause of death, and it departs in the full possession of life. Resurrection is always spoken of in the Scriptures with reference to the body. How, then, does the Savior's proof that spirits continue to live apart from the body, include proof of the resurrection? It seems quite certain that the argument appeared conclusive to the Sadducees; for Jesus assumed that it was so, and they tacitly admitted the fact; while the bystanders who knew the views of the party "were astonished at his doctrine." (Verse 33.) In other words, the Sadducees admitted that if the existence of human spirits apart from the body were proved, the necessity, for resur-

rection would follow. The argument, then, was conclusive at least to them; but was it no more than an AD HOMINEM argument? We think not; for human spirits having been originally created for the exercise of their powers through the organs of a body, must, unless their original nature be changed, which is an inadmissible supposition because unsupported by evidence, be dependent for their highest enjoyment on the possession of a body. This being so, the continued existence of spirits after the death of the body creates a demand for the resurrection of the body, and the Sadducees were philosophical enough to see this. May the Lord add his blessings.

DR. SPENCE'S SECOND NEGATIVE ARTICLE.

The Rev. G. C. Brewer's second ably written article lies before me, which I will first briefly answer, then revert to his first article.

Brother Brewer objects to my reference to "eternal punishment." Now the strongest argument against the theory of old-creational immortality is that, if it be true, man must, if the Scriptures are true, suffer anguish in fire, or its equivalent, for eternity; but as Brother Brewer objects, I will refrain from this line of argument. Let me say, however, that I do not deny eternal punishment, but claim that eternal punishment will consist in "everlasting destruction," not in everlasting misery.

When the Most High said, "Behold, I create all things new," and "He that overcometh shall inherit all things," he doubtless spoke of the all things under consideration, namely, those of the old creation, not those of the entire universe. This included man's spirit, if there be such a thing.

I deny that "a Christian is a new creature in Christ Jesus in this lifetime." I also deny emphatically that a man "passes out of the death-state into the life-state at conversion."

True, the word used for "world" by John in the passage, "The world passeth away," is *cosmos*. It meant primarily a world in order, as distinct from *chaos*, a world in disorder. But *cosmos* also grew to mean the men of this world—this *cosmos* (who are for the most part ungodly), as distinct from the men of the world to come. Jesus used the word "world" as meaning these ungodly men when he said, "Marvel not if the world hate you," and for mankind in general when he said, "God so loved the world." See also I. John 4: 4-5. The Greek word for the earth is *ge*. The word *aion* (age) is sometimes translated "world," but erroneously.

As for the unsaved remaining *somewhere*, though not on earth, after the deluge of fire, let me quote what Jesus said about it: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burnt in the fire, *so* shall it be at the end of this age." "SO." Therefore as the tares are burnt up, not kept forever burning, *so* shall it be with the unsaved. And more: As the tares were burnt in the field where they grew, not carted off to some distant field or far-away hell. *so* shall it be in the end of this age, at "the day of destruction of ungodly

men." See II. Pet. 3, in evidence that at the end of the age of the old creation there will be a great deluge of fire.

Yet, Brother Brewer, a blind man does wish for and hope for sight, especially when he has some reason to think he may get it. If he already had Sight, would he be hoping for it? I re-assert that the resurrection of the dead was the great "hope of Israel," based on the promises made to the patriarchs. Resurrection to everlasting life was implied in the promise of God to Abraham, "I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting* possession." Jeremiah says, "The land which God gave unto our father! *for ever and ever.*" The three great things promised by God to his loving people are that they shall "inherit life everlasting." "inherit the earth." and "inherit the kingdom." (Matt. 19: 5-25.) As these two latter depend on the former, therefore the resurrection of the dead was the hope of Israel, and is the hope of the church. For "if the dead rise not, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

Brother Brewer says the caterpillar is *not* non-existent when it passes into the chrysalis state. I claim it ceases to be the caterpillar; which is as good as dead. If the chrysalis-state represents anything, it must represent the death-state of man, not his present life-state. No doubt the chrysalis is unconscious.

Brother Brewer says that "immortality," when used in Scripture, means "freedom from sin and sorrow and sickness, and from the death of this mortal clay." I had supposed that immortality meant immortality. But Brother Brewer says no; it only means freedom from sin, etc. Therefore, when I next read that "God only hath immortality," I shall understand it to mean that God only hath freedom from sin and sorrow and sickness.

When I said, "Brother Brewer can not quote a single passage where the spirit is called the man," I meant the supposed immortal spirit,—the ghost that, men say, somehow gets inside the body of the unborn infant and slips out of the body at death to soar to worlds unknown. I did not mean the mind; which I know is sometimes spoken of in Scripture as the spirit, and also as the man. Thus Paul says, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man;" but he did not mean by "inward man" any immortal spirit, but only the mind (which is a thing common to men and beasts), for he goes on to say, "So with the mind I serve the law of God." He also elsewhere quotes the words of God in Jeremiah, "I will put my laws in their inward parts" as "I will put my law into their mind." Thus the "inward man" and "inward parts" were terms equivalent to "mind." Now what were these inward parts? They were what Solomon calls "the innermost parts of the belly," and consisted in the heart, liver, kidneys and bowels. Accordingly David says in Ps. 16, "My kidneys also instruct me in the night seasons. I have set the Lord always before me, therefore my heart is glad and my liver rejoiceth." Paul also talked of "bowels of mercy," and of the Cretans being "slow-bellied." The ancients supposed these parts to be the organs of thought. These were what they meant by "inner man,"

True, "the body without the spirit (or, breath: margin) is dead;" but it does not follow that the spirit without the body is alive.

Yes. God is the "Father of spirits;" for when just men shall become spirits "like unto the angels," they will then be "the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Paul says that by the new creation "the last Adam was made a spirit;" and he was speaking of the resurrection, as sec 1. Cor. 15: 44-45; and in Acts 13: 35 Paul says that Jesus became the Son of God by resurrection from the dead.

Yes, a dead man is often spoken of in Scripture as a "dead body;" why not? That does not make him any the less the *man*. He is simply not a *living* man.

The words, "While Dorcas was with them," do not imply that Dorcas had gone away somewhere, but only that she was no longer with them as she had been, a living quantity. So it might be said of a good dog, "While Towser was with us we had no fear of robbers," though Towser might be lying dead near by.

Brother Brewer thinks the reason why the writers of the Scriptures never call the spirit or soul immortal is that this would be superfluous language, like saying "*cold* ice." If so, why do preachers nowadays not consider it superfluous? Why do they call the spirit "immortal" about half the times they speak of it at all? Is it not that its (supposed) immortality is a thing so vast, and so impresses their minds by its tremendous weight, that out of the fullness of their heart their mouth speaketh? Strange that the writers of the Scriptures were never once similarly impressed!

How does Brother Brewer *know* that the disciples supposed it was the disembodied spirit of Jesus, not a demon spirit impersonating him, that appeared to the disciples on the day of his resurrection? And how does he *know* that when Luke wrote, "The Sadducees say there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." he meant disembodied human spirit, and not demons?

No; I did not say that the breathed-out spirit of our dying Lord was but wind; I explained that the word "breath," seeing that it was "the breath of *lift*" was sometimes used to mean the life itself. Instances: "The God in whose hands thy breath is, hast thou not feared." "After three days and a half the breath of life (R. V.) from God entered into them, and they stood on their feet." (Mark, nothing is said of any departed spirits of these two witnesses—Moses and Elijah—returning to their bodies.) Again: "Come from the four winds. O wind, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as God commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived." Why did not Ezekiel say, "And their departed spirits came back into them," if that was the fact?

Stephen's vision of Jesus standing at the right hand of God did not occur at the time of his stoning, but an hour or two earlier, while he was yet standing before the council. Jesus was "standing" because the Jews stood up to witness, and he was witnessing together with Stephen, the witness of two men being considered true, in Jewish law. Therefore Jesus was not standing up to receive Stephen's spirit into heaven.

Concerning "the spirits in prison" and our being "saved by water," I say as did Luther, "Peter here blurts out like a madman something which no man from his day to ours has been able to explain." Those three verses, as

also that one in 1 Pet. 4:6, read very much like an interpolation. If any man can get any clear sense out of them, I implore him to let us know what it is.

Yes, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob "all live unto him" (God), but not to themselves, nor to angels or anyone else. Else why should Jesus say that "they live *unto him*?" I think Jesus meant that they live in God's purposes, he foreseeing them as they shall be in the resurrection; for he seeth the end from the beginning, and known unto him are all his works from the foundation of the world. Therefore Isaac lived *unto him* before he was born. God calling him by name; and so also did all of Abraham's other children; for He said, "I have made (not, will make) thee the father of many nations;" which mode of speech God could use because, as said Paul, "He quickeneth the dead, and (therefore) calleth those things that are not (as yet) as though they were." Thus the dead "are not." In God's purposes Jesus had "glory with the Father before the world was;" and he added, "The glory thou gavest *me I have given* them;" and Paul said, "Whom he did predestinate . . . them he also glorified." "Glorified" *in purpose*; for "Jesus was not yet glorified" in fact, much less his disciples. Similarly, when God spoke to Abimelech about Sarah, he said, "Thou *art* a dead man, became of the woman thou hast taken," which meant, as the following verse shows. "If thou return her not, thou *shall* surely die." Therefore, when the Deity speaks of the living as dead, it is because they shall die; and when he speaks of the dead as living, it is because they shall live. "He is not a God of the dead," in the Sadducean sense of the word "dead," that is. dead for ever. But as long as men are alive, even though they were in "bell." he is and must be their God; for he is "the God of the spirits of all flesh."

I now return to Brother Brewer's first article. He says that the Scriptures never speak of the spirit dying, as they often do of the soul. I reply of course they do not, for you would not say the breath diet, but that it is cut off, goeth forth, fails, ceases, is breathed-out, and such like terms. If no such terms were found in Scripture, Brother Brewer would here have a strong argument; but they are found there, for instance: A psalmist says of God, "He will *cut off* the spirit of princes;" another psalm says, "His breath (or spirit, for the Hebrew word is the same) *goeth forth*; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his *thoughts perish*" The writer of Ecclesiastes says that man and beast "have all one spirit," and that all "go to one place;" and then, as though challenging some who said that the spirit of man goes to one place and the spirit of the beast to another, he asks, "Who knoweth the spirit of man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?" (Revised version.) Later on, this writer says, "The dead know not anything;" and later on, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the breath (or spirit) shall return to God who gave it. Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher; all is vanity." Thus the taking away the breath, or spirit, which God gave when "He breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life," is part of the many things which that pessimistic writer says are "vanity." Evidently he had no idea of any immortal spirit going upward into the glorious presence of God, or he would not have said such was vanity. Nor would he have spoken of such an ascending personage as "it." He doubtless meant

that the breath returns to God in the sense that at death God takes back the gift of life, as says the psalmist concerning the beasts, "Thou takest away their breath, they cite, and return to their earth." Is it not remarkable that this Hook of Ecclesiastes, which is full of Sadducean sentiment, and often denies that there is any future life for man, being the only book in all the Bible that plainly says so, should contain the only verse in all the Old Testament that spirit-immortalists are wont to quote as evidence of the consciousness of the dead? And is it not remarkable that the preachers of our day, unlike that "Preacher" of old, always omit to add, "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity." Again: "By these things men live (namely, by God's mercies in recovering King Hezekiah from sickness), and in all these things is the life of my spirit; so wilt thou recover me, and make me to live." The necessary inference is that if God had not healed Hezekiah, his spirit would have ceased to live. Again: "I will not be always wroth, . . . for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls that I have made." Here both soul and spirit are said to fail, which shows that they do not have the two different fates which my opponent speaks of. And that the word "fail" means here, as often elsewhere in Scripture, to cease to live, is clear from such passages as that where the psalmist says,, bemoaning His sickness and approaching death, "O Lord, my spirit faileth;" and from Luke 16:9, where Jesus says, speaking of dying, "When ye fail;" and where Paul makes "fail" mean the same as "cease" and "vanish away," saying, "Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away, . . . when that which is perfect is come."

Brother Brewer says, "No one will be rash enough to deny that it was the popular idea that the spirit left the body at death and continued to exist in a conscious state." I deny it, and think Brother Brewer somewhat rash in asserting it. Highly learned men, even those that believe in spirit-immortality, admit that this doctrine is not in any Jewish writings prior to the Grecian conquests, B. C. 330. We all know that it was a doctrine of the Greeks, and that at that great seat of Grecian learning, Alexandria in Egypt, there was a vast number of Jews. The learned writer of the article "Baruch" in the Encyclopedia Britannica says of the author of that apocryphal book, "Perhaps the writer lived about 300 to 290 B. C. The Palestinian abode of the writer is pretty clear, especially from the melancholy view death presented in chapters 2:17 and 3:19. resembling that in Ps. 6:5. In Alexandria the Jews had attained to a clear idea of immortality, in Palestine not. Ps. 6:5 reads: "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in sheol who can give thee thanks?" This learned writer as good as says that the Jews got their "clear idea of immortality" from the Greeks, not from the psalms and prophets. I have somewhere read that the doctrine of spirit-immortality did not get a firm foothold in Palestine until the first century before Christ; and we all know that in the days of Jesus there was a large and powerful body of the Jews who strenuously denied it, the Sadducees; I admit that the Pharisees and the Essenes confessed it; but what the popular belief was, we do not know. Probably the greater part of the populace still held to the faith of the psalmists in this matter. What the Pharisee Josephus said about it was doubtless the belief of the

Pharisees, not necessarily of the masses. However, the fact that the Jews still understood the psalmist's "abide forever," in the passage, "He shall abide before God forever," in its literal sense, as where they argued therefrom that the Messiah should never die, goes far to show that they had not then as yet forsaken the literal sense of such terms as "abide forever" and "live forever" as found in the Old Testament. Let us now pass on to consider Brother Brewer's claim that our Redeemer's promise to the penitent thief implied the consciousness of the dead.

Following the invariable custom of preachers, brother Brewer misquotes this passage; that is, he leaves out five essential words, namely, "Verily, I say unto thee this day, Thou shalt be with me in Paradise." I claim that this saying of Jesus ought to have been punctuated by our translators thus: "Verily I say unto thee this day, Thou shalt be with me in Paradise." We know that the Greeks had no way of punctuating their sentences with commas, colons, etc., as we have; and the method they did use, which was to place either at the beginning or end of a clause the word they wished to emphasize, does not help us out in this case, because in either position "this day" would be emphatic. I know the advocates of spirit-immortality say that it could not properly be placed at the end of the first clause because it would not be emphatic but absurd to say, "Verily I say unto thee this day," as though Jesus meant, "I do not say it jester day, or tomorrow, but today; and I admit this would be absurd if that had been any ordinary day, or indeed any other day than the very day it was; just as it would be absurd for me to say to you, if standing anywhere in America, "Verily I say unto you on this spot of ground, there shall be a resurrection of the dead"; but it would not be at all absurd, but very emphatic, to say that if we were standing at the grave of Jesus. On that day in which Christ gave this promise to that dying thief, he had been crowned with thorns in mockery of his claim to be king, and yet that thief nevertheless believed that Jesus should yet "come into his kingdom." That day the thief had heard the wisest men of his nation challenge Jesus to prove his Messianic claim to kingship by coming down from the cross, and yet, despite the fact that Jesus did not come down, he nevertheless believed him to be the Messiah, the One who should yet rule all nations. On that day Christ's disciples had forsaken him and given up all hope, as two of them said despondently three days later, "We had trusted that this was he that should redeem Israel;" and yet, marvelous to say, the wonderful faith of that thief pierced through all the gloom of these circumstances, which seemed to say clearly that this reviled, blood besmeared, ridiculed man at his side could not possibly be the destined monarch of the world, and he cheered the heart of the dying Savior by confessing that Jesus would yet "come into his kingdom;" and he humbly begged that in that coming day Jesus would "remember" him. This thief was perhaps the only man in all Jerusalem who would have given ten cents for any promise Jesus might make *that day*, and is it any wonder that in his gracious reply our blessed Lord emphasized the words "this day," saying "Verily I say unto thee *this day*, with me thou shalt be in paradise" ? Not only in the kingdom, but in the paradise of the kingdom; in the very headquarters of Christ's dominion; for Rev. 21:22 shows that Paradise will be in the new Jerusalem, and that the new Jerusalem will be in the new Earth, and that "the throne of the Lamb" will be in the city and that "the nations of

the saved" will inhabit the surrounding Earth, only comparatively few of them inhabiting the city. The penitent thief shall be with these few. That was a great promise)

Moreover, the Paradise of the new creation (which must have been the one spoken of by Jesus; for certainty he did not speak of the Paradise of the old creation, the garden of Eden) was then not yet in existence, And therefore they could not have gone thither that day; for *the new creation began with the resurrection of Jesus*; by which sublime event he was made the "last Adam" and "the Beginning of the creation of God." This is shown by a comparison of Rev. 3:14 with Rev. 1:5; for in Rev. 3 he is called "the faithful and true witness, and the Beginning of the Creation of God," and in Rev. 1 he is called "The faithful witness and the first-begotten of the dead;" and as all the things said of him in the first chapter are repeated in the second and third chapters, and as the words, "the first begotten of the dead," are nowhere repeated unless it be by the words, "The beginning of the creation of God," therefore it was as the first-born of the dead that Jesus was the Beginning of the creation of God. "The creation of God" therefore, meant the new creation; the term, "of God," being used here, as in several places elsewhere, to signify the better of two things; just as "The Israel of God" meant the new Israel, and "the Paradise of God" the new paradise.

A further evidence that it must have been the paradise of the new creation and not some abode of happy spirits awaiting the resurrection day, is supplied by the fact that Christ's words to this thief are not quoted by any early Christian writer until far on in the third century. This is the more significant because early in that century the great Tertullian wrote very extensively on the state of the dead, having much to say about Hades, he being almost the first Christian writer to assert the consciousness of the dead. That he should have omitted to mention this Paradise if he thought it then existed, is incredible.

Dear Lord, expound to us the scriptures, as thou didst to thy two despondent disciples on their way to Emmaus, so that we may say with them, "Did not our hearts burn within us as he opened unto us the scriptures."

G. C BREWER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE ARTICLE.

If our discussion is ever read by many people there will probably be some among them who agree with my affirmation and some who hold my opponent's view, but no one should be blinded to the reasoning of either side, and if there is an argument presented that makes the proposition impossible it should be given up; or when the Bible is the criterion, if a disputant is compelled to ignore, evade or pervert certain Scriptures the reader should be quick to detect it and not be misled. When certain passages seem to teach contrary ideas it is certain that a wrong construction is put on one, if not both. Plain, unmistakable language should never be used to have an unnatural meaning in order to make it harmonize with over-

wrought figurative or poetical expressions. Nor should a *word* be forced to have the same meaning in every place it is found. Words are often used in different senses. The context must determine the meaning, Take a simple illustration: Christ says in Luke 13: 24: "Strive to enter by the narrow door." while Paul says in II. Tim. 2: 24, "The Lord's servant must not strive." Here Christ commands his servant to *strive* and Paul says they must *not strive*. The same word, spelled the same way, yet no one would misunderstand this. Christ uses the word in the sense of endeavor and Paul uses it in the sense of contend bitterly. But if the sense here were not so obvious how easy it would be to confuse some people. Let us keep these things in mind as we read this or any other discussion. I will briefly review my brother's negative article. There is one common fallacy which is found in many of his arguments and when the fallacy is seen the argument fails of its purpose. The fallacy is that of drawing a universal conclusion from a limited premise and of attaching an arbitrary meaning to a word. This is clearly seen in his use of the word "world." It is true that the word sometimes means the people on the world, but not always and not primarily. It can not mean that in the passage he cites, for there we are forbidden to love the world and are told in what the world consists (1 Jno. 2:15-18).

My brother says "if there be such a thing" as man's spirit it is one of the "all things," to be made new, though he admits that there are some things not included in the "all things." Well, why must the soul be included? It must be, forsooth, for he says it is not immortal and one must be created that is immortal. See how he Assumes what he proposes to prove ?

And he denies that man is converted, made a new creature or pastes out of death into life before the resurrection. Why deny that, you may ask. Again he *must*, his theory demands it. This is just one of the absurd positions a man is forced to take by the doctrine of materialism. Others will be shown when I come into the negative in this discussion. On this point he Has the misfortune to be quarreling with the word of God. "For ye were once darkness but now light in the Lord," Eph. 5:8. "But ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and In the spirit of our God," 1 Cor. 6:11. "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me. hath eternal life and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed *out of death into life*," Jno. 5: 24. "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren." 1 Jno. 3:14. "Beloved, now are we children of God." 1 Jno. 3: 2. We will notice what is said about the wicked being burned up when the word *destroy* comes in for attention, as it will.

The reader knows my illustration on the blind man and the chrysalis. The man whose optic nerve is destroyed has no reason to believe he will ever have sight in this life and it is absurd to say he hopes for it. If man were wholly mortal and possessed not the possibility of eternal life, he would not hope for it. But nearly all men in all ages have hoped for life beyond the grave. Before life and immortality were brought to light men hoped; and where the light has never gone men hope.

It will only show the weakness of his position for my brother to say I said things that I did not say or to reply to an argument I did not make. I did not say that "immortality" means "freedom from sin and sorrow and sickness," No, I said that man in his present state is part mortal and part immortal, and that he may seek to become wholly immortal; to be freed from the ills that belong to the mortal. There may be much else that belongs to God and other immortal beings, but it is certain that they do have freedom from the thing mentioned.

Every intelligent reader knows I did not argue that Christ "*stood up*" to receive Stephen's spirit. But Stephen saw Jesus standing at God's right hand and prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." Now, "if there be such a thing," Christ must have received It, and if there be no such a thing Stephen must have been delirious or "blurring like a madman."

My brother says when Paul spoke of the "inward man," he meant the mind. I admit that the mind or the spirit either designates the thinking, knowing, rational Ego-man. But he makes his point ridiculous by naming some of the parts of the body which were sometimes used figuratively to represent man's innermost thoughts or esoteric cogitations. He says, "These were what they meant by 'inner man'." If you wish to see how ridiculously absurd this is, just substitute the words kidney and liver and bowels for "inward man" in the passages I used, Eph. 3:16. 17; Romans 7:22; 2 Cor. 4: 16; Paul here speaks of a *wan* that does not perish and decay with the body—the *on heard* man—as all can see.

My brother says here that the mind and the spirit are the same, but further on he says the spirit is the breath. He says it is never said the spirit dies because the *breath does not die!* Is the MIND just BREATH too? And does the *wind* never die? If not, my proposition is established.

He says, "Yes. God is the Father of spirits," for "when just men become spirits." etc. Now. where does the word of God say anything about just men become spirits? Are just men now the children of God? I would like to have a categorical answer to that question. According to his content ion he should have said, "No, God *is not* the Father of spirits, but he will some time be the Father of some spirits." The Bible does not say that "by the new creation the last Adam was made a spirit." Not a word of it. It is the brother's theory that says "*by the new creation,*" so and so: Paul says the "last Adam became a *life-giving* spirit." This last Adam was Christ and my opponent means that he was not a spirit and had no spirit till he was made one in the new creation—resurrection. See it, reader?

Paul does not say that Jesus became the Son of God by the resurrection. He was the son of God before he was ever crucified. It is my brother's theory that says he was the Son of God by the resurrection, not the Bible. He was *declared* to be the Son of God with *power* by the resurrection.

Brother Spence seems to be able to so manage both Apostle and Prophet as to make them depose in his favor on any point. He says the two witnesses spoken of in the eleventh chapter of the Revelation were Moses and Elijah. I didn't know that, and now if he will tell us when it was that they came to life and stood upon their feet, he will have enlightened us to a much greater extent. It would be well to remember while we wait for his

answer that Revelation was not written till some fifty years after Moses and Elijah appeared on Mt. Hermon with Christ in the presence of Peter, James and John.

He wants to know how I know that the disciples thought that what they saw was the disembodied spirit of Jesus and not a demon impersonating him. Well, I did not use that passage to prove that they thought it was Jesus' spirit but that they thought it was a spirit—showing that they believed in spirits—beings that have not flesh and bones—spirits without bodies. This was the common belief and Jesus sanctioned it. If my friend will examine the encyclopedias on the subject of demonology he will learn that the people of the New Testament times, except the Sadducees, thought that demons were the disembodied spirits of wicked men, I think.

Romans 8: 29 does not refer to either Christ or his disciples. See any Commentary.

All the references which say that man's *thoughts perish* at death and that there is no more remembrance in the grave, etc., will receive attention when we change propositions.

What is said about the spirit being the breath and the breath being *cut off, breathed out, failing, etc.*, does not apply against my proposition. Here is our fallacy again. The same word is sometimes translated breath and sometimes spirit, but there is a vast difference in the things thus designated by a common term and to confuse them would make the most beautiful nonsense. The spirit *knows*, "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him?" 1 Cor. 2:11. Does the breath know? God is "the Father of Spirits." Would it do to say he is the Father of breath? "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit." Troubled in breath? We must "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, I. e., filthiness of breath, eh? "If he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath," Job 34:14. Here both terms are used in one sentence. Did Jesus commend his breath to his Father? No. there is something belonging to man that knows; that was created in man (Zech. 12: 1); that came from God and returns to God (Heb. 12: 9; Eccles. 12: ?). It is called the "inward man." the spirit. This spirit is never said to die, to perish or be destroyed. Never.

But my brother thinks it strange that we rely so much on Ecclesiastes, but I say to him, "Thou art the man." I am willing to leave the whole book out of the discussion if he is. It is highly figurative and somewhat obscure, but there is nothing in it plainer than the twelfth chapter. The writer exhorts that the Creator be remembered in youth and gives a description of old age and death. No one need misunderstand the expression. "All is vanity," for he has spoken of the brevity and vanity of life.

The word *fail* may sometimes mean to cease to exist, but I doubt it.

In reply to my statement that it was the popular idea that the spirit leaves the body at death and continues to live, my brother says many learned men say the Jews got this idea from the Greeks about two or three hundred years before Christ. I will not admit that without some qualifications, but if I should, that would not say it was not the popular view in the time of Christ. But he says the writer of the article "Baruch" in the

Encyclopedia Britannica thinks the author of that book lived in Palestine and had not received the Greek view of death. Let that be the fact, what was this view of death expressed by this man who represented the Palestinian or Jewish belief? Did they think death the end of all? Nay, they believed the spirit existed apart from the body, I quote from Baruch 2: 17, "Open thine eyes and behold, for the dead that are in their graves, *whose souls are taken from their bodies*, will give unto the Lord neither praise nor righteousness." I will say, however, that it is very uncertain about when this book was written or who wrote it. The writer claims to have been the secretary of Jeremiah and to have written during the captivity.

Josephus may have been a Pharisee but what he says is a matter of history and not what he believed. The speech of Eleazar on immortality and the result of the speech as recorded by Josephus is the most remarkable thing in all literature. They not only believed in immortality, but Eleazar said the *laws of God had taught it from ancient time*. He also refers to the Egyptians—possibly the Greeks—saying, "Yet if we do stand in need of foreigners to support us in this matter, let us regard those Indians who profess the exercise of philosophy." I should like to quote the speech but space forbids.

If the reader wishes to know what has been taught on this subject by different people in different ages, let him consult the encyclopedias on articles eschatology, animism, spirit, soul, death, etc.

The Encyclopedia Britannica article Pharisee says the Pharisees held the popular belief and moulded the sentiments of their day.

In regard to Christ's language to the dying thief, it is sufficient to say that there is no recognized translation in the world that divides the sentence as my brother does, and since his rendering puts an unnatural meaning on it, I prefer to stand with the scholarship of the world and leave it as it-reads in our Bibles. His arrangements must always carry the impression of having been devised in emergency. The theory demands it, and no translation can ever be countenanced that is made on that consideration.

I deem it unnecessary to notice his dissertation on Paradise. The reader can consult the authorities and learn about it. But I do wonder why we might not let that have the meaning the Greeks attached to it. The idea came from the Greeks, did it not? But we ought not expect a man to be consistent and defend an erroneous idea.

I will now restate some points that favor my position and advance one or two new arguments:

First—*Christ's language to the thief*. They both died that day but Christ said to the thief according to all translations, "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

Second—*Christ commends his spirit to the Father*. Christ lived with God before the world was. When he came into this world a body was prepared for him and when the body succumbed to death the spirit went to God. Questions: Do you think the Christ that created all things ceased to exist at death? What was it Christ commended to the Father, merely nothing?

Third—*Stephen's dying prayer*. The reader will remember what was said *on* this. ^x

Fourth—*The spirits in prison*. The spirits of those disobedient persons who perished in the flood are held in prison. They still exist. Like the apostate angels they and other wicked spirits are cast into prison and reserved till the judgment of the great day. If the passage does not teach this it does not teach anything. I admit that it is difficult, but it is not an interpolation.

Fifth—*God is not the God of the dead*. But God is the God of Abraham. Isaac and Jacob. Therefore Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are not dead—extinct. They live "for all live unto God." I think this argument stands, though my brother labored faithfully to disprove the point

Sixth—*In the body or out of the body*. Paul speaks of a man who was possibly out of the body but still a *man*, seeing and hearing. Man may live apart from the body. *Quod erat demonstrandum*.

Seventh—*The body a tabernacle or temporary dwelling place*. Paul says: "For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God. a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For verily in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked for indeed we that are in this tabernacle (Greek—bodily frame) do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life. Now he that wrought us for this very thing is God. who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith and not by sight); we are of good courage. I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord," 2 Cor. 5:1-9. Peter says: "And I think it right as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me," (2 Pet. 1:13. 14).

These passages are too plain to need comment. Paul and Peter both contemplate the body as a tabernacle or tent which may be put off or laid aside for another and better habitation. Let us notice Paul's language beginning at the sixteenth verse of the fourth chapter. (1) Even if our outward man is failing our inward man is being renewed. For we look not to these transient, temporal, visible things. There is something that is eternal though at present invisible. (2) For if this body or tabernacle in which we live be dissolved, that wilt not be our end for we have another house, not a tabernacle but an eternal habitation. (3) Indeed we yearn for just that sort of a house, for do we not groan under the discomfort and afflictions that come to us in this tabernacle? (4) Oh. we don't desire to be left without a dwelling place, but we long to be in our heavenly house that this mortal, this imperfect, decaying tabernacle, may be replaced by a deathless home. (5) Now he who wrought in us such a desire—this very desire—is God, and he has given us the spirit as an earnest of this inheritance. (6) For this reason we are not discouraged in the face of death,

the decay or dissolution of our bodies, because we know that means that we will be at home with God. (7) Nay, rather we prefer that, for we would rather lose our bodies and be with God than to remain in the body and be separated from him. (8) But we always strive to please God whether we are in the body or out of it, for when we come to be judged we will receive for the things we did before we left the body—while living in the body.

Now this can never be harmonized with my friend's idea. He may make a play on the metaphors, but what will he do with the expressions, "absent from the body," "at home with God," etc.

Hear Paul again on the same subject: "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if to live in the flesh, if this shall bring fruit from my work, then what I shall choose I know not. But I am in a strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better: yet to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sake," (Phil. 1:21,22).

1. With Paul death was a *departing*. See also 2 Tim. 4:8.

2. It was gain.

3. It was "very far better" than living. This is a strong expression. Literally, "*much more better*"

Questions: If man has no spirit that outlasts death what was it that departed, from what did it depart and where did it go? Is Christ in the grave? If not, how would Paul be with him at death if there was nothing of Paul except that which went into the grave?

Paul here carries us along the boundary of two worlds. The words *strait* and *depart* are nautical terms and the thought is that of a ship about to set sail. The ship is lying at anchor but violent winds are blowing upon it that would drive it out to sea. The apostle represents himself as in a similar condition. His strong affection for them hound his heart to them—as an anchor holds a ship to its moorings—and yet there was a heavenly influence bearing upon him—like the gale upon the vessel which would bear him away to heaven.

May we face death with such courage and hope and faith.

DR. STEWART J. SPENCE'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

Brother Brewer opens his third affirmative with some excellent remarks, which I heartily endorse. That a man can honestly believe as does my opponent is no surprise to me, for I have been there myself. But despite my respect for Brother Brewer's honesty and intelligence I am compelled to differ with him in some of his interpretations of Scripture; for though many good men believe as he does, and though I so believed once on a time, yet I differ now, "for whereas I was blind now I see."

Brother Brewer still insists that "world" in the Scripture, "The world passeth away, and the desires thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever," does not include in its meaning the ungodly people of the world; who, of course, could not pass away if they are immortal spirits.

I reply: If the word "world" were not in the text at all, its last clause covers the ground, for it says that good men will abide for ever, from which it necessarily follows that bad men will pass away.

The spirit must to included in the "all things" which are to be made new if it is any part of that old creation which, if not made new, is to "pass away." As the spirit of the sinner can not be supposed to be created anew through Christ Jesus, it follows that he has no such immortal spirit.

I believe that those who repent and are converted in this lifetime will be regenerated at the resurrection of the righteous. At repentance a man is sanctified unto God, thus becoming "*holy* unto the Lord;" at resurrection he is "sanctified wholly, body and soul and spirit" (that is, body and life and mind) by entering through the veil into the new creation, thus becoming "*most holy*." By this resurrectional new creation the believer becomes "a child of God, being a child of the resurrection." It is true that the believer is, even in this lifetime, called in Scripture a son of God; but this is only in the prospective sense, just as we call the eldest son of a king the heir to the throne even before he becomes the heir in fact by inheriting the throne. In this sense John said that "now are we the sons of God;" and Paul said, "Thou art no more a servant but a son, and an heir of God through Christ;" and again, "We are the sons of God; and if sons, then heirs, heirs of God." When Paul thus wrote he was dealing with the subject of adoption in (he abstract, but when stating it in the order of events he said that the believer "*shall be* delivered from the bondage of corruption (that is, the corruption of the grave) into the glorious liberty of the sons of God," and that "we who have the first-fruits of the spirit, groan within ourselves, *auditing the adoption*" And again, "He that overcometh *shall* inherit all things, and I *will be* his Father, and he *shall be* my son." And mark this! You can use the present tense for the future, but you can not use the future tense for the present; you can not say, "He *shall be* my son," if he already is so. See also John 11:52, where people not then yet born, much less converted, are called "the children of God."

Brother Brewer is in error in thinking Jesus did not become the Son of God at his resurrection; for what said Paul? "The promise which God made unto the fathers he hath fulfilled to us their children in that he hath *raised up Jesus*;" as it also written in the second psalm, "Thou art my son, *this day have I begotten thee*." We learn from a comparison of Rev. 1:5 with Rev. 3:14 that it was as the "first-begotten of the dead" that Jesus was "the beginning of the creation of God." Paul says that our Lord "was of the seed of David according to the flesh, but determined (margin) the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Brother Brewer prefers the translation, "*declared* the son of God;" but even if this were the proper translation it would not say that Jesus had been the Son of God previous to his resurrection (except in the before-mentioned prospective sense). As our blessed Lord was of the seed of David he must have been the seed of Joseph (as see Matt. 1:1-16), for the writers of our Scriptures say nothing of Mary being a descendant of David; which silence is incomprehensible on the theory that they believed Jesus to be begotten of the Holy Spirit, and not to be, as John says, "Jesus of

Nazareth, the son of Joseph." That the holy spirit of God brooded over the holy child, even from the conception, is likely enough; but that Joseph was his real father is too often, and too plainly, stated to be ignored by us.

Brother Brewer says the ancients used the words heart, liver, reins and bowels in a figurative sense. If so, I must say those ancient Hebrews had a poor way of hunting up figurative terms.

If the ancient Hebrews believed that within them was an immortal spirit, why did they not say so, and not talk about kidneys and bowels?

Brother Brewer asks, "Where does the Word of God (by which I suppose he means the Scriptures) say anything about just men becoming spirits?" I answer. In 1 Cor. 15. There Paul says that "they that are Christ's at his coming" shall be "raised spiritual bodies." and in evidence of this he says that Christ "became a . . . spirit." His full words are: "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body; and so it is written, The first Adam became a living soul; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." The two heads of the two creations are here set opposite: the one was created only a soul, and "sown in corruption." but the other by the new creation became a spirit, "raised in incorruption." Therefore one just man has already become a spirit.

God is not anywhere in Scripture said to be *now* "the Father of spirits." (See Heb. 12:9.)

I think Brother Brewer must have misunderstood me about Moses and Elijah. the "Two Witnesses." I did not mean that they have already been martyred and resurrected. The time, however, is probably not near at hand. But prior to this event, and to the conversion of the 144,000 Jews by their ministry, will be the resurrection of the saints described in 1 These. 4. These risen saints are seen again in the heaven of the Revelation, singing praises to God for creation and to God and Christ for redemption (but not to Christ for creation), and saying. "We shall reign on the earth. Rev. 5:10. That they are risen, not disembodied, saints is pointed out by John Wesley in his "Notes on the New Testament;" his argument being that seeing that they are crowned they must be resurrected. Jesus had promised them, while they were yet in the flesh, that "he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron." Rev. 2. These saints appear again as "the armies of heaven" in Rev. 19 (unless "the armies of heaven" there mean angels), and again in Rev. 20 as the "they" of whom John says, "I saw thrones and they sat on them; and Judgment was given unto them." In his next vision (in same verse) he sees the martyrs of the 144,000 come to life; they being thus given a "part in the first resurrection." Together these two classes then "reign with Christ a thousand years." Between their resurrection comes that of the Two Witnesses. At the end of the thousand years, when the New Jerusalem has been set up in the new earth, these saints appear as inhabiting the city and reigning over the nations of the saved, which people the earth outside the city; "and they (the saints, not the nations) shall reign for ever and ever."

The Old Testament's last promise was, "I send you Elijah the prophet 'before the great and dreadful day of the Lord;" and Jesus said, "Elijah

shall surely first come." Speaking of John the Immersions, he had said, "If ye will receive it, this is Elijah that was to come." But they did not receive John as Elijah nor Jesus as Messiah; and therefore Elijah is yet to come. He was taken up alive in the flesh; he appeared again in the flesh on Mount Hermon (for it would be absurd to think God took up Elijah to heaven to die there); and he will be alive in the flesh to be martyred in that great city which is spiritually called Sodom in Isa. 1—Jerusalem. Thus God had a purpose in preserving the body of Elijah, and doubtless he had a purpose in mysteriously burying the body of Moses, probably that his body, too, might be preserved. Seeing that Peter and James and John heard Moses speak to Jesus, he must have had organs of speech which could set in motion the material air which lit on the ears of these disciples. If so, he must have had organs of hearing, also eyes, hands, feet, etc.; in short, he must have been a body. Not an immaterial body, either; for such could not move material air. I grant that a spiritual body need not be an immaterial body (for angels are spiritual bodies and yet could eat material food with Lot and Abraham), but if Moses had already become a spiritual body, he would have been just that which Paul says he will become at the resurrection. And what need could he have for two spiritual bodies? And it will not do to say that he may have then already been clothed with that resurrectional, regenerational, new creation spiritual body which comes from the second Adam, seeing that Jesus himself had not yet become the second Adam. He could not "see of the travail of his soul." that is, he could not "see a seed." until after God had "made his soul an offering for sin." Then "he shall divide the spoil with the strong (even with the mighty monster Death) because he hath poured out his soul unto death."

As for Job 34, where Elihu says, "Gather unto himself his spirit and his breath;" this is only such use of language as any of us soul-sleepers might use if we wished to express the idea that at death both the life and the mind of man are taken away. There are two words in the Hebrew signifying breath—*ruach* and *neshama*; and both could be used interchangeably for either breath or life or mind, according to the circumstances.

As for Baruch's words, "The dead that are in their graves, whose souls are taken away from their bodies," this might mean either immortal souls or merely lives, according to how their writer was accustomed to understand the word "souls." Other passages in Baruch show, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, how he was accustomed to understand it, showing that he took "the melancholy view of death" expressed in the psalms.

Eleazer's speech as related in Josephus may possibly have been spoken by Eleazer, but this is very doubtful; but even if so, this would only show that Eleazer, like Josephus, was a believer in the consciousness of the dead. But it is doubtful that the speech occurred at all, for Josephus says that Eleazer and his nine hundred comrades were moved by it to straightway commit suicide, to escape falling into the hands of the Romans, who had just previously destroyed Jerusalem. Even if most of them were spirit-immortalists, this would not prove that such was the doctrine of the Scriptures, for it was then fully four hundred years since Palestine had fallen under Grecian influence by Alexander's conquests. Besides, if any one escaped to

spread the news of that sad tragedy, it is extremely unlikely that he would remember Eleazer's long speech, which covers four pages of Josephus, and even if he did so, it doubtless got largely altered by the time it reached Josephus, in whose hands it would be sure to get embellished and amplified, as were the speeches of all his other heroes.

The word paradise came from the Persians, not the Greeks. Jesus was under no obligation to believe either the Greek or Persian view. The scriptural paradise is that of the new creation, which will be the headquarters of the serum! Adam even as the garden of Eden was of the first Adam.

Brother Brewer asks, "Do you think that the Christ who created all things ceased to exist at death?" I ask him. Where does Scripture teach that Christ created all things? I know that Paul wrote that our Lord is "the first-born of every creature," and that "all things were created in him and for him," and that through him God "reconciled all things unto himself," but I claim that Paul here took it for granted that the Colossians understood him to be speaking of the new creation, which is evident from the fact that he here says Christ reconciled "all things" to God, for certainly this "all things" could not include holy angels, seeing that they need no reconciliation; and certainly could not include demons. Another instance of Paul's use of "all things" in this limited sense is found in Heb. 2:8, where he says that (+*N| hath put all things under the feet of Jesus; but that he meant only the all things of that "world to come" whereof he was speaking is evident from the fact that Paul quotes these words from one of the psalms which says that God put all things under the feet of the first Adam; therefore when this scripture was transferred to the second Adam, its "all things" could not mean more than the first Adam's domain.

Brother Brewer asserts that the "difficult" passage in Peter's epistle is not an interpolation. I would like to be told how he knows this. It bears all the marks of interpolation.

Now as for Paul's saying that he was "caught up into the third heaven, whether in the body, or whether out of the body, he did not know." This comes in Paul's second letter to Corinth, which was drawn out by a criticising letter from Corinth, which he quotes largely in answering it. Many folks have mistaken these quotations for his own sentiments; for instance, where he says, "Being crafty, I caught you with guile." It is not at all unlikely that the words, "Whether in the body," etc., is one of these quotations. Probably there were in the church at Corinth disciples of Plato, who naturally would be reluctant to abandon their theory of spirit-immortality. It is certain that the Corinthian church contained Epicureans; for Paul's fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians was leveled at those who "said there is no resurrection" and that "in this life only have we hope in Christ." In that chapter Paul had written in a way which without openly denying spirit-immortality so ignored and excluded it that the Platonists could not but see that Paul was not on their side, and they (probably) asked of him whether, when he had that vision of heaven, he was in the body or not. They may have said. Don't tell us of your belief, but of your actual personal experience at that time. Had Paul been a spirit-immortalist it is a hundred chances to one that he would have replied, "I was out of the body;" but being unwilling

to admit this, yet being very conscientious and unable to remember his experience distinctly, he simply said, "I have not known."

Brother Brewer's seventh affirmation is, "The body is a tabernacle or temporary dwelling-place." Very true. Then he quotes 2 Cor. 5 as though Paul meant that just as soon as this his tabernacle was pulled down he would be in heaven as his eternal dwelling-place. Let me show that this second dwelling-place is not heaven but the resurrection spiritual body: Paul speaks of two "houses" or "homes;" of the one as "earthly" and the other as "from heaven," or heavenly. Now turn to 1 Cor. 15 and see where he says of the natural and spiritual bodies, "The first man (Adam) is of the earth, earthly; the second man (last Adam) is of heaven. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, so shall we also bear the image of the heavenly." It was customary with Paul to speak of the things of the new creation as "heavenly," and of those of the old creation as "earthly" and "worldly." Now Paul says that in this "earthly house" he groaned, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with his "house from heaven." Now, this word "clothed" is the same Greek word as is translated "put on" in 1 Cor. 15, where he says that when "the dead shall be raised incorruptible" then "this mortal shall *put on* immortality." The clothing, therefore, comes when the dead are raised incorruptible. He goes on to say. "Not that I would be unclothed, but clothed upon." Thus he did not desire the unclothed state lying between death and resurrection, but the clothed state in which he would have put on his immortal body. Therefore he did not expect to be with Christ during the unclothed state. He goes on to say, "That what is mortal may be swallowed up of life." Now as spirit-immortalists say that the body is all that is mortal, they surely ought to admit that Paul is here speaking of bodily resurrection, not of spirit-Survival. The parallel passage in 1 Cor. 15 reads, "Death is swallowed up of victory;" and all admit that Paul was there writing of resurrection. Then, after speaking of the comfort he got from this hope, he adds (according to Robert Young's Literal Translation), "Knowing that being at home in the body we are away from home from the Lord; and we are well pleased rather to be away from the home of the body and to be at home with the Lord." This shows that Paul did not expect to be "with the Lord" until he put on that "home" which would come to him "from the Lord" as the second Adam, even as his earthly body came from the first Adam.

Brother Brewer thinks Paul's words in Phil. I imply the consciousness of the dead. Let us see. Paul was being tried for his life before Nero at Rome, and was in doubt as to whether he would be beheaded or acquitted. He says his hope was that in either case "Christ shall be magnified *in my body*, whether by life or by death; for to me to live is Christ and to die is gain." That is, Christ would be magnified by his being acquitted, for that would give his body further life and opportunity to preach Christ; and Christ would be magnified by his bodily death, for that would also be gain to Christ's cause, because the blood of the martyrs was the seed of *fire* church. But which of these two fates he would choose, if he had his choice, he knew not; for he was divided between two contending desires, having a desire for the departing and the being with Christ, because this would put

an end to his afflictions and introduce him, after a dreamless sleep, into the presence of Christ as though in a moment, which was therefore far preferable from the standpoint of mere selfish desire; nevertheless, as to abide in the flesh was more needful for the Philippians, he felt a confidence that he would continue to abide with them.

The question is. Did Paul here mean that he would be with Christ as *soon* as he was unloosed by death from his earthly moorings? I say, no. If a missionary in Africa were to write to his friends in America saying, "Although I expect to remain here serving Christ, yet I often feel a strong desire to depart from Africa and be with you in America," would they understand him to mean that *as soon* as he left Africa he would be in America? No, of course not. (I have borrowed this simile from no less an authority than John Milton, the pious author of *Paradise Lost*, a thoroughgoing soul-sleeper.)

If Paul had nowhere told us in plain terms just *when* and *how* he would be with the Lord, there might be some excuse for supposing that as soon as he was dead he would be with his beloved Master; but not only did he tell those Philippians in that same letter that his great aim was to "attain to the resurrection of the dead," but in his letter to Thessalonica he explains the subject at length, ending by saying that when the dead in Christ have been raised, then the living Christians shall be "caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air; *and so shall we be ever with the Lord.*"

Let me quote Milton again; On the words of Jesus, "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there shall ye be also." the great poet says: "Jesus here expressly declares that there is not even a place appointed for the abode of the saints in heaven till the resurrection." Milton's comment on 1 Thess. 4 (in which Paul assures the Thessalonians that the saints who are alive at Christ's coming shall "not go before them that are asleep"), is this: "There would be no reason to fear that the survivors should go before them, if they who are asleep had long since been received into heaven."

I can not forbear quoting this great thinker's comment on 1 Cor. 15; he says: "If Christ be not raised (which resurrection took place for the very purpose that mankind might likewise rise again), then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished; whence it appears that there are only two alternatives, one of which must ensue; either they must rise again, or perish; for if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable; which again indicates that we must either believe in the resurrection or have our hope in this life only. 'If the dead rise not, why stand we (the apostles) in jeopardy every hour? Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die'; that is, die altogether, body, soul and spirit, for otherwise the argument would have no force." So said Milton. The great Gladstone said, "Soul immortality crept in, as it were, by a back door into the Church."

May the good God help us to know and do his word and will, so that we may abide for ever)

GOD'S GLAD TIDINGS.

By STEWART J. SPENCE.

Glad tidings I glad tidings I they've come past the sun;
They've come from high heaven; they're sent by the One.
Like laughing bells pealing a message of mirth,
These joyous glad tidings stream down o'er the Earth.

Isa. 52:7.

Glad tidings) glad tidings I hark, hark, "how they sing
Of a blessing supreme from Jehovah the King;
Of a gift beyond sneaking in wonder and worth;
Of a glory prepared for the children of Earth.

Luke 2:10.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! *a life from the dead;*
O death fearing mortal, now lift up thine head!
No longer sit drooped at the gate of the Grave,
For the arm that is mighty is stretched out to save.

1 Cor. 15:1-4; 20.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! list, list, every one,
And hear what Jehovah the mighty hath done;
He hath reached to the depths of the waters of death,
And hath brought back a Man who had parted with breath.

Acts 13: 32-33. Rom. 6: 9.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! a Man of our race
Was found fit to enter the Holiest Place!
There he's made the confession Jehovah desired;
He has offered the gift in atonement required.

Lev. 16: 21. Heb. 9: 24-26.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! o'er mountain and dell.
God hath now bid the trump of the Jubilee swell.
To announce the approach of the era of Rest.
To herald the age in which man shall be blest.

Lev. 23: 27 and 25: 8-10. Luke 4: 18-19.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! to children of Earth
He hath promised a second—a marvelous—birth;
When the worm from its chrysalis bursting shall fly
On the wing of the wind as a child of the sky.
John 3:8; 1 Cor. 15:44-45; Col. 1:18; Rom. 8:29; Luke 20:36.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

Glad tidings! glad tidings! a kingdom shall come!
The will of our God in the Earth shall be done;
For in all her wide borders no sinner shall be,
But his glory shall fill her, as waters the sea.

Luke 8: 1. Matt. 6: 10. Matt. 19: 28-29. Ps. 38: 10-11; 29.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! Earth new shall be given
To them who have laid up their treasures in Heaven;
For her vine-covered plains by the just shall be trod,
And the meek shall inherit this mansion of God.

2 Pet. 3:13; Matt. 26:28.

Glad tidings! glad tidings! the children of Faith,
Brought back from the land of the enemy, Death,
Shall inherit the Blessing, life, life evermore;
Life lasting all ages; life, sea without shore!

Ps. 103: 3. Rev. 1: 18. Ps. 21: 4. John 6: 58.

DR. SPENCE'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

It is now my turn to affirm, and Brother Brewer's to deny.

In my second negative article I passed over with a brief denial Brother Brewer's chief statement, namely, that man "passes from the death-state to the life-state at conversion." I now take it up. If this were true, it would prove that a new life, distinct from the life of the body and from the supposed immortal life of the spirit (both of which are *literal*) begins at conversion and runs parallel with literal life, without being any part of it. This supposed new life has been named by theologians "*spiritual*" life," and they say it is that of which Jesus speaks as "everlasting life," as in such words as "Whosoever believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting life." They are forced to this, for it would be absurd to say Jesus promised a literal everlasting life to believers, if all men, believers or not, have literal everlasting life consisting in spirit-immortality. Therefore any argument that overthrown spiritual life also overthrows spirit-immortality, and vice-versa; for they are a sort of Siamese twins, and stand or fall together."

I propose to show that Jesus had no such idea. If Jesus had any such idea when he said "live for ever" and "everlasting life," he must (first) have used these terms in a new and distinct sense from that which they bear in the Old Testament (which he certainly would not do); and (second) he must have used them in a sense unfamiliar to his hearers, the common people, who doubtless got their, ideas concerning them from the Old Testament, and therefore it was -obligatory on him to have explained to them such new sense. But we never read of his saying anything like this: "Ye have heard that it hath been said of old time that everlasting life consists in length of days for ever and ever; but I say unto you, everlasting life consists in certain moral and holy qualities of the immortal spirit."

That the Old Testament used these two terms always in the literal sense (whether speaking of the life of the present body or that of the resurrection body) is clear from a glance at them. Here they all are: "Lest he take also of the tree of life, and eat and live for ever" (spoken after Adam's supposed spiritual death); Job says of his life, "I loathe it; I would not live forever;" Jehovah says, "I live for ever;" David says, foretelling resurrection, "Your heart shall live for ever" (the heart is a part of the body); the salutation, "O king, live for ever," occurs several times; Zechariah says, "The fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live for ever?" and Daniel says, "Some shall awake from the dust of the earth to everlasting life."

Let us now examine the Bible to see if these two terms, or any of like meaning, can be made to bear the so-called spiritual interpretation.

1. When Adam was placed on probation he was told that if disobedient he should "surely die." Nothing was said to him of heaven or hell. This threat implied that if forever obedient he should not die, but live for ever in Eden. He disobeyed; and then God came and pronounced sentence upon

him, saying, "Because thou hast done this . . . unto dust shall thou return"; and then, in order that this sentence should be carried into effect, Adam was driven away from the tree of life, "lest he should live for ever"; and as a result of this, when his natural life had run its course, "he died."

The idea that Adam underwent a spiritual death on the day of his transgression is absurd, for it hinges on the "day" being a solar day, and it is clear that if both death spiritual and death temporal were booked to take place that, day, then both ought to have taken place that day, not one only. Otherwise the threat was only half fulfilled,

2. When God made to Abraham the great gospel promises of the everlasting covenant, he said, "I will give to thee ... the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." This implied that Abraham should have ever-lasting life, for a dead man could not possess a land, not even if he were only what my opponent calls dead, that is, body and spirit separated; for what could a disembodied ghost do with a land? Therefore it promised resurrection of the body. And most certainly this promise of a land for ever can not be twisted into a promise of "spiritual life." Nor did Jehovah mean by "everlasting" merely a long but limited time; for Jeremiah says, "The land which God gave to your fathers *for ever and ever*." Again: When Abraham offered up Isaac on Mount Moriah, which was one of the mountains of Zion, God said, "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." This included the great enemy Death; and thus this was a promise of resurrection to everlasting life; as said the psalmist, "The mountains of Zion; for there Jehovah commanded the Blessing, even life for evermore." Therefore that which Paul called "the Blessing of Abraham," which "should come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ," was "life for evermore"

The penalty for breaking the Abrahamic covenant was—"That soul shall be cut off from among his people; he hath broken my covenant." Now if the real penalty was an everlasting life of misery, why did Jehovah say this?

3. God made another covenant at Sinai, in which he offered any Israelite the same blessing which he had offered Adam, namely, everlasting life in the flesh on the earth, and on the same condition—perfect obedience. He had promised the same great blessing, though on a very different condition, to Abraham and his seed. Moses told Israel, "Thou shall keep all his statutes, . . . which if a man do, he shall live by them." "I set before you life and death." "Thou shalt keep all his commandments, . . . that thou mayest prolong thy days, in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, for ever." Deut. 4:40. And that "for ever" meant all future time is evident from Moses saying in another place that their days should be prolonged "as the days of the heavens above the earth"; that is, "as long as the sun," "as long as the moon endureth." See Ps. 89, vs. 29 and 36.

This promise of the Sinaitic covenant was a remarkable one, but I think God made it because he foresaw that there would be *one* man who would, by his perfect obedience, thus become entitled to everlasting life. Jesus surrendered on the cross this everlasting life in the flesh which he had thus won, that he might obtain the everlasting life offered by the Abrahamic

covenant, which could only be obtained through death and resurrection. For to enter into that everlasting covenant it was necessary that he should undergo circumcision—the real circumcision, of which the first was but a type, namely, the being cut off out of the land of the living by a bloody death. Without thus "falling into the ground" Jesus would have had to "abide alone"; that is, be the only man to live for ever; but by dying he "brought forth much fruit," being by resurrection constituted "the last Adam," and thus "made a *life-giving* spirit," with "power to give eternal life" to all "the children that God hath given him." And so said Isaiah: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see a seed, he shall prolong their days." (Bishop Lowth's translation.)

Although Isaiah does not here actually say "prolong days *for ever*," yet this is implied by the fact that he is speaking of the blessing that shall come through the Messiah's soul being "made an offering for sin," for "by one offering he obtained *eternal* redemption," not redemption for a limited period. "The Lord knoweth the *days* of the righteous, and their inheritance shall be *for ever*." Thus we see that the blessing promised by both covenants was the prolongation of days for ever in the earth.

4. Now mark! That the Messiah should "in the days of his flesh offer up strong cryings with tears to him that was able to *save him from death*" (by resurrection), "and was heard in that he feared" (that is, his prayer was granted), was foretold in Ps. 21 thus: "The king shall joy in thy power, O Jehovah; in thy salvation how greatly shall he rejoice! Thou grantest him his heart's desire, and hast not withheld the request of his lips: he asked *lift* of thee, and thou gavest it him, even *length of days for ever and ever*" See also where Jehovah says to the Messiah in Isaiah: "In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will *preserve thee*; and give thee for a tight to the Gentiles." See also the psalm: "Thou wilt prolong the king's life, and his years as many ages; he shall abide before God for ever. O prepare mercy and truth, that they may preserve him."

Now is it not utterly impossible to make these terms, "prolong thy days for ever," "length of days for ever and ever," "prolong the king's life," "abide before God for ever," "preserve him," and "save him from death," mean spiritual life? For do they not all refer to quantity of life, not quality? As impossible is it to make them mean spirit-immortality; for if a man already had length of days for ever and ever by virtue of spirit-immortality, would he pray for it?

As the resurrection life of Jesus is thus seen to consist in length of days for ever and ever, and as he is the last Adam, the life-giving spirit of the new creation, he must transmit to his seed this same sort of life himself received at resurrection, even as Adam transmitted to his seed the same sort of life he received by creation. Therefore, as Jesus received length of days for ever and ever, he will transmit to his seed "life, even length of days for ever and ever."

This argument simply annihilates the notion that everlasting life is a spiritual life begun at conversion. Temporal life comes by generation, when we "are born of the flesh;" and eternal life comes by regeneration, when we

are "born of the spirit;" which will be when the believer, like his risen Lord, will be "made a spirit" by being "begotten again from the dead." As "the first-born of the dead" Jesus is "the first-born among many brethren."

5. That Jesus understood these Old Testament terms literally is further evident from his answer to the lawyer who asked him, "What shall I do that I may inherit everlasting life?" Jesus answered, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." And that he here meant the commandments of the Sinaitic covenant is evident from his quoting several of them, "Thou shalt not kill," etc. Now Moses had promised any man who would keep all these commandments that he should "prolong his days for ever," and Jesus here says that the man who will keep all these commandments shall have "everlasting life;" therefore "everlasting life" meant to Jesus the same as "prolong days for ever,"

This is still further evident from other of the Great Prophet's uses of "live for ever" and "everlasting life." Thus he said that "in the regeneration (age) his apostles should sit on twelve thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel," and added that whosoever should forsake home and friends for his sake should "receive manifold more in this present time, and in the age to come, inherit life everlasting." Therefore life everlasting is not possessed by Christians "in this present time." It does not come at conversion. Again, Jesus said, "He that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" This again clearly says that life eternal is not "in this world." Again, "Narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and broad is the road that leadeth to destruction." How seeing that sinful men are not yet in destruction, but only on the road thereto, it follows that righteous men are not yet at the *end* of the way that "leadeth unto life." See also what Paul says: "Having become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the *end*, everlasting life." This text shows that everlasting life is not ours until the end of a life of service to God. It also shows that "holiness" and "everlasting life" are not the same thing, as they would be if everlasting life were a spiritual life consisting in holiness, begun at conversion.

Again: In Rev. 1 Jesus says, "I am he that liveth, and was dead and behold, 2 am alive for ever more; Amen; and have the keys of Hades and of Death." Did Jesus mean that he had passed from death unto life by receiving a spiritual life when he received the holy spirit at his anointing on the banks of the Jordan? Of course not. His words imply that he became "alive for ever more" after "he was dead." Then why say that any man passeth from death unto life when he receives the spirit of God at conversion? At conversion the believer receives "the first fruit of the spirit," being then "sealed with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the day of the redemption of the purchased possession;" but, like his master, he will be made alive for ever more at resurrection.

6. The Greek word for eternal and everlasting is *aionion*. It is derived from *aion*, which means an age. Therefore everlasting life meant simply the life of "the age to come," the new creation's age. How this word motion, which relates to *time*, can be twisted into meaning "spiritual," I can not con-

ceive. Paul speaks of "the life that now is, and that which is to come"—life temporal and life eternal. The Scriptures never speak of "life spiritual."

7. Brother Brewer makes "immortality" mean something else than "everlasting life." I assert that these are but two terms for the same thing, the one positive, the other negative. Spirit-immortalists are wont to quote Paul's words, "Christ hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel," as proof that eternal life and immortality are two things; but the Revised Version upsets their theory by translating it "life and interruption." This meant everlasting life in an incorruptible body. Notice also that this verse shows that only those who will receive the "life" will receive the "incorruption," both being "gospel" gifts. From this it appears that the unblest will *not* "put on incorruption," not be "raised incorruptible, but will come forth from their graves with their corruptible old-creation bodies of flesh and blood. These bodies will be good enough for the brief period known as "the resurrection (age) of judgment," but not adapted for living for ever. Paul implies the same where he says, "Flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." which shows that only those who shall inherit the kingdom of God shall inherit incorruption. See also Rom. 2:7, where "immortality" should be "incorruption," and Gal. 6:8. Therefore when Paul said that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," he meant only "the dead in Christ." The notion that the risen bodies of the wicked will be immortal, is utterly unscriptural. Jesus said, "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul *and* body in gehenna." And mark this: you can not destroy a body spiritually. You might as well talk of spiritually destroying a tree.

Further proof that everlasting life and immortality are the same thing is found in the words of Jesus in John 6, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*; if any man eat of this bread he shall *live for ever*" My point is this: As "not die" and "live for ever" here clearly mean the same thing, and as the Greek word for "not die" is the same in its root (*thanotos*, death) as the Greek word for immortal, therefore to be immortal is to "live for ever," to have "everlasting life."

8. Notice also that when Jesus said, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are *dead*" he could not have meant that they were "dead" *spiritually*, for Moses and Joshua and other holy men were among these fathers; and therefore when he added, "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever," he could not logically have meant "live forever" *spiritually*. Besides, how would their bodies, being "dead," prove that the manna did not give spiritual life to their spirits? I think Jesus meant this: "The manna given through Moses prolonged life only for a time, for now they all are dead, but the hidden manna which I shall give will prolong life for ever."

It is an error to suppose that the manna is received by us in this present lifetime. Rev. 2:17-26 shows that it will be given to those who "overcome" and "keep Christ's works unto the end." It is "the bread of life" -eternal; it is "the meat which *endureth* unto everlasting life." The eaters of it shall "not die" from the time the eternal life begins. This is further evident from

Christ's saying. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life;" for the Old Testament saints could not, according to this, have had everlasting life, seeing that they could not have drunk his blood, because it was not yet shed. This is yet more evident from his saying, "The bread which I *will* give is my flesh; which I *will* give for the life of the world." Thus he had not yet given it, and therefore the world had not yet received the life spoken of. When Jesus spoke of his flesh he did not mean his flesh in its corruptible old-creation state, but his flesh after it had been rendered incorruptible by passing through the veil into the new creation. This was beautifully prefigured by the potful of manna which Aaron took within the veil to be there preserved to future generations. Thus it was "hidden manna." In plain language, because the body of Jesus was made immortal by resurrection, so that "he is able to save ever more, seeing he ever liveth," our risen bodies will ever live also.

Four times in this chapter Jesus solemnly repeats, "I will raise him up at the last day." "This is the will of him that sent me," he says, "that every one that believeth in the Son may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." And again: "This is the will of him that sent me, that of all that he hath given me I should *lose* nothing, *but* should raise it up at the last day." Therefore if Jesus should not raise us up at the last day he will "lose" us; we shall be lost. "For if there be no resurrection of the dead, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

Jesus again used the word "not die" in John 11, where he says that the believer shall "never die," (More correctly translated "not die—for ever.") His words are. "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he die (R. V.), yet shall he live; and he that liveth, and believeth in me, shall not die—for ever." Here under the two headings, the "resurrection" and the "life," Jesus places the two things which he will do for the believer: first, he will resurrect him, so that he shall "live;" and, second, he will then keep him alive for ever, so that he shall have everlasting life. Let me paraphrase his words: "I am, as God's agent, the giver of the resurrection and the ensuing life everlasting; therefore, as I am the giver of resurrection, he that believeth in me, though he die, as has your brother Lazarus, yet shall he live again; for I will raise him up at the last day; and because I am also the giver of the life everlasting, he that thus liveth by resurrection, shall, if a believer in me, not die any more for ever." It is impossible to read the so-called "spiritual life" into this text; for it would be absurd to say, "He that believeth in me, though he die spiritually, yet shall he live spiritually," and equally absurd to say, "And he that liveth spiritually, and believeth in me, shall never die spiritually."

Now mark this: It is absolutely essential to my opponent's argument to read spiritual life into this text; for it goes without saying that he can not read spirit-immortality into it (for Jesus could not say of believers that they shall never die if this were true of all men), and therefore unless my courteous opponent ran somehow work spiritual life into this text he may as well throw up the sponge. Spirit-immortality and spiritual life are the two wings which support the dragon of everlasting torment; cut off either wing, and the other flops to the ground, and with them down goes eternal torment.

Concerning John's use of "hath" and "is" in "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life," and "This is life eternal, that they might know thee," I have this to say, that to hang the great weight of spiritual life on these two words as to hang it on very slender threads, for John's use of "is" is manifold, as in his terms, "God is light," "This *is* the condemnation." "After two days *is* the passover," etc.; and his fondness for putting the present for the future tense was such that he even quoted the psalmist's "*shall abide* for ever" as *abideth* for ever." He meant by "hath everlasting life" that the believer *shall have* everlasting life. because, as he said, "This is the promise which he hath promised MS, even life eternal." And that he did not mean "is" in the sense of *consists in* where he wrote, "This is life everlasting, that they might know thee," is clear from his also writing, "His commandment is life everlasting;" for eternal life can not *consist in* two different things. Jesus meant that eternal life will *result from* God's commandment and from that knowledge of the only true God which Christ came to reveal.

9. We have already seen that "not die" and "never die" mean the same as "live for ever." Jesus uses a similar term in Luke 20, saying. "The children of this age marry and are given in marriage, but they that shall be accounted worthy of that age and the resurrection (state) of the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die any more*, for they are equal unto the angels and are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection." Mark, "neither can they"—these sons of God—"die any more." This clearly implies that the unblest can die once more—die a second death. 'And mark, Jesus is certainly not speaking about any spiritual death, but of the literal death out of which men come by resurrection; to-wit, bodily death. How as it would be grasping at a straw to suppose that the body of the sinner will die again and his spirit continue to live, bodiless once more, for eternity, therefore these words of our blessed Lord sound the death-knell of the Gentile doctrine of spirit-immortality!

"These are the true sayings of God."

G. C. BREWER'S FIRST NEGATIVE ARTICLE.

We have now changed propositions, or rather we have changed attitudes to the same proposition, for we are still discussing the same question: Does man possess an immortal soul? I have affirmed that he does and now Dr. Spence affirms a contrary proposition, namely, man is wholly mortal and has no conscious existence from death to the resurrection. This discussion has not been conducted in very strict accord with the rules of logic, but I hope it will be none the less readable and instructive. There was some new matter in the final negative but I shall not now notice it. Moreover, while I was logically in the affirmative, my friend so industriously and so liberally advanced his theory that most of my space was used in replying to him, and now that he has taken the affirmative he begins by answering an argument which he passed over on the other proposition. It is my intention to offer some demurrers to his proposition, but if I should

do that now it would put my opponent in the negative, or at least keep him from advancing arguments to support his affirmation. Hence I shall wait and give him an opportunity to bring forward the best proof he has that man is *wholly* mortal—that not only his body is mortal but that his soul is mortal and his spirit is mortal. This he affirms for his terms are "*wholly mortal*," and we have already seen that man is composed of body, soul and spirit (I. These. 5: 23; Heb. 4: 12; Zech. 12: 1; Job 34: 14; Dan. 7: 15; Eccl. 12:7). Now let him find where mortality is ever affirmed of a spirit. Let him find where spirits are said to die or be destroyed. This his proposition Demands, but this he will never be able to find, but we pledge ourselves not to follow him off on his brain-spun theory about the *new creation*, etc., and let him forget the compulsion under which his proposition has placed him. He must try to prove that man is *wholly mortal*— that man's *spirit it mortal*. We shall remind him.

With all due respect for my brother I must say that I can not see much relevancy in his first affirmative paper. Perhaps it is my own denseness, but at any rate ! am not inclined to follow him minutely. But logic and courtesy demand that I notice what he says to some extent.

I must again say that Brother Spence has the peculiar ability to make the Bible teach anything he pleases to affirm—except that the spirit is mortal. He also mixes figures and jumbles language woefully. He runs along and makes a passage mean anything that is necessary to prove the point he is then discussing, and later he will take a position that refutes his own interpretation. For example, he says: "David says, foretelling the resurrection, 'Your heart shall live forever' (the heart is a part of the body)"; thus he makes David say that this physical heart, a part of the physical body, will *live forever* and later he affirms that the body is corruptible and that none but the righteous will ever have immortalized bodies. Therefore, according to his plan no heart will live forever, but all will see corruption in the grave and some will be recreated to live forever. The majority of the hearts, however, will not live forever. But what David spoke of as the heart shall live forever—the heart represents the mind or spirit.

But my friend gets himself into even worse trouble than that just mentioned in the passage. He says David declared that the heart, a part of the body will live forever, and then he says that "live forever," "everlasting live," and "not die" mean nothing more nor less than immortality. See Division VII. There, now, he has proved that man has an immortal part, an immortal element in his nature, an immortal heart. He has surrendered his proposition, but he has struck the truth, except the heart is not physical but is used figuratively to represent the mind or spirit. That is the Bible use of the word heart. The heart is that which loves, Matt. 22:37. It is that which thinks, Heb. 4: 12; Prov. 23: 7. It is that which reasons, Mark 2:6. It is that which understands, Matt. 13: 15. It is that which believes, Rom. 10: 9-10; Acts 8: 37. The Jaws are written in our hearts—not physical hearts. Where the treasure is there the heart is. So when David said the heart shall *live forever* he affirmed that the heart is immortal and the heart is the rational, thinking part of man—the spirit—therefore David affirmed that the spirit is immortal—shall live forever. Even so, amen.

My friend proves that Christ gives eternal life to believers and that eternal life is the same as immortality, and yet he affirms that believers die, cease to be, become extinct and remain non-existent for thousands of years. That, too, after quoting the Scriptures that say they shall never die, never see death, shall live forever, have eternal life, etc.

But he seems to have three or four kinds of eternal life. Here is his theory: First, Adam had life which he might have enjoyed forever if he had not disobeyed. With this I agree. Adam did not die spiritually. Second, God promised to give Abraham and his seed eternal life through a resurrection.

Third, God then changed his plan and offered the Israelites, who were Abraham's seed, the same to whom the other promise was given, life without the necessity of death if they would obey him perfectly. I wonder why God changed his promise. He first promised life by the resurrection and then changed and promised life on the condition of perfect obedience and yet not a single soul ever received life on either promise! Christ deserved life on the second promise, but no other being in all the earth had obtained life on *any terms*, hence Christ not wishing to be the only being living surrendered his life that he had won by obedience (He would not have had any life if he had not won it—the Christ of creation would have craved to exist) in order to provide an entirely different plan by which men may live. The only reason Christ had to die for the Israelites was that they did not obey, else they would never have died. So he would have us believe. But this is contrary to Paul's teaching. He says death came by Adam and that in Adam all must die whether they sin or not, Rom, 5: 12-20; I. Cor. 15: 22. Why did infants among the Israelites die? Tell us, beloved. My brother will pardon me for saying that his theory is the rankest nonsense I have ever yet had to deal with, though I have debated with soul-sleepers before.

The whole trouble with my brother comes from the arbitrary meanings which he puts on the terms "life" and "death." With him life is existence and death extinction. He says the eternal life promised through Christ is continued existence on the earth in the flesh—prolongation of days forever. Then why, I ask in all seriousness, do believers have to die? They die for awhile and then come back into possession of the same literal life in the same literal flesh that they lost by death. Why the necessity of death? Paul surely was not acquainted with this strange doctrine when he said flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God—meaning heaven itself or life in the presence of God, 1. Cor. 15: 50. Life is more than existence and death is not extinction. Life is union with God and death is separation from God. A tree by connection with God through nature has life—man has animal life by breathing the atmosphere. This is the connecting link between him and nature and when this connection is broken, up he dies. A spirit lives while in connection with the spirit of God; its death consists in separation from that Spirit. But the Spirit of God produces all sorts of life—vegetable, animal and spiritual. There is no life but in God. He "alone hath life in Himself." Now the withdrawal of any specific influence of the Spirit results in a death analogous to the influence withheld. Hence

we have as many sorts of death as we have of life. A spirit may live in one sense and be dead in another.

In Scripture style a man may be living and at the same time he dead. Living to that with which he has union and organization and dead to that from which he has disseverance and separation. Adam died (was separated from the source of life) the day he ate the forbidden fruit, though he lived (existed in the flesh) nine hundred years after that. In the same sense the wicked angels died when they sinned, but they still exist. For further proof that men may live and at the same time be dead, read the following:

"Let the *dead* bury their own *dead*, and follow me (Matt. 8: 22; Luke 9:60). Paul said to living Christians: "Ye are *dead* and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3: 3). "But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I *died*" (Rom. 7: 9). "She that liveth in pleasure is *dead while she lives*" (1 Tim. 6: 6). "We know that we have passed from *death* unto *life*, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother *abideth in death*" (1 Jno. 3; 14). By what sort of twisting can this passage be made to mean something contrary to what it says? Here John contemplates a class of persons who possessing human life are nevertheless *dead--abiding in death*; and another class of whom John was one. who had passed out of death into life—a life that did not belong to them before they were Christians. This can not be gainsaid.

My friend says temporal life comes when we are "born of the flesh" and eternal life when we are "born of the spirit." Exactly; except, of course, we do not have the full enjoyment of the life—do not have freedom from sickness and death till "in the world to come." But my friend says the birth of the spirit "will be when the believer, like his risen Lord, is 'made a spirit' by being 'begotten awaits from the dead'." Question: Will not all men be raised from the dead? Will not all then be born of the Spirit and have eternal life? If not, why not? But where in all God's word is it said that Christ was made a spirit? I have urged my brother to tell us, but he says nothing, but continues to quote it with quotation marks duly placed. I will now submit a few questions on this point which I must insist that he answer.

1. Did Christ have a spirit before his resurrection?
2. Did Christ exist before he was born of Mary?
3. If Christ existed before he had a body of flesh, what became of that Christ that created all things while his body was in the tomb? Was he dead?

If he says Christ did not exist before he was born of Mary, he disputes Christ's own words in John 8:58; 17:24; and John's word in John 1:1-5, and Paul's word in Phil. 2:6-8.

But is a man born of the spirit at conversion? Let us see. Jesus says except a man be born again, born from above, born of water and the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God (Jno. 3:3-5). He says again, except a man be *converted* he cannot enter the kingdom (Matt. 18:3). From this we see that conversion inducts one into the kingdom, but one cannot enter the kingdom without a birth of the Spirit; therefore, conversion is equivalent to a birth of the Spirit. Conversion is equally an Induction into the kingdom. A birth of the Spirit is equal to an induction into the kingdom. Things

equal to the same thing are equal to each other. Therefore, one is born of the Spirit at conversion, and one receives spirit life at that birth.

Where is the proof that man is wholly mortal? Where is mortality alleged of a spirit? Don't forget what you are trying to prove, beloved. You are now in the affirmative.

DR. S. J. SPENCE'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

Before advancing my second affirmative, let me touch on my opponent's first negative.

Brother Brewer thinks that unless I can produce some text which says the spirit is mortal, my case is lost. I might with equal reason say that unless he can produce some text which says the spirit is immortal, his case is lost. Indeed, with far more reason; for if the writers of the Bible had believed in a spirit which never dies, they would certainly have spoken of it as such; whereas, on the other hand, if they believed, as I do, that the spirit is nothing more than the breath, the life, or the mind, they would naturally not be so likely to say the spirit dies as to say the *wan* dies, seeing that "man" would in such case include body, soul and spirit. Nevertheless they do occasionally speak of the spirit's passing in terms equivalent to "die," such as "fail," "cut off," etc., as I have shown by several quotations in my first negative. For instance, Hezekiah says, "In these things is the life of my spirit; so wilt thou recover me, and make me to live"; from which it is clear that if God had not recovered Hezekiah from sickness, the life of his spirit would not have lived. Again, in the passage, "The spirit shall return to God who gave it: vanity of vanities! *all* is vanity 1" Here the "air" clearly includes the spirit's return to God, Solomon's idea being that this too is a part of the all things that are vanity. He evidently was not thinking of an immortal spirit, consciously returning to God.

When David said, "Your heart shall live for ever," of course he spoke of its living for ever by resurrection, not by continuous life of the flesh; for the passage occurs in a psalm prophetic of Christ's resurrection and crucifixion. The entire verse reads thus: "The meek shall eat and he satisfied; they shall praise Jehovah that seek him; your heart shall live for ever." Brother Brewer thinks that "heart" here means the spirit. Well, be it so. If so, the spirit of the sinner is thereby proved to be mortal; for it is only to the "meek" and those who "seek God" that the words, "Your heart shall live for ever," are addressed.

Brother Brewer admits that Adam had promise of life for ever in the flesh on the earth if perfectly obedient, but denies that God made a similar offer to Israel at Sinai. How then does he interpret the words, "Prolong days, in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, for ever?" To sustain his view he quotes Paul in Rom. 5; but in Rom. 7, Paul says, "The commandment, which was *ordained unto lift*, I found to be unto death." Now, the fact that only one man ever won the life thus offered through Moses does not at all do away with the fact that the law was "ordained unto life."

Evidently Brother Brewer misunderstands me where he says, "He says the eternal life promised through Christ is continued existence in the earth in *the flesh*--prolongation of days for ever." No; eternal life in *the flesh* was the promise through Moses, but the promise through Christ is eternal life in the spiritual body, begun at resurrection. Not a different kind of life, but a different kind of body. That Jesus repeated to the young lawyer the Law's offer of everlasting life, saying to him. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," is explained by saying that the Law was then still in force; for Jesus had not yet died and risen. Since our great Redeemer's resurrection eternal life has been offered on the easy terms of the Gospel; namely. "Repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ"; not on the difficult terms of the Law of works—absolute obedience. The atonement has now been made, and the trumpet of the jubilee is being sounded throughout the world,

Brother Brewer quotes several passages as "proof that men may live and at the same time be dead." I deny emphatically that a man can be actually alive and actually dead at the same time; but a man can be actually alive and at the same time *reckoned* as dead, because destined to die. I refer my reader to my second negative, especially God's words to Abimelech in Gen. 20.

On John's words, "abideth in death," I say, as before, that John made very free use of the present for the future tense, saying "abideth" and "hath" when he meant *shall abide* and *shall have*. Thus he says of the unbeliever, "The wrath of God abideth on him," evidently meaning, *shall abide*; because "the day of wrath," when "the wrath of God shall be poured out," is yet future. Again. John says, "He that doeth the will of God *abideth* for ever," evidently speaking of the future, for at present those who do the will of God pass away like other men. By quoting Scripture as my opponent here does, I could prove that our blessed Lord died and was buried before the days of Isaiah; for that prophet says of him, "He poured out his soul unto death," and "he made his grave with the wicked." I could also prove that he was resurrected before David's time, for that sweet singer says of the coming king, "He asked life of thee, and thou *gavest* it him; even length of days for ever and ever;" thus putting it in the past tense, though it is quite evident that David was here foretelling a future event, for he says in another psalm, "Thou will prolong the king's life; ... he *shall* abide before God for ever." In the Scriptures a man is often spoken of as being that which he shall be hereafter; for instance. Paul says in Eph. 2, that we who were dead through trespasses and sins are now alive and risen with Christ and ascended with him to heaven. But is Brother Brewer sitting down with Christ in heaven *now*? No, indeed! If he were, he wouldn't be preaching that immortality comes to man through the first Adam.

Brother Brewer argues that because a man must be converted to enter the kingdom of God, and because a man must be regenerated to enter the kingdom of God. therefore conversion and regeneration occur at the same time. I fail to see the logic. It is like saying the garden gate and the house door are the same. I believe Brother Brewer is converted, and I hope he may do much good in the world, but I do not believe he is yet born of the

spirit; for if he were, he would be moving about like angelic spirits and like the wind, for Jesus said, "The wind bloweth where it listeth; ... so is every one that *hath been* born of the spirit." That is, they move around like the wind, even as did Jesus after he had been born of the spirit by regeneration—resurrection. The idea that the kingdom of God is already set up and can be entered now, is quite unscriptural. John the Baptist was not in the kingdom (Matt. 17:1-3); the disciples were not in the kingdom (Matt. 18:1-3); Paul was not yet in the kingdom (2 Tim. 4:18). Christ's kingdom is "not of this world"—this *cosmos*; that is, this present state of the earth; it is of the world to come—the cosmos that will be set up by new creation on the "new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." When God's kingdom is come, then God's will shall be done in earth as it is done in heaven.

Other questions of Brother Brewer are answered in the following pages— my second affirmative.

In my first affirmative I showed that the Scripture's "everlasting life" is a life begun at resurrection and promised only to the righteous, and therefore that no man now has an everlasting life consisting in spirit-immortality or anything else. I was then sneaking of the lifetime; I purpose now to speak of the life itself.

Three Greek words are translated "life" in our English Bible—psyche, zoe, bios. Psyche means the life itself, and is the word which is also translated "soul." Zoe means the lifetime, whether "the life that now is, or that which is to come, temporal life or everlasting life. Thus Jesus said, "He that hateth his psyche in this world shall keep it unto zoe eternal" Bios means the things which fill up a man's lifetime and when written down are his biography; as where Paul says, "My manner of life (bios) from my youth know all the Jews." Thus we could say, "Herod sought the young child's life (psyche); Pilate brought to a dose Christ's temporal life (zoe), but God raised him to everlasting life (zoe); Matthew wrote the life (bios) of Jesus." In this paper I shall deal only with psyche.

I purpose to show by the following scriptures that the Bible uses the word life where it is psyche in the Greek or nephesh in the Hebrew, in such a way as shuts out the idea that man has two lives—one of his body and the other of his spirit—and shows that man has only one life, and that this one life is the life of his body, whether of his present or his resurrected body.

In Lev. 17 it is written, "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it you upon the altar to make atonement for your lives; for it is the blood which makes atonement for the life." Again: "He shall pour out the blood, and cover it with dust; for it is the life of all flesh." Speaking of the Messiah, Isaiah says, "He poured out his soul unto death." That is, he poured out his blood, his *life*. Jesus said of himself, "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." And again, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life."

How, when the life of the animal had been sacrificed on the altar it had no other life left—no immortal spirit's life to soar away, freed from the clay fetters of Us flesh; and therefore, seeing that the sacrificed animal was a type of the sacrificed Lamb of God (blessed be his name!), it must be that

Jesus had no other life than that which he "laid down" and "gave up" on the cross. Indeed, is it not absurd to suppose that if he had two lives, one of his body and another of his spirit, that his atoning sacrifice consisted merely in giving up the comparatively insignificant one?

When David said, "He saveth thy life from destruction." did he believe that man's life really consists in an indestructible spirit?

When James and John asked "Jesus to call down fire from heaven on certain inhospitable Samaritans, he replied, "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

Does not this say that he came to save men's lives from being destroyed? He that hath an ear, let him hear

Listen to what has been called "Christ's favorite saying," for it comes six times in the four gospels: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life shall find it."

Who said life can never be lost?

Let us read it in its connections: "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me; for whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, shall save it. For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his life? and what shall a man give in exchange for his life? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works."

Jesus meant that the unfaithful disciple who saves his life for a while by not bearing his cross to the place of crucifixion, if there be need for his martyrdom, shall lose eternally the life he thus saves temporally; for when the Son of man comes in his glory he will reward such an one according to his works by loss of life for ever.

As it is clear that Jesus was not here speaking of the (supposed) immortal life of the spirit (for said spirit's life could not be lost by crucifixion), therefore it follows that he was speaking of the bodily life.

Therefore the question is, Could Jesus have thus spoken while believing in an immortal spirit life? I say, no; for it would be absurd to say, "What shall it profit a man to gain the whole world, and lose his bodily life when the Son of man cometh to judgment, thus causing his immortal spirit to go for ever without a body?" Pshaw! Would not the sinner rather prefer this? And yet if you say that Jesus here spoke only of a bodily life, while believing in but not referring to an immortal spirit life, this must have been his meaning. For what else could he have meant?

Of course, I believe that it is the bodily life which the sinner will lose when Christ comes to judgment, whether the sinner is then alive in his present body or in the body which he, if then dead, will be resurrected, but I am showing the absurdity of supposing that this could have been what Jesus meant if he believed in an immortal life of the spirit.

Most spirit-immortalists believe in the resurrection of the body, both of the just and also of the unjust, and further believe (or rather *suppose*, for the Scriptures plainly teach the contrary) that the men bodies of the unjust will be as immortal as those of the just. How then can *they* say that Jesus meant the unjust shall lose bodily life when he comes to judgment?

Again, our beloved Master said, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." (By the term, "hate his life" was meant the same as in the text, "They loved not their lives unto the death;" that is, they suffered martyrdom.)

Here again it is evident that Jesus did not believe that a man's life, all except an insignificant part of it, consists in spirit-immortality; for if it did so, would he not "keep it unto life eternal" in any case, whether saint or sinner? None but universalists would so assert. And this test dissipates their pleasing but air-built theory.

Nor does it help the soul-immortalist's argument to translate psyche as "soul" in these passages; for you could not suppose Jesus to say, "He that loseth his immortal soul for *my* sake, shall save it," for if it were immortal it could not be lost by martyrdom nor by any other means.

Nor can the imaginary "spiritual" everlasting life be read into these texts; for in such case the word for life would be *zoe*, not *psyche*; and besides, it would be nonsense to say, "He that loseth his spiritual life for my sake and the gospel's."

Nor can the manner of life he here meant; for in such case the word would be *bios*; and moreover, it would be nonsense to say, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his manner of life? Besides, Jesus uses the word "it" for the life lost and the life saved, saying, "He that loseth his life for my sake, shall save *it*"; which makes it clear that he did not mean that by sacrificing one kind of life you might save another kind. Not even by confusing these three Greek words for "life" can this oft-repeated saying of our Lord's be made to mean anything else than that which it so plainly says.

He that hath an ear, let him hear.

Yes, the Son of man came to *save men's lives*. Therefore it is wrong to say that life can not be lost, but flows on in an unbroken stream from birth to the boundless stretches of eternity, either in bliss or woe. Jesus said it could be lost. And he was speaking of the psyche, *the life itself*. Can words be plainer? In the face of this definite statement of the Great Prophet, of whom Jehovah said to Moses, "I will put *my words* into his mouth, and he shall speak whatsoever *I shall command him*" is it not risky to say a man's life can be made a burden to him for the vastness of eternity, but can never be lost?

To fire parables and mere inferences against these definite statements of the Anointed One of God, is like shooting peas against a castle wall.

That Jesus is *the savior of lives* is also beautifully shown by many of the allegories of the Old Testament, notably that of Joseph. We all know that he was clothed by his father with a beautiful robe, which probably was typical of that clothing of Jesus by his Father when "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy spirit and with power," on the banks of the Jordan; and how, thus robed, Joseph was sent by his father to seek his wandering brethren, even as Jesus, after being anointed with the *spirit* of the Lord God was sent by his Father into the world to seek the lost sheep of the house of Israel, who were his brethren according to the flesh; and how out of envy Joseph's brethren delivered him to the Midianites, even as

Christ's brethren delivered him to the Gentiles; "for Pilate knew that from envy they had delivered him;" and how Joseph in Egypt was tempted and tried, even as Jesus underwent sore temptation in this Egypt-world; and how Joseph was cast into prison, there to die, even as Jesus was cast into the prison-house of death; and how Joseph was raised out of prison by the great king Pharaoh, even as Jesus was raised out of death's dark prison by the great king Jehovah; and how, after being thus raised, Joseph was exalted by Pharaoh to be a prince and a savior, even as Jesus was similarly exalted by God after his resurrection to be a prince and a savior; and how Pharaoh commanded that men should bow the knee before Joseph, even as God commanded that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow; and how Joseph was given a new name by Pharaoh, even as Jesus was given of God a new name after he had become a new creature; and how Joseph, as Pharaoh's agent, became the savior of the lives of his brethren and of the Egyptians, this salvation occurring several years after himself had been saved out of prison, even as Jesus will become, as God's agent, the savior of the lives of his people, this salvation to occur several centuries after himself was "saved out of death;" and how Joseph gave his saved brethren a portion of Egypt to dwell in, even as Jesus will give the meek to inherit the earth; and how eventually Joseph brought all Egypt into the possession of Pharaoh, even as Jesus will at last bring all earth into the possession of God.

Notice that Joseph was not a savior prior to his resurrection out of Egypt's prison. Similarly, Jesus was not a savior "in the days of his flesh;" but after "being made perfect, he *became* the author of eternal salvation." In the days of his flesh Jesus could save nobody (that is, with "*eternal* salvation;" except, of course, by promise), for the reason that God had not yet "saved him out of death" (Heb. 5:7, R. V.), and he could not extend to others a salvation which had not yet been given himself. Psalm 21:4 shows when it was that Jesus was given God's salvation: "He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever. His glorying is great in thy salvation." This answers Brother Brewer's question as to how the creator of the world could die. Jesus had no eternal life until the Father had given to the Son to have eternal life in himself, by resurrection. The theory that Jesus had lived for ever before he came into the world, as also the still more wild and romantic theory that he was an integral part of the deity, sprang up in the church in the third century.

You see, it is the man Jesus who is, under God, the savior of lives, the life-giving spirit of the new creation, the last Adam. Accordingly, it was not till after Joseph had been raised up by Pharaoh that he could say to his brethren, "God sent me before you to *preserve* life; . . . to *save your lives* by a great salvation." The Egyptians also said to him, "Thou hast *saved our lives*; we will be Pharaoh's servants." Now unless you deny that Joseph was a type of Jesus, which no one can successfully do, it follows from this that Jesus also will *save lives*. The only difference is, that Joseph saved men's lives from death for a time only, while Jesus will save men's lives from death for ever, by raising them from death, "no more to return to corruption." And as it was the life itself—the *nephesh*, the *psyche*—which

Joseph saved, so it will be *the life itself* which Jesus will save. There is no escape from this conclusion. Therefore the lives of such men as are not saved by Jesus will simply be lost; they will not be doomed to drag out a miserable being for ever and ever.

He that hath an ear, let him hear)

The Old Testament is full of similar allegories of life-salvation: Noah's life was saved by the flood; Lot's life was saved at the destruction of Sodom; Ishmael's life was saved by the well of water shown by the angel; (and notice that these were not mere accidental or ordinary occurrences, such as might happen in any nation, but were nearly all by divine intervention, many of them being by the ministry of angels); Isaac's life was saved from being sacrificed on the altar; Jacob's life was saved from Esau's vengeance by the angel giving him power to prevail with Esau, so that he could exclaim, "My life is preserved!" Joseph's life was saved by his being raised out of the pit where his brothers had cast him; the first-born of Israel was saved from death on the night of the passover by the sacrifice of the lamb; every Israelite boy was saved from death by being circumcised (Gen. 17:14; Exo. 4:24-26); all Israel was saved from death in the Red Sea; afterwards Israel was saved by the miracles in the wilderness—the manna, the smitten rock, the brazen serpent, etc.; Moses was saved when a child by Pharaoh's daughter, and later by escaping from Pharaoh into the land of Midian; Joshua's life was saved by Jehovah when Israel took up stones to stone him; Rahab's life was spared when God destroyed Jericho; Samson's life was saved by his midnight escape from Gaza.

Of what were all these instances of life-salvation figurative?

David's life was saved on several occasions, notably from the great plague which was sent because he had presumed to number Israel without exacting the redemption money commanded for such occasions, "to make atonement for the life;" Hezekiah's life was saved by his being recovered from deadly sickness; Jeremiah's, by his being raised out of a pit; Daniel's, from the lions' den; Jonah's, from the belly of the sea-monster; Joash's, by his being hidden in the temple of God.

What did Jehovah mean to prefigure by these cases of temporal salvation of life? There can be but one answer.

Many of these cases were also figurative of resurrection. That of Isaac and that of Jonah are so spoken of in the New Testament.

What did the Most High mean to foreshadow by these great allegories running all through the Scriptures (not to mention the many others which are in other ways figurative of resurrection, including the solemn and beautiful ordinance of baptism)? Did he mean to foreshadow so trivial a thing as the salvation of the bodily life by resurrection must be if man has a deathless life of his spirit? Not The mountains of God do not labor to bring forth a mouse 1

G. C BREWER'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

Dr. Spence is affirming that man is wholly mortal and has no conscious existence from death till the resurrection, but so far he has offered nothing that could justly be called an argument to sustain his belief. His brief remarks on my first negative deserve some attention, but there is positively nothing in what he calls his second affirmative that is worthy to be called an argument.

He admits that he cannot find where mortality is affirmed of a spirit and says he would as well demand that I find where the spirit is said to be immortal. But I would have you notice that I am not calling for the expression "mortal spirit" or "dying spirit" or any such words. No, I am not that little. What I ask for and what he is compelled by his proposition to find is where the spirit is ever spoken of as mortal—anything attributed to it or affirmed of it that would justify the inference that it is mortal. He never can do it, though he affirms that very thing. He would as well try to find mortality affirmed of God. The words "fail," "cut off," etc., do not mean extinction or annihilation, nor do the words from which they are translated mean anything like extinction. What is the use and where is the propriety in trying to make them mean that which they never do mean? There is no necessity for giving lengthy definitions; any reader who does not know the meaning of these terms can consult a dictionary. My friend speaks of the "passing of the spirit" as if such a thing were ever spoken of in the Bible. His inference from Hezekiah's language is about as correct as his point on Abimelech. God used the words *dead* and *die* in two senses, its the reader can easily see by reading the reference (Gen. 20), God made him "*as a dead man*" and thus kept him from touching Sarah and sinning. Obviously God destroyed the passions of his flesh to prevent his sinning, but promised to restore him to a normal condition if he would release Sarah, otherwise he should *die*—lose his life.

A similar perversion of Scripture is seen where my brother makes Solomon say the spirit is vanity. The idea of speaking of an intelligence as vanity } The passage has been explained in a former paper.

When David said "*your heart shall live forever*" there was no condition mentioned that would limit the language to any persons, but if there were the explanation would be found in the word live." Only the righteous live either here or hereafter. The unrighteous are "dead while they live." That passage stands against the brother's position like a Gibraltar.

It is true the commandment was ordained unto life but not life in the flesh forever. Life was never promised through the law except as the law brought them to Christ (Gal. 3). The law was weak, imperfect, made nothing perfect, could not take away sin and could not give life. These are plain statements of God's word. The whole system was a temporary affair added till Christ should come. It was not designed to save anybody without Christ. Those who sinned under the law had no forgiveness till Christ died (Heb. 9: IS; Rom. 3: 25).

Brother Spence denies that one may be dead and living at the same time.

Of course, one can not be both dead and alive in the same sense at the same time, and since he allows the word to have only one sense, viz: extinction, he is compelled to deny that such is possible. But his quarrel is with God's word. Why will a man be so blinded by a theory that he will boldly dispute an unmistakable statement of Jehovah? "But she that liveth in pleasure is *dead while she liveth*" (1 Tim. 5:6). Not will be dead after the judgment nor after anything else but *IS DEAD WHILE SHE LIVETH*, But in the face of this emphatic statement my opponent says when a person is spoken of as dead it is because he is destined to die. 'Paul said of converted, risen Christians that "Ye are dead" (Col. 3). Were they destined to die?

Now if we grant the claim concerning John's use of tenses it is no advantage to my brother's position. But I will not grant it, for to do so would be to concede that there was no possibility of his being correct but there is not—no not the shadow of a possibility. Of course, the prophets sometimes used the present for the future tense and other writers of the Bible did so at times. But it is the grossest violence to language and a ruthless perversion of Scripture to put such a forced construction on the following plain statements:

"We know that we *have* passed from *death* unto *life*, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother *abideth* in *death*" (1 Jno. 3: 14). We *have* passed out of death into life and as a result of the change we love the brethren and this is the proof of the transition, transformation or birth. He who does not love his brother *abides* or still remains in death for if he were begotten of God he would partake of his *Father's* nature and love, for "everyone that loveth is begotten of God" (1 Jno. 4:7). To be consistent the man must make the loving future also, and thus take Jove away from the present evil age. That would be no worse than other things he has done, however. But hear John again:

"Beloved, *now* are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be" (1 Jno. 3:2). Our "now" or present relation to God is clear—we are his children—but our "shall be" or future relation is not known. How can a man dare say this means that in the future we "shall be" children of God? We are *now* God's children. If we are God's children we must have been born into God's family, hence it is absurd to contend that we are not born of the spirit or born of God in this life. We become children of God when we obey the gospel of his Son. "For ye ARE all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized in Christ, did put on Christ" (Gal. 3: 26, 27). Christ's illustration of the wind was given to explain to Nicodemus that the flesh man, the seen, the physical man is not changed by the new birth but the "inward man," the spirit, is changed. That that which is born of the spirit is spirit—is unseen like the wind. Will our immortalized bodies be invisible?

No, John the Baptist and the disciples were not in the kingdom before the death of Christ. The kingdom was not then set up but it was "at hand." Jesus declared it would be established before the death of all the disciples (Mark 9:1). Either it has long ago been established or else some of those disciples are still living. The kingdom is not of the world—is not main-

tained by the sword, does not have an army and navy, does not have a throw of gold. It "cometh not with observation" or display. It is composed of principles—"love, joy and peace in the Holy Spirit." It is within us. The principles of Christ's kingdom and the laws of initiation into it were first announced on the day of Pentecost.

My brother's disquisition on "life" does not, in my judgment, sustain his affirmation. It is true that there are three Greek words and at least two Hebrew words that are translated life. *Bios*, *Zoe*, and *psyche* are the Greek words. From these we have biology, zoology and psychology. *Bios* and *Zoe* are synonymous, but *Zoe* is exalted in the New Testament above *Bios*. The latter is more often used of animals, animal life, etc, while the former is used to designate the higher life. Christ is the life—*zoe*—the book of life—*zoe*—eternal life—*zoe*—the tree of life—*zoe*—and all such expressions. *Psyche* is the mind, or breath or force which causes life, and in some instances it means the spirit. All this means nothing that is of any advantage to the affirmative. I have shown that "life" has a variety of meanings. The only point that I can see from all Brother Spence's essay on life is that life may be lost. But "lost" is not extinction. The prodigal son was lost but not extinct. He was dead and destroyed (Greek), but he still existed and lived. Dead while he liveth. The Christian lives a lost life in this world in order to have the life that is to come. He is dead and his life is "hid with Christ in God."

But my opponent says the lamb on Israel's altar shed its blood, gave up its life, and had no life left, and it was a type of Christ. So far he is correct, but now hear his conclusion. Therefore, Christ had no life after he shed his blood! Christ had no more life than a sheep! Shame, shame! You might as well say the sacrificial lamb had four feet and two horns. It was a type of Christ, therefore, Christ had four feet and two horns. I don't like to expose a man's fallacious reasoning like that, and I have charitably refrained from doing so in many instances in this discussion, but some men's "mouths must be stopped." He has now denied the pre-existence of Christ, the Deity of Christ, that he "was born of a virgin and that he had a soul, but still he claims to believe in the atonement and the resurrection. Beautiful consistency! He says the theory that Christ lived with God before he came into the world got into the church in the third century! ! ! You see what regard he has for the plain declaration of Jehovah's eternal truth. This, however, is the natural result and the inevitable and only consistent conclusion of this materialistic Russellite-Adventist-no-soul doctrine and I want all my readers to see it. That is my excuse for this discussion. When a man departs from the truth the further he departs the better it is for the truth. And, while I would earnestly entreat any man to abandon a false theory and be satisfied with God's word, it is always my endeavor to force my opponent to see the consequence of his doctrine and either avow the consequence or repudiate the doctrine. I intended from the beginning of this discussion to make my brother see that his doctrine necessitates a denial of Christ's divinity. It certainly does, though all exponents of the doctrine will not so readily accept the conclusion.

Hear, all ye Russellite and Adventist propagandists who still think you

believe that Christ came forth from God and was with Him before the world was, suppose *you* try to answer the questions submitted to Dr. Spence in my first negative article. Christ was not the Incarnate Son of God, according to your doctrine, but a common son of Adam.

But that man has a life or soul-psyche, that does not end with the death of the body is proved beyond a doubt by Christ's own words in Matthew 10: 28—"And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell." Men can kill the body, and if man were wholly mortal he would be all dead or, like Rover, "dead all over," but there is something that survives the body—a soul that men are not able to kill. This forever annihilates the no-soul doctrine. Oh, but my friend would object that that very passage says God is able to destroy the soul. Certainly, but "destroy" does not mean annihilate any more than "death" means extinction. I will have an opportunity to show this in my next paper. I introduce it here so it will not be new matter. But grant that God can annihilate a soul and still this passage disproves the claim that man is "wholly mortal." It speaks of "both body and soul," a soul that men can not kill. Men can certainly end mortal brings. They can take a man's animal or physical life but man has a life-psyche—that human hands can never endanger.

Another argument against the affirmation. God, has no pleasure in the death of the wicked (Ezek. 18:23; also 32). But—"Precious in the sight of Jehovah is the death of his saints" (Psalms 116: 15). Now, be it remembered, that my opponent has one and only one meaning for death—extinction. God finds no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but he delights in the death of the righteous. Surely, God loves the wicked more than the righteous, according to this strange doctrine.

Oh, Lord, keep hack thy servant from presumptuous sin. Help us to "tremble at Thy word" and to walk humbly before Thee.

DR. SPENCE'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

As I wish to devote the space of this my last affirmative to the scientific aspect of our subject, I can answer Brother Brewer's second negative only very briefly.

Where Paul says of Christians, "Ye are dead," he was not speaking of spiritual, but *reckoned*, death, based on the actual death of Christ: "For we thus reckon, that if one died *for* all, then all died;" and see also Rom. 6:11; 7:4; 8:10. All whom God reckons as having thus "passed from death unto life," because Jesus did so for them, receive God's loving spirit, and therefore "love the brethren." I am not ashamed to believe that "there is ONE GOD. and one mediator between God and man. the *man*, Christ Jesus"; but I do feel some shame for having in time past worshiped the babe of Bethlehem as the all-wise, omnipotent and omnipresent Deity, Creator of all worlds.

Brother Brewer sadly confuses the three Greek words for life; he says "The Christian lives a lost life in this world." Now, no man can live a

lost psyche, which is the life Jesus was talking about when he said, "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." The word translated "conversation" or "manner of life" is bios; and perhaps a man might correctly be said to live a lost bios; but that is not what Jesus was talking about.

Brother Brewer says the kingdom of God was set up at the day of Pentecost. Daniel the prophet says, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," Dan. 2; "these kings" being the ten toes at the end of the Roman empire; and in chap. 7 he has the ten horns and also a subsequent little horn all come before "One like a son of man came to the Ancient of Days, and there was given him a kingdom," Daniel goes on to tell how this kingdom shall "be under the whole heaven," and shall stand for ever, "even for ever and ever." The Son of man will, therefore, reign on the earth for ever; at also says Rev. 21-22.

Why does Brother Brewer quote, "The kingdom of God is within you." if at the time Jesus said this the day of Pentecost had not come? If by "is" Jesus meant "will be," I agree; it will be within us.

Brother Brewer says that, "Destroy both soul and body in gehenna," does not imply either soul or body will cease to exist. If he can explain how a body can be destroyed without ceasing to exist, he will astonish the world. When Jesus said, "Kill the body, but are not able to kill the psyche," he used a paradox, same as where he said, "He that loseth his psyche, shall save it." He could not have meant to point-blank contradict all the Scriptures which speak of man killing the sou).

He promises to show that "perish" and "destroy" do not mean annihilation. Let me advise him to first carefully study the following Scriptures, and also to do as I did, get down on his knees and ask God about it.

"I will *destroy* the wisdom of the wise,
And *bring to nothing* the understanding of the prudent."
"All that rise up against thee shall *perish*;
And all that are incensed at thee shall *be as nothing*."

"Yet a little while, and the wicked shall *not be*; ... the wicked shall *perish*; . . . but the meek shall inherit the earth, and dwell therein for ever," Ps. 37. "Jehovah *preserveth* all them that love him; but all the wicked shall he *destroy*? Thy money *perish* with thee." (Will money be preserved for ever?) "The bottles *perish*" (by ceasing to exist as bottles), "It is better for thee that one of thy members should *perish*, and not thy *whole* body be cast to gehenna." (How does the one cut-off member *perish*?) "If Christ be not raised, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*" "The cosmos that then was, being overflowed by water, *perished*; but the heavens and the earth that now are, are reserved for fire against the day of destruction." (The cosmos then-existing on the earth ceased to exist, as will the present cosmos before God puts a new cosmos on the earth by the new creation). "The last enemy that shall be *destroyed*, is death." "And death shall be *no more*" "That through death he might destroy ("*briny to nought*," R.V.) him that hath the power of death; that is, the devil." So also wrote Justin Martyr (about 150 A.D.) : "There is coming a day of judgment, in which evil angels and men and demons shall *cease to exist*" Nothing contrary to this appears in the Church's history until near

the end of the second century. Even the learned author of "Universalism Asserted" candidly confesses, "The Church seems to have taught the annihilation of the wicked up to A.D. 166."

When Jesus told his disciples to "fear not them that kilt the body but are not able to kill the soul" (psyche), he could not have meant to contradict all the Scriptures which speak of man killing the soul; such as where David said, "Wicked men have arisen to seek after my soul"; "They that seek my soul to destroy it"; and Ezekiel's saying that certain false prophets "slew the souls that should not die, and saved alive the souls that should not live." Jesus must have here spoken paradoxically, as in the saying. "He that loseth his psyche for my sake, shall find it." Thus it is lost and not lost, killed and not killed.

As Brother Brewer is persistent that I must find a passage which says the spirit is mortal, here is one: "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" As the greater includes the less, this word "man" includes all there is of man, body, soul and spirit. Indeed, the word would be absurd and have no force if the vastly greater part of man—nine hundred and ninety-nine parts in a thousand—were immortal spirit. Similarly with many other passages, such as, "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; . . . for he considereth that we are dust." What excuse would this be for sin if only a trifling part of man were dust? What force or meaning could there be in God's sentence of condemnation on Adam, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," if only an insignificant part of Adam was to be thus punished? Such half truths are the worst ties. If a man were carrying a bagful of gold and copper coins and were asked what he was carrying, and replied, "Copper," this would be true in itself but a lie in fact and intention. Besides, if I could find a scripture which would say, "The immortal spirit can die," Brother Brewer would at once say, "That does not mean literal death." Therefore, when I furnish him passages which say, "My spirit faileth; ... I am as those that go down to sheol" (the grave) and "I will not be always wroth; for the spirit should fat) before me," the word cannot be supposed to mean the (so-called) spiritual death, and "fail," because it is more appropriate to the breath than would be the word "die," makes it all the more clear that the cessation of the breath, or spirit (same word in the Hebrew), is what is meant.

I propose to now show the scientific difficulties of believing that such a person as an immortal spirit inhabits our body. And when I say a "person" I mean a person, not a mere principle or thing; for if said spirit can pass out of the body at death and appear as Moses and Elijah appeared on the Mount of Transfiguration, with bodies possessing organs of speech and hearing, said spirit must be a person—a *he*, not an *it*. Therefore the question arises, How could this person which is variously known as spirit, soul, ghost, sprite, specter, haunt, etc., have come into the body at first?

It is easy to see how life came into man's body; for the life is but an *it*. It came with the living seeds of both parents. But how did this being which Brother Brewer calls "the inward man," and says that this "man" passes out of the body at death and then lives independently of the body, thus

showing he was the life of the body, ever come to *gel* into the body? That is the great question.

There have been several attempts at answering this question. The Transmigrationists say that a spirit comes from somewhere in the universe, enters the body of the child, dwells in it till the body dies, then passes on to enter some other hotly; and so on *ad infinitum*. This must be a very unsatisfactory belief, for it leaves the child himself without any personal future life. The ancient Romans believed, according to Cicero (about 50 B.C.), that "the immortal gods shed souls into human bodies," and that when thus shed "the heaven-born soul had been degraded from its dwelling-place above and, as it were, buried in the earth; a situation uncongenial to its divine and immortal nature." He further says that "the soul is uncompounded," and therefore "can not undergo dissolution."

The Jews of the Middle Ages believed very similarly to Cicero, saying that whenever a living child is born in Earth, God then commands a living foul in Heaven to go down and inhabit said child's body until death, which command the soul reluctantly obeys,

Some Christian writers of the seventeenth century taught that the child becomes immortal at baptism, being at that time "born of water and the Spirit" by the Holy Spirit of God begetting an immortal spirit in the child, though not necessarily insuring its salvation thereby.

Akin to this last-mentioned theory is the notion that at some time during the process of incubation, or at birth, God creates an immortal spirit in the child's body in much the same way as he is supposed to have created one in Adam's body. This theory, like the preceding one, is open to the objection that, if it were true, God's work of creation did not cease in six days but is still going on, being carried forward by a system of constant interference with nature, each interference being at least equal to that of a new creation. The most general belief is that every man inherits an immortal spirit from Adam; this spirit either existing as a unit in the parental seed, or else in some way accompanying it as an influence and then somehow developing from it. If existing as a unit in the parental seed, it follows that all such spirits must have, first existed as separate spirits in Adam.

Scripture seems to give some countenance to this last theory by saying that "Levi was yet in the loins of his father Abraham when Melchisedec met him"; and that "all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls." But this can easily be interpreted as meaning lives, not immortal souls.

The scientific objections to this theory-are immense; these: If God created all immortal spirits as separate individuals in Adam, then Adam must have transmitted to each of his sons just as many of these spirits as there would be bodies of their descendants in the course of all the ages of time, in order that there might be one immortal spirit to each body. I leave my reader to puzzle out how Adam contrived to impart to Abel (who died childless) only one spirit, and to Seth enough for the millions of his descendants. Nor is that the only difficulty; for here is another: As the science of embryology teaches that only one seed of man is used in the production of one man, therefore in the one seed which developed into Seth

must have lodged these countless millions of spirits. Nor is that at!; for if one seed of man contained at least one immortal spirit, it follows that every seed of a man must contain at least that much, and as untold millions of human seeds never germinate at all, the question arises. What becomes of all the immortal spirits in these ungerminated seeds?

This theory of separate spirits created in Adam breaks down, as the reader sees, of its own weight. It is too monstrously absurd even for a theologian. • The theologian, therefore, has to hunt some other theory for the spirit's descent from Adam. Here he is all up in the air, with not a thing solid on which to rest his foot. All he can say is that *perhaps* there is something or other in or around or in some way accompanying the parental • seed which mysteriously develops into a spirit while the rest of the seed is developing into a body. No theologian has ever been able to tell us how this marvelous development occurs, though embryologies can tell us every step taken by nature in developing the body. The theologian has made up his mind that man is born with an immortal spirit within him descended from Adam (he fancying the Scriptures so teach), and therefore he has to account somehow for his belief that said spirit results from the parental seed, and he guesses and guesses as to how it did so. He is fond of comparing the spirit to the aroma of a flower, and of saying that as the aroma lies latent in the seed and is afterwards developed into an odor by its surroundings of air, sunshine, etc., so the immortal spirit may lie dormant in the parental seed and develop into a formed spirit by its surroundings. Rut it is clear that a spirit having a body possessing organs of speech and hearing is a very different thing from an aroma. Even if it were possible for an aroma to develop from some single uncompounded element, such as oxygen (which it never does), still it is inconceivable that a spirit-form possessed of organs of speech and hearing, and capable of being clothed in white raiment, can result from a single uncompounded element named spirit. To illustrate: The element oxygen is, as far as we know, uncompounded, and therefore can not be destroyed, because it can not be taken apart; but when combined with the element hydrogen, it makes the compound water, which can be destroyed, because its two elements can be separated from each other. But oxygen by itself could not make an aroma, nor water, nor anything else; for it would remain simply oxygen. Similarly, if there we re-such an element in the, universe as uncompounded spirit (as our theologians say there is, following Cicero), and even if it accompanied every seed of man, it would remain simply spirit, and therefore could not form a spirit-body having organs of speech, etc., such as Moses had on Mount Hermon. Theologians are forced to say that spirit is uncompounded; for if they admitted that it is compounded, like water, they would have to admit that it can be dissolved, and thus they would lose their great argument for its imperishability.

They also tell us that this, their fancied spirit,' is the life of the body. They say that in man the life consists in this indwelling spirit, though in the beast it consists merely in the harmonious working of a machine of flesh. To support this claim they are fond of. quoting the words of Saint James, "The body without the spirit is dead" (which is true enough, but James did

not mean an immortal spirit). But embryologists wreck this theory, for they say that both parental seeds are alive, and therefore the life of the child's body comes from two sources and consequently can not consist in a spirit which, if uncompounded, must needs come from one source only, either father or mother. Scripture supports the scientist in this; for it not only terms man the "seed of man," but also the "seed of the woman." Moreover, if the body's life in man consists in an immortal spirit, why need the body ever die? For if the spirit saw fit to remain in the body, would not the body continue to live even if some nerve-shock had stopped the heart's beat? Even medical science can restore the heart's heat after it has stopped, to say nothing of keeping it from stopping when it otherwise would do so; and surely this marvelous immortal spirit, which Brother Brewer says "controls the body." ought to be able to do as much.

Another very strong argument against my opponent's theory is furnished us by the Evolutionists. Brother Brewer is an intellectual man, else I would not waste time on him, and he knows that relics of man have been found at least as far back as the great Ice Age, which was thousands of years before Adam. I have long ago ceased to kick at evolution, for I became convinced that to fight it was but to batter my head against a stone wall. Evolution is of God. Man is descended, or ascended, from lower animals, Adam was the first man only in the sense that Abraham was the first man; that is, the first of a special and chosen race. God waited long centuries for man to emerge from brutism and to become such as He would choose for immortalisation. Now, seeing that man came from the beasts, and seeing that they have no immortal spirits, how could man come to have one? I will not do to say that immortality might have come gradually by evolution while man was evolving from the beast; for no man can be half-way immortal; he must be either deathless or not deathless.

A further strong argument against the doctrine that man is born with an immortal ghost inside him is, that there is no need for any such individual. Man does not need an immortal spirit to live by, for the beasts live without any; man does not need an immortal spirit to think by, for the beasts think without any; and man does not need an immortal spirit to have future life by, for God will give man future life by resurrection. Nor does man even need an immortal spirit to suffer endless torment by, for if a stern necessity required that God should punish with everlasting torment the sins of a few decades, or, in those dying young, a few months or years, could he not resurrect them with immortal spiritual bodies, even as Paul says, he will the righteous? Therefore the immortal spirit is not needed; and, as God does not do needless acts, there is no such being.

The phantasies of dying people are a common source of the belief in disembodied spirits. Dying people who have all their lifetimes been expecting angels or the spirits of their parents to appear at their deathbeds, sometimes fancy they see them. Just so the victim of delirium tremens, who has been told that he will see snakes, sometimes fancies he sees them. Healthy brains see neither snakes nor angels. Sir David Brewster showed that the apparition moved with the eyeball of the patient; therefore is in the eye.

Brother Brewer seems to think that the world-wide belief in disembodied

spirits it valid evidence of their existence. On that I have this to say: Let a belief of this sort once get started, and it is sure to travel all round the globe, and not be long about it. It perhaps had its start in that well-known difficulty of realizing for a few days or weeks that a loved one is really gone—the *wish* for his being alive is father to the thought of his being so.

Sir Oliver Lodge and some other scientific men who have devoted themselves to psychical research, are constantly telling us that they think they are on the eve of demonstrating the consciousness of the dead, but not quite yet. The mirage is always a little way in the distance.

As for the appearances of spirits in the dark rooms of spirit-mediums, at so many dollars per appearance, I would ask, Why do not the spirits appear • in light rooms, or in the open air? Have immortal spirits a fondness for darkness ?

As for the ghost stories which infest almost every community, often doing serious damage to the health and happiness of children and weak women through their belief in them, I ask, How is it that these ghosts always appear at night? It is not that people do not expect to see spirits in the daytime? And how is it that they appear with clothes on? Do ghosts need clothes? Do not both spirit and clothes exist only in the imagination of the person who sees them?

Sir Walter Scott describes a certain class of apparition this way: In light slumber, when the sleeper is still enough awake to dimly know where he is, but enough asleep to dream that a ghost enters his room, his knowing where he is, so that the room is real to him, makes him think the ghost real also.

It is not uncommon with, persons who become comatose during severe sickness to tell on recovering that they were in heaven. If their accounts of heaven agreed together, there might be some argument in this; but unfortunately each one gives a different description of that glory world. I knew one who actually described it as a place with a wall around it.

The theory that dreaming is the spirit's thinking, is scientifically absurd, for it is a fact that in very deep sleep there is no thinking. This is proved by the fact that in light sleep from chloroform the patient dreams, but not in deep narcosis. How is this? Can an immortal spirit be chloroformed? Perhaps you reply. "No; the spirit keeps on thinking just the same, but the chloroform has clogged the brain, which is the channel by which the spirit communicates its thoughts to us." I answer. Then what is it in *you*, when the chloroform is passed and the channel is again open, that receives the communications of the spirit? "What is it in me?" you say; "Why, the—the—spirit itself, I suppose." O dear no! That won't do! A spirit could not need any channel by which to talk to itself. Try again. "Well, then," you reply, "it must be my *mind* which gets the spirit's message." Oh, well, then, I reply, if you've got a mind which can think well enough to understand what your spirit says, why can not it think well enough to do all your thinking? Then what need have you for that ghost?

No, Brother Brewer; you have no need for ghosts. Nature has no need for ghosts; God has no need for ghosts. Therefore ghosts do not exist. In all this poor, ghost-ridden, ghost-worshipping, superstition-haunted world

there never was such a thing as a disembodied spirit, and never will be. They exist only in man's imagination, like fairies and kelpies. You have never seen a ghost, You have never seen anyone who has seen a ghost. In all the long, ages between Genesis and Revelation not a single ghost appears, with the exception of Dives and Lazarus; and they existed only in the imagination, not in the belief, of him who spoke the parable about them, and in a Hades which existed not in his own belief, but only in the imagination of the Pharisees, to whom the parable was addressed. If you doubt this, turn to the "Description of Hades" found in the writings of the Pharisee Josephus.

While apologizing for the already too great length of this my last paper, I crave for one more page on which to slate briefly my view of this entire subject, as follows:

When God found himself alive and alone in the universe, he found it was pleasant to live, and determined to fill the universe with life, in order to fill it with happiness. Therefore he is peopling every star with living beings. His primary creation of a world, by which he gets numbers through propagation of species, is imperfect, and its men are mortal, but by a more perfect creation of each star, and of the cream of its men, God gets beautiful worlds inhabited by deathless and righteous beings, these no longer increasing by propagation. Each of these perfected worlds is patterned after heaven, and a kingdom of heaven is set up on each, a king being set over each kingdom to act as God's agent, and thus as vice-God. As the rulers of Israel were termed "gods" because acting as God's agents, so this king will be called "The mighty God," and "The great God," because standing in the Mead of Jehovah the Most High God. (See Ex. 7:1 and 4:16.) To fitly represent the Deity he will be abundantly anointed with the spirit of God. This king will not be a native of some other star, but of the one he is to govern. He will first be tested and found fit for this high office by a severe trial of his obedience; after which he will be immortalized, being the first of his race to thus become "alive for evermore," As the representative of his race, he, before being immortalized, offers unto God a sacrifice for the sins of his race, to make atonement for them, this sacrifice consisting in the giving up of his old-creation life as an offering (not as payment of a debt) for sin, and as a confession that man's life is justly forfeit for sin and that everlasting life is a gift of God's free grace, not something inherent in us nor due to us as a debt for service done him. Like this "Firstborn of the dead," all the saved of each world (if our own world is a sample of all) will put on immortality by being created anew; thus becoming no longer mere flesh and blood bodies, but spiritual bodies, immortal in their nature; this change being called a new birth, and by it they will receive powers of motion greatly superior to those of their first creation, being able to ascend up in the air, and even visit heaven and other heavenly worlds. Thus man, while inheriting his own native star as his proper borne, will at times meet with the inhabitants of other worlds, until their mutual acquaintanceship will, according to the great Creators benign plan, have knit the entire universe together in love, and thus in happiness.

There will be no dismal dungeons of endless torture in that glorious

universe. The future outlook of God's creation is not black with horror, but bright with sweetness. While many men will not be "accounted worthy of that age," but will have to be satisfied with having enjoyed the life that now is, yet untold millions will be saved; for there can be no doubt that God will save as many persons as the habitable worlds of his universe can accommodate with room; for hath he not determined "That my house may be filled"?

Let us strive to enter in; for "yet there is room."

G. C. BREWER'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

In replying to my friend's paper I have rather a conglomeration of things to deal with. There is much in it, however, which I shall deem it a courtesy to ignore. He calls this his "last affirmative," but it is not necessary to tell the reader that there is nothing affirmative in it from beginning to end. He is under the demand both of the rules of honor and the laws of logic to at least try to prove that man is wholly mortal and has no conscious existence from death till the resurrection, but instead of advancing anything in the way of proof to support that proposition he devotes his entire space to negative reasoning and to objections to the proposition which I affirmed in three essays, allowing him equal space to deny. It is very easy to deny, demur and destroy, but it is far more difficult to affirm, establish and sustain a position. Any man can refuse to believe the doctrine of immortality and surround himself with verbal subtleties and infinite negations if he chooses to do so, but where is the man who can *prove* by the Bible or by anything else that man is wholly mortal and therefore ceases to exist at death? No man can do that, but my opponent in this discussion agreed to try to prove it. You see his efforts.

He calls this paper "affirmative," but he begins his paragraphs thus: "Another very strong argument against my opponent's theory," "A further strong argument against the doctrine," etc, etc. Thus he argues *against* something the whole time, when he should be trying to establish his own doctrine.

I have clearly shown that death means a separation, dissolution and the end of a state or condition. Christians are dead "while they live," "dead to sin but alive unto God," and a sinner is dead while he lives—dead to God but alive unto sin.

My opponent now clearly avows the consequence of his no-soul theory— that Christ our Lord was wholly mortal, not divine, not *Immanuel*--God with us. He is now ashamed that he once confessed Christ as such. Christ will also be ashamed of him.

What I said on the three Greek words—zoe, bios, and psyche—is clear and stands unrefuted.

My brother denies that the kingdom has yet been established, but he overlooks the fact that "it was at hand" in the days of Christ and John the Baptist and people were living in it, citizens of it, in the days of Paul. Col.

1:13. His theory on the symbols of Daniel 'can not overthrow these plain passages of the New Testament. Christ was talking of the, nature of the kingdom when he said it cometh not with observation but is "within you."

I did not say that the body would not cease to exist as a body when -destroyed. Certainly it will cease to exist as such. But my friend says I will astonish the world if I show how the body can be destroyed and not cease to exist. But the world is not as ignorant as my friend supposes. He is like the subscriber to a certain magazine who wrote to the editor advising him to change his policy, for *all his readers* were dissatisfied and complaining. The magazine had over two million readers, and the editor was so amused by the letter from this rural reader that he investigated the case to see how amusing it was. He found that there were only a dozen subscribers at this critic's postoffice and he was not acquainted with but *two* of them. The "*world*" knows that when the body dissolves the elements still exist. While my opponent was smattering around in science he ought to have learned that science affirms the indestructibility of matter.

The truth is, however, I did not say that the body would not cease to exist, but he could not answer the point on Matthew 10:28 and thought he ought to say something. But we are told that other Scriptures say men can kill the soul. But Jesus here says men can not kill the soul, although they can take a man's physical life—kill the body—and of course there are no scriptures that teach a different doctrine. When Ezekiel said they killed certain souls and saved other souls alive, it is clear to all that he used the word souls in the sense of persons, individuals, etc. This use is frequent and was clearly pointed out in the beginning of this discussion. "Eight souls were saved by wafer" illustrates the point.

The words "perish" and "destroy" are pressed into service and are used to mean extinction and annihilation. Instead of giving or accepting the lexical meaning of the words, he attempts to make them carry his idea by citing several references which he seems to think define the words and illustrate their meaning. He quotes "I will *destroy* the wisdom of the wise, and bring to *nothing* the wisdom of the prudent." Thus he thinks destroy means bring to nothing, and he would say bring to nothing means cease to exist. But unfortunately his efforts here are in vain. This poetic language simply teaches that the wisdom of the wise of the earth will fail of its purpose, be nullified and brought to nought—effect destroyed. In the same reference God says he will "*confound* the wise" and put him to shame. The twentieth verse makes clear the meaning. It reads: "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?" But why waste time on the point that is so clear?

That no reader may be confused by my opponent's quotations containing the words "perish" and "destroy," I will here give their meaning and uses. My friend is not very accurate in his use of Scripture language, as the reader has seen from the beginning of this discussion, but the words "perish" and "destroy," etc., are found often in the Bible.

The two words under consideration here are from the same Greek word in all the passages cited by my opponent. The noun *apooleia* occurs in the New Testament twenty times. Eight times it is translated *perdition*, five

times *destruction*, twice *waste*, and once by each of the following words: *die*, *perish*, *damnation*, *damnable*, *pernicious ways*.

The verb from which the noun is derived is *appollumi*, to destroy. It is found in the New Testament ninety-two times. From this number of occurrences we should have no difficulty in ascertaining its meaning. By examining references we see that it is translated *perish* thirty-two times. Thirty-one times it is translated *lose* or *lost*, and twenty-seven times it is translated *destroy*. It is once translated *marred* and once *die*.

This is the word depended upon by annihilationists to prove their doctrine but by a study of its uses it is seen at once that they give it a wrong meaning. The following quotations will show how absurd it would be to make the word mean extinction or annihilation.

In Luke 15:24 the father said of his prodigal son, "For this my son was dead (extinct according to my opponent) and is alive again; and was *apololos*"—lost, destroyed, perished—"and is found."

Was this prodigal extinct, annihilated, non-existent, before he returned home? In the same chapter and the ninth verse Jesus makes the woman in the parable say, "Rejoice with me for I have found the coin which was *apoleso*"—destroyed, lost. In the same chapter we have the parable of the lost—destroyed, perished—sheep, which was afterward found and restored to the fold, which again shows that the sheep was not annihilated.

But why spend time on this word since the Bible nowhere says the spirit dies, perishes or is destroyed? That is the very thing, however, that my opponent is *affirming* (?) and which all Adventists claim will happen to the spirit. There is not a single, solitary shadow of a syllable in all the Bible that teaches such a thing.

But we are told that it would be a misrepresentation to speak of man as "dust" and as "mortal man" if he possesses an immortal element or an immortal spirit. And when the Bible uses such expressions it must mean that man is wholly mortal. It is strange, however, Shakespeare, Milton, Browning, Longfellow and thousands of others could use those terms and never be misunderstood or accused of being materialists!

We would as well say that because an egg is called an egg that therefore it is impossible that it should contain a future chicken. Or it would be just as sensible to say that an acorn is not an acorn if it contains a future tree. But it is an acorn, and nothing can be found in it that would show its great possibility; there is a mighty forest in its shell.

We now come to the place in this "affirmative" (?) where my opponent says he proposes "to show some scientific difficulties in believing"—what he is "affirming"? No, in believing that man possesses a soul which men can not kill. If he were affirming his own proposition, as he is in honor bound to do, I would be devoting this space to presenting difficulties to believing his doctrine. But we can not expect a man who holds a false and illogical theory to be consistent and logical in his dealings. Habits of mind determine a man's habits of life.

He advances several theories which he says have been offered on how and when the spirit enters the body. But surely no sane man ever held any of the theories he mentions. On that point we confess we "know in part"

only. That is *one* of the wonderfully inexplicable things about a being that is wonderfully and fearfully made. But because we do not understand it does not in the least argue that it is not true. Does my opponent think he understands the resurrection? Does he imagine that any scientists would agree with his monstrous theory? We do not yet understand the simplest things of life. Science demonstrates many things which no scientist would undertake to explain. We know many of the laws of physics, but we do not know yet what matter is. No psychologist would attempt to tell what I he mind is. We see the phenomena of electricity every day, but we don't know yet whether electricity is a fluid, the repulsion of molecules, or the vibrations of ether. As will be seen by the quotation from Huxley, scientists recognize many things as more wonderful than the immortality of the soul. It was stated in the first chapter of this debate that the existence of the spirit in man is not a demonstrable truth. We accept it by faith and are dependent on revelation for our strongest evidence. When and how the spirit enters we do not know. The Bible says Jehovah "formeth the spirit in man," and we believe it. Zech. 12:1. If a man rejects the Bible there is no way to convince him.

Let me state, however, that believers have never met any opposition from real science or experienced any trouble with *real scientists*. Pretenders, smatterers, pedantic egotists, and wild theorists sometimes try to array science against Christianity.

In the beginning of this discussion I mentioned the attitude of science towards this question and quoted from Prof. William James and others on physiological psychology Of the part the brain performs in thinking, but my opponent, unable to understand the language of these learned men, now introduces the same point in a childish jargon about where the spirit is when one is chloroformed. He then betrays his ignorance on this point by representing the spirit as talking to the mind, etc As. if the mind were not the spirit. It has been shown time and time again in the discussion that the spirit is the rational, thinking ego—the intelligence. The cerebrum, or brain, is the organ of transmission. It transmits thought, but never produces it. When the brain is inactive the person is unconscious, but is not non-existent. Nor is the mind or spirit *non est*. On this point let me quote from Reuben Post Halleck's text-book on psychology, page 105: "The theory of the physical bases of memory has not been generally taught, because it was thought that this theory would lead to materialism. Should the theory prove to be true, it was supposed that the soul could not be immortal. . . . But the alarm is needless in this case. One person can talk to another in a distant city only by means of a telephone wire. If the wire is broken the speaker can no longer make the other hear; but it does not therefore follow that the speaker has ceased to exist The brain may play a part analogous to the telephone wire. It has never been shown that consciousness can not have as much of an existence apart from the brain as a speaker can apart from a telephone. All that has been shown is that consciousness can manifest itself to mortals only by means of physical mechanism." This point is also discussed in the paragraphs which I give from Fiske.

My opponent says he can not dispute the theory of Evolution, and thinks

evolution makes impossible the doctrine of immortality. He is indeed a strange product, but, I think, a natural product of his carnal doctrine and wild speculations. He claims to believe in the resurrection after which the righteous will be immortal; to believe in God and actually that God answers prayer—even to showing one the meaning of Scriptures; and yet, and yet, he denies the miracle of creation, denies the divinity of Christ, denies that Christ had spirit that men could not and did not kill, denies that we "Are now the sons of God," and denies any other Scripture expression that doesn't fit his hobby! To what extremities will a man go for a pet theory! He is not only an apt illustration of the condition of mind that his manner of thinking and speculating will produce, but he is also a verification of the poet's statement that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." His efforts to find an argument against the immortality of the spirit from the science of Evolution and physiological psychology reminds me of what one of Shakespeare's characters said of two others who were making great efforts to excel each other in using big words: "They have been to a feast of languages and stolen the scraps," was his remark. My opponent has loafed around the grog-shops of infidelity and come away with the smell strong on his garments.

As said before, our trouble does not come from real science, and I have already quoted the greatest psychologists the world has ever known to show that they do not hold that the brain or physical organism is necessary to the existence of the mind or spirit. I shall now quote from another great scientist who agrees with that idea, and also shows that the logical outcome of evolution is immortality. John Fiske is recognized as one of the greatest scientists that America ever produced, and he did more for a dissemination of the theories of Darwin and Spencer in America than any other man. I take the following excerpt from his lecture on "The Destiny of Man Viewed in the Light of His Origin." He says:

"It is not likely that we shall ever succeed in making the immortality of the soul a matter of scientific demonstration, we lack the requisite data. . . . In the domain of cerebral physiology the question might be debated forever without a result. The only thing which cerebral physiology tells, when studied with the aid of molecular physics, is against the materialists, so far as it goes. It tells us that, during the present life, although thought and feeling are always manifested in connection with a peculiar form of matter, yet by no possibility can thought and feeling in any sense be the product of matter. Nothing could be more grossly unscientific than the famous remark of Cabanis, that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile. It is not even correct to say that thought goes on in the brain. What goes on in the brain is an amazingly complex series of molecular movement, with which thought and feeling are in some unknown way correlated, not as effects or as causes but as concomitants. So much is clear, but cerebral physiology says nothing about another life. Indeed, why should it? The last place in the world to which I should go for information about a state of things in which thought and feeling can exist in the absence of a cerebrum would be cerebral physiology!

The materialistic assumption that there is no such state of things, and

that the life of the soul accordingly ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colossal instance of baseless assumptions that it known to the history of philosophy. No evidence can be alleged for it beyond the familiar facts that during the present life we know Soul only in its association with Body, and therefore can not discover disembodied soul without dying ourselves. This fact must always prevent us from obtaining direct evidence for the belief in the soul's survival. But a negative presumption is not created by the absence of proof in cases where, in the nature of things, proof is inaccessible. With his illegitimate hypothesis of annihilation, the materialist transgresses the bounds of experience quite as widely as the poet who sings of the New Jerusalem with its river of life and its streets of gold.

Scientifically speaking, there is not a particle of evidence for either side. Now the more thoroughly we comprehend the process of evolution by which things have come to be what they are, the more we are likely to feel that to deny the everlasting persistence of the spiritual element in man is to rob the whole process of its meaning. It goes far towards putting us to permanent intellectual confusion, and I do not see that any one has as yet alleged, or is even likely to allege, a sufficient reason for our accepting so dire an alternative."

If this great scientist had been replying to my opponent's negative objections he could not have better phrased his ideas. But to further show how real scientists have regarded this question, let me here quote a few sentences from Thomas Henry Huxley. Since my opponent thinks the theory of evolution disproves and makes impossible the belief in immortality, let's see what the men who taught us all we know about that science have to say on the subject.

In a letter to Charles Kingsley, written September 23, 1860, Huxley said: "I neither affirm nor deny the immortality of man. I see no reason for believing it. but, on the other hand, I have no means of disproving it. I have no *a priori* objections to the doctrine. Give me such evidence as would justify me in believing anything else and I will believe that. Why should I not? It is not half so wonderful as the conservation of force or the indestructibility of matter"

In another letter dated May 5, 1853, he said:

"I have never had the least sympathy with the *a priori* reasons against orthodoxy, and I have by nature and disposition the greatest possible antipathy to all the atheistic and infidel school. Nevertheless I know that I am in spite of myself exactly what the Christian would call, and so far as I can see is justified in calling, atheist and infidel. I can not see one shadow or tittle of evidence that the great unknown underlying the phenomenon of the universe stands to us in the relation of a Father—loves us and cares for us as Christianity asserts. So with regard to the other great Christian dogmas, immortality of soul and future state of reward and punishment, what possible objection can I—who am compelled per force to believe in the immortality of what we call Matter and Force, and in a very unmistakable *present state* of rewards and punishment for our deeds—have to these doctrines?"

How true is the saying that "fools rush in where angels dare not tread"!

The more a man knows of the wonders of the present life and the phenomena of nature, the more reticent and reverential he is about things of the spirit and future conditions.

I take it that it would be an insult to the intelligence of the reader to notice what is said in the paper under review about ghosts, witches, deathbed deliriums, etc. And as to the theory gratuitously given us by Dr. Spence, it is no more than we would expect. He is like a Universalist friend of mine who called the Apostle John the "champion dreamer of all times" because of the visions of the future which he gave us in *The Revelation*, and yet in the same essay this Universalist told us about the condition after death, the opportunities of salvation, the progress of the soul "from sphere to sphere to the most high eminence," etc. But how can we expect either logic or consistency when, as Huxley says, "the intellect has floundered out of its depth" and roams wild through the realm of the unknown and unknowable?

We can not prove the doctrine of immortality by science. Our science does not disprove it or even lodge an objection against it. Hence the believer "can rest in hope," for though men destroy the body they can not harm the soul, and as the body grows weaker with age the inward man is refreshed and rejoices in the knowledge that when the body fails him there is an eternal house ready for him to enter, and when he is compelled to leave the body he shall be at home with God. Matt. 10:28; 2 Cor. 4:16; 5: 6.) He should not forget, however, that when he *departs from the body* that he will have to answer for the things he did *while in the body*. (2 Cor. 5:10.

Therefore—

"So live, that when Thy summons come to join
The innumerable caravan, that moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

A CLOSING WORD BY STEWART J. SPENCE.

As our debate, now ending, has been carried on with earnestness and honesty on both sides, we can ask God's blessing on it, hoping that it will at least incite others to "search the Scriptures."

Forty years ago I debated this same subject, I then affirming soul-immortality, the deityhood of Jesus, etc. The way I denounced my opponent was "the limit." but where men's convictions are strong and honest, they are apt to become a little acrimonious in debate.

Yes, *apollumi* sometimes means merely "lost." The question is, Does it

mean it in such passages as this: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished?"

That Shakespeare should talk nonsense is no proof that God did so. As for Milton, who taught that body and soul and spirit sleep till resurrection, in a comment on the text, "If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die," says: "Die altogether; otherwise the same would have no force."

Nearly all men have held the theories I related of the immortal soul's entrance into the body. Whether these men were "sane" or not, I don't know. I have my doubts.

The forest is *not* in the atom-shell; only the seed is there. And so the immortal spirit is not in the body. Possibly, however, the seed of the resurrection body is in our present one. The *elements* of matter are not destructible; but the *forms* of matter are, Man is one of these forms, as sec Gen. 11:7.

Who is that other fellow at the other end of Halleck's telephone line? What in you receives the message sent by the spirit through the brain? That's the question.

If, as Fiske admits, science has not demonstrated that there is an *immortal* spirit in man (I know "there is a spirit in man"), how does he know that "by no possibility can thought and feeling be the product of matter"? And what is it, if not brain matter, which produces thought and feeling in dogs? Fiske's Assumption that if God produced man's body by evolution, He could not stop there, is absurd; for if true, neither could He stop at the soul or spirit, but must forever go on evolving.

Reader, don't be scared; you are not immortal; if you are not one of the few who will "be accounted worthy of that world," you wilt at least not live forever in woe, thank God!

A CLOSING WORD BY G. C BREWER.

According to our first agreement, our debate closed when we had written six articles each, but as there was some new matter in our last papers, we agreed to write one more short article each.

Doctor Spence thinks that *apollumi* means more than lost, in 1 Cor. 15:18. If we should grant that the word means extinction, annihilation, in the passage, it seems to me that here would be a strong argument against the Doctor's view. Paul says, "If Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." But he says in verse 20, "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead," therefore your faith is not vain, you are not in your sins, and *the dead in Christ have not perished*, but live, "for all live unto God," and the fact that they live makes the resurrection necessary, as was proved in my second affirmative essay. If it is not correct to draw the conclusion that they have *not perished*, neither can we conclude that our faith is *not vain*. According to the materialistic view, Paul and Stephen and all others who

suffered martyrdom did *perish*, became extinct, and have had no existence for nearly two thousand years, and may not exist again for many thousand years yet to come. Truly they have perished, if that be true.

Doctor Spence now admits that there is a spirit in man, but says it is not immortal. Strange that in three long articles he could not find an intimation that the spirit is *mortal*, or dies or perishes. He objects to the doctrine of immortality because he can not understand how the spirit could enter the body, and then turns right around and says "I know 'there is a spirit in man'." Now let him tell how and when this spirit entered man, and he will have met his own objections.

If there is any "seed of the resurrection" in man's body, *anything* analogous to the life germ in an acorn, certainly man is not "wholly mortal." Surely my friend has surrendered his position. If you burn an acorn or in any other way destroy the life germ to the extent that my brother says man is destroyed by death, the acorn will never germinate or spring into life again. Nor will man ever see life again if he is thus completely annihilated.

Halleck's illustration is clear. He says in conclusion of his illustration: "It has never been shown that consciousness can not have as much of an existence apart from the brain as a speaker can apart from a telephone. All that has been shown is that consciousness can manifest itself to *mortals* only by means of a physical mechanism." The expression "to mortals" answers my opponent's question.

Is it possible that the Doctor thinks that man has no *thought* or *feeling* that a dog does not also have? So he argues. Should a man then be charged with "acrimony" if he denounced such a doctrine as degrading! And yet men will espouse this doctrine for no other purpose than to evade that which *only* bad men fear—eternal punishment.