

THE WATCH TOWER:

OR,

MAN IN DEATH:

AND

THE HOPE FOR A FUTURE LIFE.

BY GEORGE STORRS,

1850

# THE WATCH TOWER:

OR,

## MAN IN DEATH:

AND

### THE HOPE FOR A FUTURE LIFE.

BEING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEACHINGS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES ON THE STATE OF MAN IN DEATH, AND HIS HOPE FOR LIFE HEREAFTER.

---

"IF A MAN DIE SHALL HE LIVE AGAIN?"  
"HE THAT HATH THE SON OF GOD HATH LIFE."  
"I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."  
HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON OF GOD HATH NOT LIFE."

---

BY HOMO.

---

New-York:  
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.

## C O N T E N T S.

---

### CHAPTER I.

The questions discussed, 7.—Extracts from Bishops Whately and Law, 8.—Terms referring to the locality of the dead, sheol and hades, 10.—Extract from Kitto on hades, 11.—Bishop Lowth's admission, 12.—Scripture descriptions of sheol, 15.

### CHAPTER II.

Positive Scripture testimony, 16.—Resort of the advocates of the common theory, 16.—Men's "plans and purposes" do not always fail in death, 17.—David's case considered, 18.—Solomon's teaching, 19.—Hezekiah's case considered, 21.—Eccl. 12: 7 noticed, 24.

### CHAPTER III.

Teachings of the New Testament, 25.—Facts of New Testament history, 25.—Revival of dead persons by our Lord and his Apostles, 25.—The death and re-living of Jesus, 28.—Our Lord and the Sadducees, 29.

### CHAPTER IV.

Teachings of New Testament continued, 34.—Resurrection or translation the only hope of future life, 34.—Jesus points to that as our hope, 35.—Paul's hope, 36.—Peter harmonizes with Paul, 38.

### CHAPTER V.

This world and "that world, even the resurrection from the dead," is all Jesus reveals of life, 40.—Paul's writings examined, 41.—Phil. 1: 23, p. 41.—2 Corth. 5: 1-8, p. 44.—2 Corth. 12: 2-5, p. 51.—Heb. 12: 18-24, p. 52.—Acts 23: 6-8, p. 54.—Acts 7: 59, Stephen's case, 56.

### CHAPTER VI.

Rich man and Lazarus, 57.—Is it a parable? 57.—Lightfoot, Whitby, and Wakefield on its parabolical character, 59.—Dr. Clarke and Bishop Lowth, 60.—Parables not always founded on facts, 60.—The Hebrews speak of things without life as if possessed of it, 61.—Dr. Gill on it, 62.—Theophylact's remarks, 63.—James Bates, 64.—The *key* to it, 66.—True exposition of it, 68.

### CHAPTER VII.

Rev. 6: 9-11 considered, 73.—The dying thief, 74.—Moses at the transfiguration, 76.—THE CONTRAST, or comparative views of the different theories of consciousness and unconsciousness in death, 77-84.

### THE GOSPEL HOPE.

A *Sermon*, 85.—Hope defined, 85.—The true gospel hope shown, from the teaching of Christ and his Apostles, to be the resurrection from the dead, 86-96.

# THE WATCH TOWER:

OR, MAN IN DEATH;

AND THE HOPE FOR A FUTURE LIFE.

"Watchman, what of the Night?"

"The morning cometh."—Isa. 21 : 11, 12.

---

## CHAPTER I.

THE chief Watchman of the flock, in ancient times, had his "*Watch Tower*," from which he could survey the most distant field where his flock ranged. Concern for them would cause him to give many anxious looks in the direction they had gone; and night might sometimes overtake them in the field. Still he keeps a vigilant look-out for them. He watched the going down of the sun, and looked for the morning, when that glorious orb would re-appear. Under-shepherds might often inquire—"Watchman, what of the night?" At length he responds—"The morning cometh."

So, looking out upon the setting sun of this life, the watchful mind may be led to inquire, "Will the orb of day ever return?" or, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Job 14 : 14. "Will he be revived into life?" Night has closed in upon him, and all is dark and cheerless in death, unless there are good and sufficient reasons for faith in a future life; and the anxious *Watcher* cries out—"I wait for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in His word do I hope. My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch



for the morning : I say, *more* than they that *watch for the morning.*" Psa. 130 : 5, 6.

From *the Watch Tower* we observe the night closing in on our friends and fellow-travelers ; and our anxious hearts long to see clearly through the darkness thrown over them by the closing tomb. Fancy cannot, and will not satisfy thoughtful minds in this matter.

What is it to be in the state of death ? is an inquiry to which no man can well be indifferent. Job gave utterance to language common to all men, when he asked concerning man in death, "Where is he?" Job 14 : 10. Unaided by Revelation an awful uncertainty must rest upon the human mind on this question. Had we to occupy the position of the wisest heathen, when we commit our friends to the tomb, we should still inquire in vain, "Where is he?" Men have indeed dreamed their departed loved ones into some paradise : but it has been one of imagination only ; and one which they would much rather have kept them from entering, if they could possibly have retained them here.

So far from any man being able to penetrate the gloom of death, to find comfort or life for any in that state, the Lord has asked the solemn and significant question—"Have the gates of death been opened to thee ? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death ?" Job 38 : 17. If, then, living men have not, and cannot enter into that state, to explore those dark regions, what folly to talk of *knowledge* there.

The knowledge of that state, as to the condition of those who descend into it, must be a matter of direct revelation from God, if possessed at all. Human reason, and philosophical speculations are just as unavailing here, as they are in relation to man's origin. Unaided by revelation, who could ever have found from whence man derived his being ? Men, *Christian* men, talk loud and long about *man's dignity* ! Pray, where do they learn such a lesson ?

Is it from revelation, or the vain speculations of philosophy ? or that "wisdom by which the world knew not God ?" 1 Cor. 1 : 21. They talk of the separate existence of a human soul—its immateriality, its immortality, and conscious existence in death, as if these matters were facts not to be questioned or denied. A denial of these points is denounced as *infidelity* ; no matter how closely we may adhere to scripture authority in our denials. It seems as if Platonic speculations, with them, outweighed the plainest scripture testimony. We do not accuse them of knowingly thus preferring human to divine testimony. Early religious training has created a prejudice in favor of the Platonic theory, which thereby has become interwoven in all their religious experiences, so that fear of final apostasy prevents their allowing themselves to doubt the truth of any of these topics in relation to "the soul."

By this course they shut themselves up to a stereotyped theory, without ever seriously considering that it may, ultimately, prove disastrous to themselves, or their posterity. This theory, it is evident to our mind, as men advance in means of information, must lead to *real* infidelity, or to the equally fatal scheme of spirit-rapping—or, to speak more truthfully, *animalism*—which is now sweeping over the earth.

That the doctrine held by most professed Christians, concerning man's duality—or double-being—one part of which is immortal, and survives in a conscious state in death, is not the doctrine of scripture, we trust will be made apparent by a careful examination of those texts relied on for its support, and the opposing testimony of Scripture. The question we are to discuss, is *not*, "What is the soul ?" or "What is the constitution of the soul ?" These questions are purely philosophical, and for answers to them philosophy may be consulted, by such as are anxious to know what God has not seen fit to reveal. The Bible nowhere propounds nor answers such questions

Every assertion, by man, about a human soul—as a separate existence—and every statement of the *nature, capabilities, and mode of existence* of such a soul, is neither more nor less than a *human opinion*. Just what that is worth, all such speculations are worth, and no more. The Bible propounds no such topics, and gives no countenance to them. The question before us, then, is not “What is the separate state of the *soul* after death?” but “What is the state of *man* in death?” and “What *the hope* for him in the future?” The soul or spirit of man—as those terms are theologically employed—as a disembodied personality, is an idea unknown to inspiration. ARCHBISHOP WHATELY, in his “*Revelation of a Future State*,” says—“To the Christian, indeed, all this doubt would be instantly removed, if he found that the *immortality of the soul, as a disembodied spirit*, were revealed in the Word of God.” \* \* \* “In fact, however, NO SUCH DOCTRINE IS REVEALED TO US; the Christian’s hope, as founded on the promises contained in the Gospel, is *the resurrection of the body*.”

DR. LAW, BISHOP OF CARLISLE, speaks as follows :—

“It will be necessary to attend to the true meaning of the word DEATH, as it is strictly and properly applied in scripture; and this may be best seen, by looking back to the remarkable passage where it is first used, in that denunciation which brought Adam and his posterity under it; and where we must suppose it used in all the plainness and propriety of speech imaginable. And, accordingly, we find the original here, as full and emphatical as words can make it. They are translated—Thou shalt *surely*—but might with more strictness have been rendered—Thou shalt *utterly die*; which one would think sufficiently explained in the sentence passed on our first parents, where they are reminded of their original, and of that state to which this change should reduce them. ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.’ Now what do we imagine they could possibly understand by this denunciation but a resumption of that natural life or conscious being, which

their Creator had been lately pleased to bestow upon them? the forfeiting which must necessarily include a total loss of all those benefits that then did, or ever could proceed from him? This surely, and nothing less, must be implied in that most solemn sentence; nor can we well conceive the unhappy subjects of it to have been at that time so very ingenious as to explain it away by distinguishing upon the several component parts of their constitution, and concluding, that by death no more was intended than only a separation of these parts, while the principle of them was still living in some different manner, or that it was a continuation of their consciousness and real existence, though in some other place. No, *this was the philosophy of after ages*; concerning which, all I shall say at present is, that some of its most eminent patrons cannot help observing, that they ‘do not find it in the scriptures.’ [TILLOTSON, vol. ii. Ser. 100.] These, in their obvious meaning, represent the *whole* man, individual, person, or being, as included in the sentence addressed to him; nor do they seem to take notice of any other circumstance in the case, beside that, so often mentioned, of his returning to the ‘dust or ground from whence he was taken;’ and might not the first pair as well expect, that the same ‘breath of life, which the Lord God had breathed into their nostrils, whereby man became a living soul,’ should still survive the execution of that sentence, or that the dust itself should praise God; as that any kind of knowledge of, or communication with him, should continue in that state of darkness and destruction to which they were then doomed?”—*From Sermon on Heb. 2: 14, 15, “Forasmuch then,” &c.; Carlisle Edition, 1784.*

The scriptures everywhere regard man as an undivided personality—as *one* being, to whom are addressed commands, promises, threatenings, warnings and encouragements. Whatever may enter into man’s nature, as an organized being, alters not his oneness: and nothing which may go to make up his manhood is to be considered, separately, as constituting his personality. An organized being, endowed with life, constitutes him a living being. His disorganization, with deprivation of life, leaves him

where he was before living ; his personality ceases, except in the purpose of God to re-organize him, and restore life. But such a "purpose" can only be known by revelation : nature has never shown such a result ; and there is no voice in it to encourage such a hope.

Job has put the matter in its true light. "*Man* giveth up the ghost, and where is *he*?" Not where is his *soul*? but where is *he*—*the man*? To this inquiry, it is replied—"As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up : so *man* lieth down and riseth not ; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job 14 : 10-12. Surely this language is expressive of the entire dissolution of man, so that he is no longer a living being. This view is confirmed by the question which follows, viz. :—"If a man die shall he live again?" To which Job responds—"All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee," &c. The Septuagint reads thus—"Though a man die he may be revived, after finishing the days of this his life. I would wait patiently till I come again *into existence*. Then shalt thou call and I will answer thee ; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands."

We will now notice

#### TERMS REFERRING TO THE LOCALITY OF THE DEAD.

"HAVE the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?" Such is Jehovah's challenge to the patriarch Job, and which occurs among that wonderful series of questions by which the Almighty impressed His tried servant with the extreme narrowness and insignificance of human knowledge. The interrogation is equivalent to, "What knowest thou of death, or the dead?" And well had it been for mankind, and for the integrity and practical efficiency of Christianity, had they been content with the knowledge of their

ignorance in this solemnly profound direction. We cannot explore the place of the dead,—we know not even if there be a *place*, except in the imaginations of men, who because they know that all mankind share a common experience in this matter, speak of them as having gone to one place. It is the necessity of human thought which is compelled to localize the departed, that has originated a place, and a name for the place, of the dead. The Hebrews called it *Sheol*, the Greeks *Hades*, and the Saxons *Hell*; words most aptly chosen, since while they subserve the necessity of human thought, they express at the same time the modesty of the human mind, which in its election of terms, would, in this instance, appear to approve of the wisdom of not being wise above what is written. The Greek word *Hades*, is of very common occurrence in the Greek classics, but its classical signification is no criterion of its meaning in the sacred writings. We are referred back to the Hebrew *Sheol* for the strict sense in which it is employed by the inspired writers. "The Greek term did not come to the Hebrews from any classical source, or with any classical meaning, but through the Septuagint as a translation of their own word ; and whether correctly translating it or not, is a matter of critical opinion. The word *Hades* is, therefore, in nowise binding upon us in any classical meaning which may be assigned to it. Hence the real question is, what is the meaning which *Sheol* bears in the Old Testament, and *Hades* in the New? A careful examination of the passages in which these words occur will probably lead to the conclusion, that they afford no real sanction to the notion of an intermediate place of the kind indicated, but are used by the inspired writers to denote *the grave*, the resting place of the bodies, both of the righteous and the wicked."—*Kütto*. Let it be borne in mind that nothing relative to the state of the dead can be ascertained by these words simply, and separately considered. In all the three languages, they have a common signification

—their etymological meaning being, the *unseen, hidden, or unknown* place, or state. These terms, then, so far from conveying to us any information concerning the place or state of the dead, only express our own ignorance of these matters, and ought on this account to operate as a perpetual check upon the indiscretion of the rash speculator. Whatever sense the word Sheol has in the Old Testament, Hades, as its Greek equivalent, will have in the New. The Hebrew prophets, in their allusions to the place and state of the dead, conveyed their ideas in the imagery which was suggested by their mode of sepulture. It is not to the Hebrew writers, but to the Greek philosophy, that we trace the birth of those opinions concerning the state and place of the dead, which at the present time prevail as the orthodox creed of modern Christianity. Such opinions must necessarily be defective, and destitute of any claim on our religious belief, since they partake of the imperfection and uncertainty which characterize all human investigation. They are philosophical traditions—not scriptural informations—and as such, ought to be jealously excluded from the sacred domain of inspired authority. It is evident that the Hebrew prophets were strangers to these philosophical opinions,—their poetical descriptions of death and the dead show whence their imagery was derived, and suggest that they could form no other conceptions of the condition of the departed, than what the analogies of their mode of interment presented to their view. Bishop Lowth, in his “Lectures on Hebrew Poetry,” p. 78, says, “That which struck their senses they delineated in their descriptions: we there find no exact account, no explicit mention of immortal spirits.”—A very significant testimony! This testimony is the more important, since the Bishop considered that the immortality of the soul, as a disembodied existence, was a doctrine known to, and acknowledged by the prophets; and he accounts for their uniform silence on this subject, “because

they had no clear idea or perception by which they might explain where or in what manner it existed; and they were not possessed of that subtilty of language which enables men to speak with plausibility on subjects abstruse and remote from the apprehension of the senses, and to cover their ignorance with learned disputation. The condition, the form, the habitation of departed spirits were, therefore, concealed from the Hebrews, equally with the rest of mankind. Nor did revelation afford them the smallest assistance on this subject.”

We would beg the reader's special attention to this paragraph from the pen of the learned Bishop. He acknowledges that the writings of the prophets contain “no explicit mention of immortal spirits,”—that they never alluded to disembodied spiritual existence,—and that “revelation” did not “afford them the smallest assistance on this subject.” Is his inference then a reasonable one, that the prophets who make no “mention of immortal spirits,” *therefore* believed in immortal spirits? and that, although they make no allusion to disembodied spiritual existence, this is to be explained by their inability to express suitably their ideas? And that, notwithstanding “revelation” afforded not “the smallest assistance on this subject,”—the soul's disembodied existence, as the human personality, and the intermediate state, as popularly understood and held, were yet doctrines of revelation? By what unknown process could the Bishop arrive at such conclusions? The sacred writers have said nothing about these doctrines, therefore, says Bishop Lowth, they believed them! We humbly suggest that this negative premise would be more logically connected with a negative inference; that since the sacred writers have *said nothing* about these doctrines, the probability is that they *knew nothing* about them. Their word *Sheol*, drew a veil over the departed state, and involved it in concealment and darkness. If ever they have occasion to refer to the departed, their thoughts are



not directed *upwards*, as if they believed that the personality, as a disembodied soul, had ascended to God,—they think of the body and the tomb, and associate the departed with that which is buried. Thus, “they shall go down to the bars of the pit, when our rest together is in the dust.” Job 17 : 16. “Let not the pit shut her mouth upon me.” Psa. 69 : 15. “My life draweth nigh unto the grave. I am counted with them that go down into the pit. Free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more ; and they are cut off from thy hand. Thou hast laid me in the lowest pit, in darkness, in the deep.” Psa. 88 : 3-6. “Therefore, Sheol hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure, and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it.” Isa. 5 : 14. “When I shall bring thee down with them that descend into the pit, with the people of old time, and shall set thee in the low parts of the earth, in places desolate of old, with them that go down to the pit, that thou be not inhabited.” Ezk. 26 : 20. It seems sufficiently plain that the prophets associate the personality of the departed with the *buried body* ; and since the words which they utter are not always their own, but they are frequently the message-bearers of Jehovah, as in the citation last given,—it seems also plain that God Himself points to the *grave*, as the temporary abode of the human personality : “Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return.” Gen. 3 : 19.

The only means we have of estimating the real opinions of the sacred writers on this subject, is the language in which they convey their thoughts. Their opinions must necessarily be of a very indefinite and general character, since the subject is involved in so much obscurity. So much, however, is beyond dispute, that their language, instead of indicating their belief in the soul's disembodied and conscious existence, suggests their utter ignorance of such ideas. They spoke as if they believed that the out-

ward image of death, and its circumstances, were not the fictitious, but the real semblance of the state of the departed. Their descriptions of Sheol or Hades are utterly irreconcilable with the supposition that they believed the state of death to be a condition of consciousness and activity. All, irrespective of character, are dismissed to Sheol :—“All go unto one place ; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.” Eccl. 3 : 20. “All things come alike to all ; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked.” Eccl. 9 : 2. Sheol is a place of inaction and silence. “Let them be silent in Sheol.” Psa. 31 : 17. “There is no work, nor device, nor *knowledge*, nor wisdom in Sheol whither thou goest.” Eccl. 9 : 10.

Sheol is never described except in the imagery of terror ; and is always regarded as a great evil. It is never spoken of as the portal of heaven,—the gate of immediate bliss to the righteous. On the contrary, it is described as an awful unfathomable abyss, extending deep into the heart of the earth, to indicate the completeness of its dominion. “Deeper than Sheol, what canst thou know ?” Job 11 : 8. It stands in contrast with heaven ; and therefore, the inhabitants of the one must be distinct and separate from the other. “If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there ; if I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there.” Psa. 139 : 8. “Though they dig into Sheol, thence shall my hand take them ; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down.” Amos 9 : 2.

Now, whatever may be the opinions of uninspired Jewish writers, whether ancient or modern, they can be of no authority in determining the opinions of the Hebrew prophets, whose thoughts, inspired by the Holy Spirit, are conveyed in language sufficiently explicit to indicate their faith and doctrinal instruction on this subject. It is to introduce a novel and dangerous canon of biblical interpretation, to affirm, in reference to the present question, that the *silence* of the sacred writers speaks consent. W

presume it will be apparent that the terms denoting the locality of the dead, suggests nothing in favor, but rather involve the denial of the doctrines of the disembodied soul, and an intermediate state of consciousness for man, between the night of his death and the morning of resurrection ; and, therefore, the logical conclusion is, so far as these terms are concerned, that the origin of such opinions is purely traditional.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### MAN IN DEATH.—POSITIVE SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY.

WE have seen that the terms Sheol and Hades used in relation to the state of the dead, give no evidence, ever amounting to a probability, that dead men are in a conscious disembodied existence. On the contrary, we shall find the Scripture description of the state of the dead excludes all idea of their consciousness.

The account of man's creation compared with the statements of man's dissolution in death, forbids the idea. Thus—"The LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gen. 2 : 7. "His breath goeth forth," [that which God breathed into him ;] "*he* returneth to his earth ;" [*he, man*, formed of the dust of the ground : "the body," if you will have it so ;] "in that very day his thoughts perish." Whatever may be said of the soul or mind, as a distinct entity, the text clearly announces the fact, that it ceases to think in the very day of man's death, and therefore all consciousness ceases.

To avoid this conclusion, the advocates of the common theory have resorted to one or other of the following in

interpretations.—*First*, that it is *the body* that ceases from thought, or no longer evolves thoughts when dead. *Second*, that the term, thoughts, signifies *purposes, plans, &c.*

On the first view, we remark, That supposing man to be dual, as they maintain, the body never did think—it was incapable of any such work, because it was matter, and "matter cannot think," they tell us. To say then, that it is "the body that ceases to think," in death, is a denial of their own premises : for that which cannot think, cannot *cease* to think. Hence, if there is a cessation of thoughts in death, it must be what they call the soul that ceases to think.

The first position, therefore, is utterly untenable ; and the second may be found equally so, on examination : for it is not true, as a general rule, that a man's plans or *purposes* perish when he dies ; or, if they perish, or come to naught at all, it is not true that this always happens "*in that very day*" of his death.

For an illustration. Washington, and others, purposed to make the colonies of America a body of independent and prosperous States. Now, their plans, or purposes did not perish in the very day they died ; even should they hereafter do so. It really seems to us as if the Spirit of God caused the words—"in that *very day*"—to be inserted in the text to bind down the sense to the action of *the mind* of the dead man ; rendering it impossible to make any other application of the expression than that of the entire and total extinction of man's conscious existence, when he is dead.

That "holy men of old," who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," did affirm the incapacity of the dead to perform any good or evil while in a state of death, it seems to us, is as evident as any other truth of inspiration. In this view only can we account for the fact of their language being so expressive of deep lamentation in

prospect of death, taken in connection with their utterances in relation to that state.

1. David, Psa. 6th, cries out—"O Lord, rebuke me not in thine anger" \* \* \* "have mercy upon me, O Lord, for I am weak : O Lord, *heal me*, for my bones are sore vexed. My soul is sore vexed" \* \* \* "return, O Lord, deliver my soul : oh save me for thy mercies' sake : for *in death* there is NO REMEMBRANCE of Thee : in *sheol* who shall give Thee thanks ?"

This language expresses the Psalmist's regret at the prospect of death : an earnest appeal to God to save him from it ; and a special plea against dying, viz : His memory of God would come to a total end ; and hence, praise to God in that state was utterly impossible : none can give thanks to the Lord in *sheol*. *Sheol* is the original word, in this text, translated grave in our version. It is the word of the Old Testament used to denote the state of the entire man when dead. In that state the Psalmist, speaking by the Spirit, tells us what men cannot do ; and it is entirely adverse to the idea of a living conscious existence.

This same idea is expressed fully and distinctly, Psalm 115 : 17, "*The dead praise not the Lord*, neither any that go down to silence." Surely here is no ground for doubt as to the fact that death is a state of unconsciousness ; a state where no exercise of mind can be called into action. Add to this, the clear affirmation of Psa. 146, already considered—"in that very day his thoughts perish"—and we have a "threefold cord" that cannot be broken, as to the mind of the Spirit regarding the state of the dead, revealed to the Psalmist.

If anything more is needed in confirmation of this matter, relating to David's particular case, we have it in the Spirit's testimony, by the mouth of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2 : 34—"David is not ascended into the heavens." Peter had previously said, "The patriarch

David is both dead and buried," &c. Not David's *body* merely ; David himself. It was the personality of that patriarch of which Peter spake, and that was dead and buried ; hence could not have ascended into heaven, and could not therefore be the cause of the wonderful outpouring of the Spirit realized on that occasion ; but Jesus, the Son of David, though he was slain, "God raised up," and he "being exalted" from death, by his resurrection, to the "right hand" of God, "shed forth" the promised Spirit—the demonstration that Christ was *alive* from the dead.

This inspired discourse, of Peter, is a clear New Testament confirmation of David's own testimony, that a state of death is not a condition for any work, even of good. The resurrection state, only, was that which could restore to the knowledge and service of God.

2. Passing from David to Solomon, his son, we shall find a perfect harmony. In Ecclesiastes, ninth chapter, we have as clear a statement as could well be made, that in death there is no capacity for the performance of any good or evil. Solomon first states the condition of mind of evil men while alive, verse 3—"The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their hearts while *they live*, and after that they go to the dead." He then goes on to say :—"For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope : for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die ; *but the dead know not anything*, neither have they any more a reward ; for the memory of them is forgotten."

In the controversy on the state of the dead, much has been said on this text : yet we doubt if the full force of it has been seen. The perfect *ignorance* of the dead is clearly the grand idea it is designed to communicate. Mark well the language. "To him that is joined to all the *living* there is hope," however unimproved and ignorant he may be. If he is *alive*, he may improve ; but if he is dead, there is no improvement ; and he is of no use while dead : hence,

"a living dog is better than a dead lion." The most unimproved and ignorant man *alive*, is of more value than the most intelligent, wise, and powerful man when *dead*. That dead man might, while living, have been as superior to the uneducated and ignorant survivor as the lion among beasts is superior to the dog ; but when dead, he is infinitely *inferior* to him ; "for *the living*" [however ignorant and lacking in intelligence in other matters] "know" [have knowledge enough to know] "that they shall die : " [a truth which any man, though but one remove above an idiot, possesses intelligence enough to *know* : ] "but the dead" [are inferior to such persons, as much as a dead lion is inferior to a living dog, *because* the dead] "*know not ANYTHING* : " total ignorance is the state of all the dead. No language can more absolutely and unequivocally affirm the entire *unconsciousness* of the dead, however powerful their intellect might have been while living.

It is said, however, if our view of the state of the dead, as indicated from this text, is true, "it proves the dead will never have any more a reward : " and hence it is concluded, our view must be incorrect ; and we are asked, why we overlook or pass by the expression—"neither have they any more a reward ?"

We neither overlook nor pass it by. To our mind, it is a further confirmation of the truth that dead men are unconscious. The objector refers to the clause under consideration as if it read "neither *shall* they ever have any more a reward." But such is not the fact. It does not speak of the unlimited *future*, but of the *present* state of the dead—"Neither *have* they"—in their state of death—"any more a reward." The reader will not fail to see the wise man's climax, in argument. It is, as follows : A living man, however humble his condition, is better than a dead one ; *for* the dead know not anything : there is no reward in that state ; *for* the memory of them is forgotten ; that is, they cease to have memory ; hence, know nothing

and can receive no reward while in death. The memory spoken of, is surely not the memory of the living in relation to the dead ; for that remains among some of the friends or admirers from generation to generation, sometimes for thousands of years ; but the mind of the dead having ceased—their thoughts perished—their memory perishes also. Such was, unquestionably, the sense in which the son of David here speaks ; which is further evident from what follows—"Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished." These dispositions are all exercises of the mind : hence when all such exercises cease, the mind itself must have lost all power to act ; it must be utterly unconscious.

A further confirmation of this view is found in the tenth verse : "There is no work, nor device, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR wisdom, in *sheol* whither thou goest." Here is definiteness, one would think, sufficient to satisfy all, who believe Solomon spake by the Spirit, that a state of death is a state of entire incapacity for good or evil, either of body or mind : hence, is an unconscious one. In this matter, Solomon and his inspired father, David, are in perfect agreement.

3. Hezekiah, as a third witness, confirming the views of David and Solomon, will next be examined. He was "sick unto death." The Prophet Amos came to him with this message—"Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live." On hearing this, Hezekiah was deeply affected and afflicted. He prayed and wept sore ; and, in answer to that prayer, he had fifteen years added to his life. After his recovery, in praising God, he assigns one important reason for his reluctance to die : "For," saith he, "sheol cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee," &c. Here the container is put for the contained. Sheol and death stand for those who are in them. It is but another mode of saying, "Men when dead cannot praise Thee or celebrate Thy goodness." Why ? Because there is "no knowledge in sheol," as



Solomon had plainly declared, and Hezekiah confirms that view of the subject.

On what other view can we account for Hezekiah's extreme reluctance to die? The common view, which represents men as "going to heaven" at death; or, at any rate, to a state of conscious existence far better than the present, does not explain this case. The state of the pious dead is better than the present, all the advocates of the common theory maintain. But, when Hezekiah was told he should go into it, he "turned his face toward the wall, and prayed" that he might not be sent there; and distress at the thought caused him to weep sore. This could not have been from any apprehension that he would "go to hell;" for he could appeal to God, and say—"I have walked before Thee with a perfect heart, and have done that which was good in Thy sight." Why, then, such a reluctance to go into that "better land?" Is not that state one where sin, sorrow and death come no more? where temptation and trial cannot reach the happy soul? Why, then, does Hezekiah pray so earnestly to remain longer away? Why wept he sore in view of his nearness to such a happy end? And what did he gain by his weeping and praying so earnestly? Do you say, he gained an addition of fifteen years to his life? Truly! But did he not take those years from the sum of his heavenly felicity? Did he not lose fifteen years of heavenly enjoyment, and turn those years back to be spent in the sorrows, trials, and dangers of this life? Did he arrive at the very gate of heaven, and then weep and pray to be permitted to come back to this world of sorrow and sin?

In fact, however, on the common theory, nothing was added to the life of Hezekiah! Can you add to the years of an "undying and immortal soul?" It was only an *exchange*, in which the royal supplicant and weeper gave up fifteen years of his heavenly felicity for that period here, in this world of trial! What an *exchange*! If a man

should exchange a purse of gold for one of trash; or if he should exchange, willingly, and with earnest desire, health and beauty for sickness and deformity, who would not be astonished at his folly? But all comparison fails; for Hezekiah is, by the common theory, represented as *exchanging* fifteen years of heaven, with all its safety, riches, society, and joys, for that period in the earthly dangers, trials, sorrows and sufferings, to which human life is here liable! Surely no rational satisfaction can be given why a sane man should make such an exchange, unless it could be made to appear that God, whom he served, desired him to make such a sacrifice. But the will of God, as a first choice, seems to have been that Hezekiah should "die, and not live."

If Hezekiah understood—as his words, after his recovery clearly affirm—that in death he could not praise God, nor celebrate Him, then there is a rational ground upon which to account for his desire not to die. In this view, we can see why he mourned and wept sore at the prospect before him. It was just such a feeling as must naturally arise in the mind of a lover of God and His service. He could not but prefer to remain here, where he could see something of the works of God, and "behold the inhabitants of the world," even though attended with many sorrows and sufferings, to lying down in the dust of the earth, to remain in the silence of death, till a distant day of resurrection. In view of death, as such a state, Hezekiah had an object worthy of desire; and he gained a real boon; fifteen years were actually *added* to the sum of his conscious existence. No wonder he praised God so sincerely and heartily after being brought back from the gates of "the pit of corruption." He understood the value and desirableness of life: and he knew when dead he could "not praise the Lord."

In the mouth of three witnesses—and such witnesses, too, as three eminent kings of Israel—we consider the fact established, so far as the Old Testament testimony is con-

cerred—that in death, *man* is without knowledge, and without any capacity or power for good or evil. No *inference* can nullify or destroy such plain and positive testimony as that we have produced. The inspiration of these men must be impeached, or their testimony remains in full force. It is thus summed up :—

“In death there is no remembrance of God”—“In sheol” none can “give Thee thanks”—“The dead praise not the LORD”—“In that very day” of death, “their thoughts perish”—“The dead know not anything”—“There is no knowledge in sheol”—Those in “sheol cannot praise Thee ;” and those who are in “death cannot celebrate Thee.” See Psa. 6 : 5 ; 115 : 17, and 146 : 4. Eccl. 9 : 5, 10. Isa. 38 : 1-19 inclusive.

The only text we need to notice, in the Old Testament which is supposed to be adverse to our view, is Eccl. 12 7, “The spirit shall return to God who gave it.” Without entering into any arguments now, on the nature of the spirit, here spoken of, it is sufficient to say, whatever is its nature, its conscious or unconscious condition must be established by testimony, or else we know nothing of its condition. But the writer of Eccl. has, himself, settled the state of those in sheol—or in the state of the dead ; and he has decided it to be one WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE, thus forever depriving our opposers of any right to use this text in proof of a conscious state in death.

## CHAPTER III.

## MAN IN DEATH.—THE TEACHINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In approaching the New Testament on this subject we must bring along with us the fact that inspired men, speaking by the Spirit under the previous dispensation, have distinctly announced death to be a state where there is “no-knowledge,” and where men “praise not the Lord.” Hence, no *inferences* from the language of the inspired men of the Christian dispensation can be permitted to reverse the *positive* declarations of the Old Testament writers. If no positive testimony appears, affirming the living, conscious state of dead men, in the New Testament, we have a right to the conclusion that no such doctrine is taught there. But we shall find on examination, very likely, that the inspired Jews of the Christian dispensation do not contradict the inspired Jews of the previous one. Both harmonize in the fact of a future life to the people of God by a resurrection, or a reliving from the dead.

A few facts of New Testament history may first be examined, which go to confirm the idea that life after death is only by a resurrection from the dead.

## I. THE REVIVAL OF DEAD PERSONS BY OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES.

On this subject, it may be remarked, that in no case was there any language used indicating that the essential being of the dead was in any other place than what appeared obvious to the actors, and to beholders of these revivals. In other words, There was no calling of “souls” from heaven, or from above, to reënter the bodies of the

dead: there is no such language employed as indicated that a surviving entity—called, *soul*—must return to re-inhabit the body, before it could live again. When Jesus raised to life the daughter of Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue, Mark 5 : 22-43, he “entered in where the damsel was lying” and took her “by the hand, and said unto her, Damsel, I say unto thee arise.”

The *personality*—the damsel herself—was there. It was to her who was “lying” before them, that was *the* damsel, to whom Jesus spake, and not to an entity, or being invisible, in some other state or place.

So likewise Luke 7 : 11-15, as Jesus was going into the city of Nain he met a funeral train: the only son of a widow was dead, and being carried forth to his burial. Jesus came near and touched the bier, and they who bare the dead man made a halt. What now occurred? Simply, Jesus addressing the dead man, said, “Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.” What follows? “And he that was dead sat up and began to speak.” All the circumstances, and the language, forbid the idea that a disembodied soul, which had gone to heaven at death, was called back to reënter the body. It was the dead man, borne upon the bier, to whom Jesus spake, and whom he called “Young man,” and bade him “arise,” and who immediately “sat up and began to speak.”

How far the whole transaction is removed from the idea of a living soul being recalled from some distant world on this occasion. There is not one circumstance or sign—one look, prayer, or command, that gives any indication of the absence of any part of this man. He is there, really, personally; and at Jesus’ voice awakes from the death-sleep that had come over him; his manhood resumes its living existence, which it had not till Jesus spake in his ears.

The case of Lazarus, John 11th, may next be noticed. “Lazarus is dead,” said Jesus. This death he calls *sleep*.

Before our Lord came to the grave, he asks, “Where have ye laid *him*?” Thus recognizing the fact that the *personality* of Lazarus was there. When he came to the grave, he utters not a word calculated to lead any one to suppose Lazarus was anywhere else than there. No calling upon an invisible entity to return and re-inhabit “the body!” But looking into the grave, “He cried with a *loud voice*, LAZARUS, COME FORTH.” Did Jesus call him from where he was not? But he did call him from the grave; then Lazarus was there. To say, “his body was there, but his soul had gone to heaven,” is to assume the whole question, not only without any evidence, but against the clearest evidence of the falsity of such a position. *Lazarus* was dead: *Lazarus* was laid in the grave; and from the grave Jesus bade *Lazarus* come forth, and he did come. The whole transaction is adverse to the idea of the duality of man—one entity of whom does not die—does not go into the grave, but in conscious living existence departs to some far-off sphere, in common language, “above the stars.”

The case of the female disciple, named TABITHA, or DORCAS, who was dead, and restored to life by Peter, Acts 9 : 36-41, is another example where the evidence is against the idea of the personality being found anywhere except in “the body” *alone*. After Peter had prayed, “Turning to the body, he said, *Tabitha*, arise; and *she* opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up,” &c. Peter calls “the body,” *Tabitha*. Showing that the personality was there, and not somewhere else. “He presented her *alive*” to the saints and widows present. *She*—*Tabitha* herself—had been dead—now she is alive. No hint—no intimation that a separate, living entity had been recalled from heaven, or from any other state or place. Her personality was dead, but now is restored to life. Such an idea as a double entity is not found in the scene.

## 2. THE DEATH AND RE-LIVING OF JESUS.

The death and revival of our Lord Jesus Christ himself will be found, on examination, equally adverse to the idea of the survival of his soul in conscious existence when dead. It will be no part of our inquiry now what his *soul* was. That soul was made an "offering for sin," Isa. 53 : 10 ; it was "poured out unto death," verse 12. In agreement with this, the Saviour said to his disciples—"My soul is exceeding sorrowful, *even unto death*," Matt. 26 : 38. His soul descended into *sheol*, Psa. 16 : 10 ; and we have already shown that "in *sheol* there is no knowledge." Paul declares "Christ died." He uses no such language as modern theology employs, such as—"Separation of soul and body," to denote the death of Christ. He speaks not of his soul as departing to heaven when he died, but—"CHRIST DIED:" the personality died. That his death was a reality, and not a mere separation of a living soul from the body, must be evident, from the fact that the death is spoken of the soul, and our Lord's own testimony, three days after his death occurred—"I am not yet ascended to my Father," John 20 : 17. Here is the personality that was dead, embracing his entire manhood, and whom God had raised up from the dead, according to the prophecy—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in *sheol*"—in the state of death. Furthermore, Jesus said to John, when he appeared to him on the Isle of Patmos—"I am he that liveth : and *was* dead ; and behold, I am alive forever more, amen ; and have the keys of hades and of death," Rev. 1 : 18.

There was no manifestation of the Christ, either spiritually or otherwise, while he was dead : and without a re-living from the dead, he himself is perished, and with him all the race of Adam. Hence, upon his revival into life—or resurrection from the dead—depended all the hope for a dying race, for a life to come. This view gives a tremendous importance to the resurrection of the dead ; just

such an importance as the Scriptures attach to it ; and such as the advocates of the common theory—of the living survival of the soul—never did, and never can see or feel. "CHRIST DIED"—"God raised HIM from the dead"—"Knowing that CHRIST being raised from the dead, dieth no more ; death hath no more dominion over HIM."

Such testimony shows, in an unmistakable manner, that the personality of Christ actually died ; was unconscious in *sheol*, in hades. His life-giving power to his followers all depended on the fact of his revival from the dead : so that, "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain : ye are yet in your sins : then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED." 1 Corth. 15 : 17, 18. There is no future life for any man, if Christ is not restored from death. Such is the clear testimony of the New Testament : all turns on the fact, whether Christ is alive : but he is not alive unless God raised him up from the dead ; hence there was no living survivance of his soul in death.

## 3. OUR LORD AND THE SADDUCEES.

The discourse of our Lord with the Sadducees is further proof that dead men are unconscious, and that a future life depends on the resurrection, or re-living from the dead.

We would ask very especial attention to that part of the Evangelical history which records the interview of our Lord with the Sadducees. Luke xx. This sect was evidently one of very great consideration among the Jews, since, notwithstanding the very serious errors which they professed, they were sufficiently numerous and influential to share the dignities of office with their rival countrymen, the Pharisees. With both these sects Christ was at issue ; and, therefore, his opposition to the one is not to be regarded as identifying him with the other. The Sadducees were very prominently opposed by the teaching of Christ, the grand theme of whose ministry was resurrection from the dead, a doctrine which this sect especially



repudiated. The success of our Lord's mission as a teacher was, therefore, so much loss of influence to them ; and in this respect, gain to that of the Pharisees. Under these circumstances they adventured to publicly confront him, and imagined that they should successfully perplex him, by instancing, what they supposed, an insuperable difficulty in the way of the doctrine in question.

It is not undeserving our notice that no allusion is made by the Sadducees to a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, to which their objection would also have been applicable ; but they proceed from the time of the *death* of the woman of seven husbands to that of the *resurrection*. It would seem that, if our Lord had taught the doctrine of the conscious disembodied soul existing in a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, these philosophico-religious controvertists would scarcely have traveled over this long interval to a future event ; it would have been more to their purpose to have inquired, "What relation does this woman sustain to her seven husbands *now* ?" There would have been no greater absurdity in this question than that which they proposed, since, if it be affirmed that the soul is the human personality, capable of a separate existence, then relationships of some kind might be presumed to obtain in the intermediate state, as likely as in the resurrection. It would have answered their end equally well, to have asked the general question, "What relation does she now sustain to these husbands ?" as the more specific one, "Whose *wife* will she be in the resurrection ?" This form of the question, indeed, would have been the more useful, because it would have embraced the two obnoxious articles of the Pharisaic creed, and like a two-edged sword have cut both ways at once. The Sadducees not only denied the resurrection, but the Pharisaic philosophy of the existence of separate souls. Their silence with respect to this subject of disembodied existence, in an intermediate state, makes

it highly probable that whatever the Pharisees may have taught, Christ's ministry comprehended no such doctrine. Their inquiry is only in reference to the resurrection—they ask—"Therefore, *in the resurrection* whose wife of them is she ?"

And Christ's reply, although it does not formally contradict the popular doctrine of the conscious intermediate state, yet certainly seems to imply that there is no such state. "The children of this world," he says, "marry and are given in marriage : but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from 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 children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Here are but two states spoken of—"the children of *this* world," and "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world." Not the remotest allusion is made to any other state in which man exists. On the contrary, it is affirmed of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, neither can they die any more." It might be plausibly replied that our Lord used this word "die" in allusion to the event of death, the mere experience of dying ; but it seems more natural and more in harmony with the context to suppose that he meant by it the state of death, the whole period between dying to "this world," and arising in "that world" of which he had previously been speaking. And the very phrases by which the redeemed are designated, seem to exclude any intermediate state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection. They are called in reference to their two states, "the children of this world," and "the children of the resurrection."

But further, having exhibited to them the futility of their supposed unanswerable argument against the doctrine in question, and placed its possibility before them by the announcement that the new condition of the future

life will dispense with many of the relations and circumstances of the present, he proceeds to appeal to their sacred books, and their acknowledged authority, Moses, in vindication of the doctrine of resurrection from the dead. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto him." This allusion to the writings of Moses, let it be carefully observed, is for this especial purpose—to prove to the Sadducees *the certainty* of the resurrection. Its purpose is thus formally announced by Christ—"Now that the dead are" [*will be*] "raised." Obviously the future, according to a common idiom of language, is here put in the present tense. We inquire, how does this appeal to the words of Moses prove the disputed doctrine? Moses called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. But Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, are *dead*! Is God the God of the dead? Said Christ, "He is *not* a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." Does this last statement, "all live unto him," mean, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were actually alive as disembodied spirits? If so, how does it prove the point in debate? Christ is arguing with the object of proving the certainty of the resurrection—"Now that the dead are raised," is the position which he undertakes to prove. Such an interpretation of his words, makes our Lord's argument pointless; it then contains no proof "that the dead are raised." But the argument is logical, and the proof triumphant. As if our Lord had said—True, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *are dead*, but their death is only *temporary*, they will *live again*; this brief cessation of their existence is nothing to Him "who calls those things which be not as though they were." All live unto God, whom He designs *shall* live, though they live not *now*. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, although dead, yet

live in God's affections and purposes; and at the appointed time they shall live in His actual presence. God would not be called "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob," were they *dead for ever*, as you Sadducees believe: "for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Jesus Christ, as "the Resurrection and the Life" promised—and the Patriarchs are interested in that promise—"Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not die for ever;" he shall die for a time, but not for ever; he shall rise again. Because, therefore, the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will live again at the resurrection of the just, God, the "God of the living," is appropriately called, by Moses, their God. The proof of resurrection from the dead is complete and irresistible. The point to be proved, "*Now that the dead are raised*," is triumphantly reached. "Then certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said."

This grand argument, however, involves much more than is at first apparent. It affirms, by implication, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are *dead*: that they are *not now* in possession of conscious life. Our Lord's argument demands this supposition; it is an essential step upon which he rises to his consummate proof of the resurrection of the dead. Where, then, is the Great Teacher's recognition of the doctrine of the disembodied spirit, and the intermediate state of consciousness of the dead? This one instruction, the more valuable on account of its argumentative form, and proceeding from him who has "the keys of hades and of death," is sufficient alone to *scare* away the human traditions against which we contend.

## CHAPTER IV.

## TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, CONTINUED

As the facts of revival from the dead, under the ministry of Christ and his apostles, are adverse to the idea of a survival in conscious existence, during the period of death, of a disembodied entity—and as the teaching of Christ, in his controversy with the Sadducees, is equally opposed to such doctrine, so are all the *promises* of a future life, given by Christ and his apostles. They do not use the language so prevalent in the current theology—such as, “going to heaven at death”—“Christ comes at death”—“death is the gate to endless joy”—“he has joined the happy spirits in the presence of God”—“he is now walking the streets of the New Jerusalem”—“he has gone home to heaven”—“he knows more than all the world”—“the immortal soul took its flight to realms of glory,” &c. No such language did Christ or his apostles ever utter.

THE RESURRECTION, OR TRANSLATION THE ONLY HOPE OF  
FUTURE LIFE.

Our Lord's teaching is summed up in the sixth chapter of John, in plain language, on this subject. He holds up no hope to his followers of an immediate entrance into the bliss of a future life at death; but he does promise them in the most emphatic and unequivocal language, that if any man believe on the Son, “I will raise him up *at the last day.*” So full was his testimony on this point,

that he four times uses these identical words in that one chapter, at the same time, declaring, that those who believe not on him, “have *no life* in” them. He proclaims himself as “the resurrection and the life:” thus pointing his followers to a re-living from the dead as their only hope of a future life. He never once speaks of their “souls” as conscious while they are dead, or as in possession of heavenly bliss while death holds dominion over them. We do not say but that the advocates of the common theory may *infer* such doctrine from some expressions; but we do say, that our Lord never taught such doctrine in the plain and unmistakable language which its advocates employ to express their ideas of the matter.

Not one solitary text can be found where Jesus promised his followers that they should go to heaven at death, or to any other place of conscious delight. Even the case of the dying thief will be found, on examination, to afford no such promise. A *promise* is essential to build hope upon. Without it, the assumption of possessing unmerited blessings is the height of presumption, and a most unwarrantable encroachment on the gifts of God.

But Jesus does give his friends great and precious promises: such as, “Thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection* of the just.” Luke 14 : 14. “I will raise *him* up at the last day.” John 6 : 39, 40, 44, 54. “When the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory” \* \* \* “every one that hath forsaken houses,” &c., “for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life.” Math. 19 : 28, 29. When shall Christ “sit upon the throne of his glory?” See Math. 25 : 31, “When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, **THEN** shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.” Then it is, he crowns his followers with life eternal, and not at death. Mark saith,

"In the *world to come* eternal life:" and Jesus said to the Sadducees, Luke 20, "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, [*kai*], *even* the resurrection from the dead," &c. It is by a resurrection from the dead that men attain the world to come, and not by dying. A future life depends on the unloosing of the grasp of death—the unlocking its doors. By the resurrection of Jesus he obtained "the keys of hades and death;" and "at the last day" will use those keys to open "the prison," and bring out those who are members of his mystical body, the Church. These great and glorious promises forbid the idea of a state of conscious bliss in death; that state is one of imprisonment—of darkness—of the dissolution of being. The resurrection brings the release—the light of life—the reorganization of being; made spiritual, immortal, deathless: death shall have no more dominion over them.

That the view we take of our Lord's teaching is the true one, we think, is fully confirmed by the ministry of the apostles. First—There is an absence of such phraseology as the common theology employs, such as we have referred to in our first paragraph of this chapter. Second—They everywhere, and on all occasions, make the resurrection of the dead to be the hope of future life. Thus: Paul saith, "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question;" Acts 23: 6. He surely was not called in question about a hope of "going to heaven at death." He must have been called in question for that which he preached; and he tells us what it was. "Now I stand and am judged for *the hope* OF THE PROMISE made of God unto our fathers:" \* \* \* "for which hope's sake, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should RAISE THE DEAD?" Acts 26: 6-8. No hint or intimation of going to heaven at death: but he looks to the reversal of death by a revival into life: such was the promise to the fathers,

the fulfillment of which promise, Jesus was the forerunner and first fruit.

The apostle, true to his preaching, makes equally prominent, in his epistles, the hope of the future life to be by the re-living from the dead, so that, "if Christ be not risen, faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins: then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED." 1 Corth. 15: 17, 18. In this chapter, throughout, the apostle clearly teaches, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then there is no future life. Whoever candidly and impartially examines it, particularly the 17th and 18th verses, in connection with the 32d, it seems to us, cannot fail to see that Paul looked to the resurrection as his only hope of a future life. Saith he—"If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantage it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

This language shows clearly, that if there is no resurrection, death is final, leaving man without any hope of future life: and he inquires, with awful emphasis, what use there was in his having exposed his life for the cause of Christ, by hazarding it in a fight with beasts, if there is no resurrection? Surely, this question loses much, if not all its force, if Paul at the same time held, that so soon as the wild beasts had killed him, he would immediately have gone to a land of life and glory in conscious enjoyment. On the contrary, he does state his case as hopeless for the future, if there be no resurrection; and advises, if such be the case, to make the best of this life, by eating and drinking for pleasure, "for to-morrow we die"—cease from life, and are no more forever. Such language, we judge, cannot possibly be harmonized with the theological teaching of an immediate admission to heaven at death. These views of Paul will be further confirmed when we come to examine those expressions in his epistles which are relied on to support the popular



theory ; not one of which, however, can be produced that corresponds, in plain words, with the theological assumptions of an immortal soul that survives in consciousness when the man is dead. Paul was no teacher of a *soul-survival* in life and consciousness when mortality terminates in corruption ; but he pointed to the "*last trump*" as the time when "victory" over death is attained, and "this mortal shall put on immortality." See 1 Corth. 15 : 52-54, and 1 Thess. 4 : 15-17. Till that period, the apostle teaches, "the dead in Christ" are "asleep ;" and that then it is they shall awake ; or, "the dead in Christ shall rise" *then* : and he gives no note of comfort to survivors, that the dead ones are in any other state or place than that of death, till Christ's return "from heaven, with the trump of God."

In harmony with Paul, Peter points to the resurrection and the revelation of Christ as the hope for the dead in Christ. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope by *the resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible ;" \* \* \* "salvation [*Syriac, life*] "ready to be revealed in the last time." \* \* \* "That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory *at the appearing* of Jesus Christ." \* \* \* "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope unto the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1 : 3-13. What Peter means by the appearing and revelation of Jesus Christ is not to be mistaken, as he has spoken clearly on this point, Acts 3 : 19—when he said, "When the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord ; and He shall SEND Jesus Christ, which was before preached unto you :

whom the heavens must RECEIVE UNTIL the times of restitution," &c.

It is the return of Jesus from heaven that Peter calls attention to, and not of a soul disembodied, going to heaven at death. Such an utterance Peter never made. No : so far from it is he, that he points believers to the "new heavens and new earth," when the present is "dissolved," as the "promise" of God to which we are to "look," and not to death, or any other state or place. Strange that this apostle should so entirely overlook, and take no notice of a disembodied state of bliss, for an immortal soul, had he believed such a doctrine. He passes directly from this present state, or life, to the period of "the day of the Lord," and the "restitution" of that day ; leading us to "His *promise*," which is not of a place in heaven at death, but to the "incorruptible inheritance" in the "new heavens and new earth." How unlike the modern theology.

We might greatly enlarge on the New Testament testimony, relative to the resurrection, and the importance attached to that doctrine ; and the fact that Christ and his apostles never speak of an "immortal soul," or an "undying soul," or of any soul or spirit of man that survives in a conscious state in death. A strange omission, truly, if the popular notion on the subject is true. In these days of theological speculation and "orthodoxy"—as it is claimed—the language employed in the pulpit and elsewhere, on the subject of the state of dead men, is full of just such expressions as are never found in the Bible ; and may justly be styled, "the doctrines and commandments of men,"—*traditions*, and not inspiration.

## CHAPTER V

## MAN IN DEATH.

WE trust it has been made plain, that the teaching of Christ and his apostles does not harmonize with the modern theology relating to man's state in death. They taught the resurrection, or a translation, as the hope for a future life. They never speak of an "immortal" or "undying soul;" nor of "going to heaven at death." Not one such utterance did they ever make, in the unmistakable language employed by the advocates of that theory. "This world," and "that world, even the resurrection from the dead," is the testimony of Jesus. Two worlds, or *living* states for man, is all our Lord speaks of for the encouragement of his followers; and it is all that his apostles ever proclaimed to encourage hope, and comfort the living "concerning" the dead, or those "which are *asleep*." This total absence, by Christ and his apostles, of such language as is in constant use in modern theology, is, to our mind, demonstration that such theology, on the state of the dead, is a corruption of primitive Christianity; an unwarrantable *adding* to the inspired testimony. These additions, however, never would have occurred had not theologians grafted the fable of an immortal soul on Christianity, without the least authority from inspiration. It is this foundation corruption of the truth of God that has led to all the others. Had it not been for this assumption of an immortal soul, no one would ever have thought of death as anything but death—cessation of life; and, of course, of all consciousness. But with the assumed im-

mortality of an inward entity, that cannot die, anything however indefinite, that seems to intimate a state of consciousness in death, is laid hold of to support that theory; and the *plain and positive* testimony of the contrary fact is made to give way to mere inferences.

We shall not stop here to disprove man's inherent immortality; that has been done in "STORRS' SIX SERMONS," and in his "Review of Prof. Post" on that question; to which the reader is requested to refer; we only say now—There is not one text in all the Bible that saith, man is immortal, or that he hath an immortal soul. That fact is settled, and as undeniable as any truth in the universe. Hence, we come to the examination of the texts relied on for proof of a conscious survival in death, with the assurance that whatever those texts mean, they do not mean that dead men are alive, or are in living consciousness. A future-life only results from resurrection, or translation "that he should not see death." Thus, "by faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death;" Heb. 11: 5. But how or what did Enoch gain if he would have been just as surely carried directly "to heaven *at death*?" Wherein is it so great and peculiar a favor to be translated, and "not see death," if, after all, he would have been alive, and in the presence of God, just as really though he had died?

## PAUL'S WRITINGS EXAMINED.

Why did Paul "desire to depart, and to be with Christ" by a *translation*, if he could just as well have been with him by dying? Phil. 1: 23. We are aware, we have touched a tender spot in the theology of our opponents by this reference to Paul's *desire*. They construe Paul's language into a desire to die, that his *soul* might be with Christ. But such a construction is without a shadow of proof; for first, Paul saith not a word about "his soul," nor any

other man's soul or spirit in the entire epistle. Second, he speaks of death in the next chapter as a calamity, and says, "Epaphroditus was sick nigh unto death; but God had *mercy* on him," and restored him to health. Had Paul believed Epaphroditus, had he died, would have been "with Christ, which is far better" than being here, how could he say, "God had *mercy on him*" in keeping him from dying when he was "nigh unto death?" Did Paul think it would be "far better" for himself to die than to live, and just the reverse for Epaphroditus? Strange logic that! Paul's "desire to depart" was manifestly a desire for a translation, after the example of Enoch, so as "not to see death." It was a "desire" perfectly innocent in itself, but which he knew would not be likely to be granted him, as the whole connection shows; for in the third chapter he points the Philippians to his death and resurrection; saying, "Being made conformable unto his (Christ's) death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead:" verses 10, 11. Thus it is manifest that he did expect to die; and hence, though he *desired* a translation, he did not *expect* one; nor did he expect to be with Christ till "the resurrection of the dead;" for he saith in the same chapter—"Our conversation is in heaven; *FROM whence* also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change* our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." No hint of expecting Christ to "come at death," when the "vile body" goes to corruption.

Thus we see, that though Paul *desired* a translation—which would be "far better" than either "to live in the flesh" or "to die"—yet he did understand that he would die; and he labored and suffered, "if by any means" he "might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," which he taught would be when Christ shall come *from* heaven; for, saith he to the Thessalonians, "The Lord himself shall descend *from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the

archangel, and with the trump of God: and *the dead in Christ SHALL RISE,*" &c.

Such language is not to be misunderstood, mistaken, nor perverted to accommodate the theology of an immortal soul, that is never named in all the Bible; and concerning which, the apostle never utters a word. The common construction put upon the apostle's language, of "desire to depart and be with Christ," is a simple perversion of it, and is contradicted by the entire epistle, as well as by all his teaching concerning the resurrection, which we have previously considered.

Thus we have disposed of the first text of our opponents, from which they *infer* the consciousness of the dead, and find it avails them nothing, but when taken with the context, and entire argument of Paul, is strongly confirmatory that the only hope of a future life is by resurrection or translation.

If it still be urged that Paul said, "to die is gain:" we reply, to die might be gain to one who had "five times received forty stripes save one," who had been "beaten with rods, stoned, thrice suffered shipwreck, in journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by his own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness," besides numberless other trials; "to die" might be "gain" to such an one, even though an undisturbed "sleep," in unconsciousness till the resurrection. A minister in these days, with "\$5,000 salary," a comfortable home, and called of men *Rabbi*, or "Doctor of Divinity," might not see how it would be gain to die, unless he was going at once to heaven; and it may be doubted if he would think even that *gain enough* to make him in a "strait" to die—as any physician might testify who attends him when ill—but Paul's "salary" was a very

different matter ; and he might think it gain to die, and rest till the resurrection ; though he might " desire," by a translation, " to depart and be with Christ, which" would be far better" than either " to live" or " die." Such might have been *his* view of the matter.

To take the common view of Paul's discourse, here, is to make him say, in one breath, that he *knew not* what to " choose"—to live or to die—and in the next, to declare he was in a great strait to die : *i. e.* he did very much choose rather to die than live ! Can any rational man suppose Paul would talk in such a contradictory strain ? Between life and death, as a means of " gain" to Christ and his cause, Paul said, " What I shall choose I know not : " but there was another thing he did greatly desire, and choose, if it were consistent for his Master to grant it, viz : by a translation " to depart and be with Christ," so that he would neither live here, in this mortal " flesh," nor " die." *This* Paul did choose ; at the same time, he declares that he was aware that he should " abide and continue" as he was, in this present state, for the benefit of the church.

The view we have taken is further confirmed by Paul's language to the Corinthians, where he says—" We which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that THE LIFE OF JESUS might be made manifest in our MORTAL FLESH—knowing that He which RAISED UP the Lord JESUS shall RAISE UP US ALSO by JESUS," &c. 2 Corth. 4 : 11, 14. It is the change of mortality to immortality that Paul everywhere speaks of, and looks for ; to take place either by resurrection or translation, and not a *soul*, disembodied, in bliss anywhere.

The next text which is resorted to to sustain a disembodied consciousness, is Paul's language, 2 Corth. 5 : 1-8. " Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent

from the body and present with the Lord." It is readily allowed that this passage seems to teach the doctrine of the soul's separate state, and immediate felicity in that state. But this *apparent* instruction is to be attributed to the fact that such doctrines are so generally taught and accredited. Holding the traditional belief that the soul of man is his personality, and is capable of existing, independently of the body, it is natural to put such a construction upon this text as that which commonly obtains. But we cannot think that the believers in Corinth, who had read and understood the Apostle's first epistle, could have so interpreted his meaning. Such an interpretation would have been in direct contradiction to the very clear and cogent reasoning contained in the 15th chapter of their first epistle. Let the text under consideration be taken, not as is generally the practice, *apart from*, but in connection with, its context. The chapter contains, in its first half, a profession of the believer's faith in his survivance of his mortality. The imagery—for the language is obviously figurative—is that of an " earthly house of this tabernacle," which is condemned to be " dissolved," and which was the Apostle's appropriate image to describe the mortality of the creature man. *Man*, the one compound being, is compared to an " earthly house" or " tabernacle," which will be " dissolved." Nothing is here said, nor implied, about an *immortal*, and essentially *permanent* part of man ; which, in its own nature, is independent of this general and complete dissolution ; which is most unaccountable, as on the popular supposition this immortal part is the human personality. The believer is here taught, that *he himself*, in his one totality—not a part of himself—must be " dissolved." But he knows that if, like an " earthly house," he must crumble in dissolution, he will be restored again in the beauty and durability of a " building of God, a house not made with hands," and which is not impressed with mortality ; but one that is " eternal in



the heavens." Here the two states of the believer's existence are described by an "earthly house" or "tabernacle," which must dissolve, and "a building of God, a *house eternal* in the heavens." Paul is undoubtedly speaking of the two bodies to which he alludes in the 15th chapter of his first epistle—"there is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body*;" and hence he says, in the second verse, "for in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven. For we that are in this tabernacle"—[dwelling as mortal creatures]—"do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed"—[we desire not to die]—"but clothed upon"—[with our eternal house from heaven]—"that *mortality* may be swallowed up of *life*." "Therefore, we are always confident;" for we know that if, on the one hand, as mortal beings we must dissolve in death—on the other hand, as beings upon whom God has conferred for Christ's sake, and through him, the gift of immortality, we shall, when we are raised from the dead and receive our spiritual natures, live again as immortal beings "eternal in the heavens." "We are always confident" of this, and know "that whilst we are at home in the body"—whilst, that is, we are existing as earthly tabernacles, mortal and perishable, "we are absent from the Lord," with whom we cannot be until we have put off our mortality, and assume our immortality; which will be when we are raised from the dead in our "spiritual body"—our "building of God"—our "house" which is "eternal in the heavens." "We are confident," I say, of so glorious a re-creation in Christ Jesus awaiting us; and are, therefore, "willing rather to be absent from the body," that is, from our "natural body"—our present mortal and corruptible nature, which separates us from the Lord—and to be possessed of our "spiritual body;" our new, incorruptible nature, in order "that we may be present with the Lord," which cannot be until the resurrection, when "mortality shall be swallowed up of life."

The Apostle desired to "be" present with the Lord, not as a disembodied soul, for he says, "*not* for that we would be *und clothed*;" and hence, in harmony with this desire, he says, "in this we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven;" and, therefore, since this "clothing upon," or re-creation of the human nature, cannot take place until the resurrection, "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality"—his desire to "be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord" cannot be gratified, and he evidently did not expect it, from his reasoning, until the dead in Christ shall rise.

So far, then, from inculcating the doctrine, that at death the *soul* of the believer is present with the Lord, this text forms part of an important passage in the Apostle's writings, in which he exhibits an utter disregard of such a doctrine, and declares that his own earnest longing was for the day of resurrection; when, being "absent from the body"—having parted for ever with his mortality, he should possess his new, immortal nature, in which he should behold and be forever "present with the Lord."

We leave, then, the teacher of the popular doctrine, to explain this remarkable fact, that here, as in the two places which we have previously considered, the Apostle Paul says nothing of the blissful interval between death and resurrection—expresses no desire in reference to this interval; but as if impatient of it, he groans and earnestly desires to be "clothed upon" with his "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The conclusion is unavoidable, that the Apostle Paul knew of no such state of intermediate blessedness for the soul; the consummation of his wishes is thus expressed—"if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Philip. 3 : 11.

Some, in their determination not to yield this, the

citadel of their favorite dogma, endeavor to make something plausible of it, by what is termed riding a metaphor to death. The figurative expressions, "clothed upon," and "at home in," and "absent from the body," it is alleged, "must signify *something distinct* from the *clothing* and the body. *That* which is 'clothed upon,' and which is 'at home in or absent from the body,' is the immortal soul." Now this looks very specious; but admit it, for the sake of argument, and it is obvious what a strange and unmeaning confusion of language the whole of this part of the chapter exhibits. Paul sets out with expressing the strong confidence which he, and believers generally had in their triumph over mortality when they should receive their "building of God,"—their "spiritual body," which he had shown, in his first epistle, will be bestowed at the resurrection. Groaning under the burden of a present mortality, he earnestly desires that the time may soon arrive when, possessed of his "spiritual body," "mortality shall be swallowed up of life." Until this clothing upon—that is, until the resurrection—it is obvious that mortality reigns—it is not "swallowed up of life." But how does this instruction of Paul's agree with the popular belief that the immortal soul at death escapes from its prison-house of clay, and that at this moment—

"There is a land of pure delight,  
Where saints immortal reign."

The Apostle is evidently at variance with the modern theology on this point, when he teaches, that not until we are "created in Christ Jesus"—invested with our "spiritual body"—"clothed upon" by our "building of God"—the grand result is accomplished, mortality is swallowed up of life.

Besides, on the supposition that the being "absent from the body" and "present with the Lord," refers to the immortal soul leaving its corporeal abode and ascending

to God, how, we ask, does this statement follow as an inference from what the Apostle had been previously discoursing upon? Why does he preface it by a term which shows that it stands connected with the foregoing observations as a consequence, and say—"Therefore, we are always confident," &c.? The substance of Paul's statement is, that he earnestly desired the arrival of resurrection, that he might be possessed of his spiritual and immortal nature. What logical connection is there between this emphatic desire, and the statement that, when he died, his disembodied soul ascended to the presence of God? According to the exposition given above, the connection is obvious and natural; but such an exposition of the passage, the only possible one, as it appears to us, gives a most decided contradiction to the doctrine which is so fondly and furtively reared upon it.

But further, if we are to understand that apparent something which is to be clothed upon to be the spiritual nature, or soul, then the Apostle plainly avows that he had no desire for this intermediate state; for he says, "Not for that we would be *unclothed*." Even with this gloss, his longing is for the "redemption of the body" at resurrection. Let it be noted, that according to this exposition, Paul does not pass over in silence the popular notion of an intermediate state of bliss, as in the true exposition of the passage, as given above, he is made to affirm that he would rather not participate in it; he does not desire disembodied bliss—"Not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

Once more, if it be affirmed that the imagery of being "clothed upon," represents the popular notion of the soul as something within, which is "clothed upon" with its "earthly house," or "building of God," then consistency demands that the doctrine of the soul's incorruptibility and immortality be forthwith discarded,

from the orthodox belief ; for it is written—“ *This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.*” 1 Cor. xv. This something within—the *soul*, must *put on incorruption and immortality*, and is *itself* called “ *this corruptible, and this mortal.*” “ So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written—Death is swallowed up in victory.”

The attempt to evade the proper meaning of the Apostle's language, does but involve the disconcerted polemic in greater perplexities, and in the end, lead to his being entangled and taken in his own net. Candor must compel the acknowledgment, that the very prevalent custom of quoting this text of Paul's for the purpose of teaching that he expected to be with Christ immediately at death, is most unwarrantable ; a very gross and mischievous perversion of his meaning.

That the New Testament does not clearly teach a conscious state for what is theologically called “ the soul”—or a disembodied living state for man—in death, is, to our mind, a fact which cannot be denied : not one *positive* text can be produced in support of such a theory. Nor can it with truth be pretended that such doctrine is any where taught in the Bible in the plain language used in teaching other important doctrines, such as—Christ died for our sins—the resurrection of the dead saints—the new birth—repentance—faith, &c. If the theory of a conscious living existence in death be true, we have a right to look that it shall be distinctly and explicitly taught in the New Testament, and not be left to *inference*. It should be exhibited more distinctly than either of the other doctrines we have named, because the Old Testament is *explicit* that “ there is *no knowledge in sheol,*” &c. Where is the testimony of Christ or his apostles that plainly contravenes the inspired testimony of the previous dispensation ? Wo

answer, It cannot be produced—it is no where written that man's *soul* goes to heaven at death, or to any other place in living consciousness. Till such testimony can be produced we reject the theory as subversive of the truth, and the whole gospel economy of life—after death—only by a resurrection, or being made alive from the dead, “ at the last day.”

We have, however, not only, as we believe, proved the dead are unconscious, and that there is not one positive text opposing this view, but we have undertaken to show that those texts relied on, to prove their consciousness, are capable of an interpretation in harmony with the positive testimony we have adduced in support of their unconsciousness. We have already examined Phil. 1 : 23, and 2 Corth. 5 : 1-10, and shall go on with other texts from which inferences are drawn to favor the common theory.

2 Corth. 12 : 2-5 is urged as proof of a *soul* that does consciously survive when man is dead, or that can live when the body is dead. Now, not one word is said in the passage about “ a soul,” at all. Paul saith—“ I knew a *man*” \* \* \* “ whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell” \* \* \* “ such a *man*” \* \* \* “ was caught up into paradise” \* \* \* “ the third heaven,” &c. Not a word does he utter about a *soul* thus caught up ; and if this description of Paul is proof, that a man may be conscious when dead, then it equally proves that a man when dead does not know whether he is dead or alive ; for this man did not know whether he was in the body or out. Did Paul mean to be understood that this man, of whom he speaks, did not know whether he was dead or alive ! Can a man be dead and not know it, if he is conscious ? Paul does here assert that if this man was out of the body, he did not know it ; so that if a man is conscious when dead, he will not know he is dead, so far as this text proves anything in that direction : then what

becomes of the notion that "dead men know more than all the world;" for any person living can tell that a man is dead when he sees him in death; but the dead man, if conscious, is so ignorant he cannot tell whether he is dead or alive! at least, he will not know that his body is dead, for Paul did not know this man was out of the body, if he was: "I cannot tell," said he. If Paul had said, he did not know whether the man was dead or alive, it might have given some plausibility to the theory that dead men are alive; yet even then, it would show dead men were very ignorant; but he simply says, some *man* was "caught up," he could not tell how; but he knew that man *was alive*; yet whether he was caught up *bodily* or only *mentally* was a point he could not determine. That he did not contradict his own statement, in his previous epistle to the same church, we may rest assured; and there, as we have already seen, he predicates future life on the fact of a resurrection, without which they that have fallen asleep in Christ, even, "are perished." See again our remarks on 1 Corth. 15: 17, 18, 32.

We pass to Heb. 12: 18-24, "The spirits of just men made perfect," &c. We certainly have no right to make an inspired apostle contradict himself. But the construction put on this language makes Paul to contradict his previous teaching in the same epistle, as well as known facts. He had said, in the previous chapter, that the ancient worthies "died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them *afar off*:" and he concludes the chapter by saying—"These all, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not the promises*: God having provided some better thing for us, that *they without us should* NOT BE MADE PERFECT." Does he tell us, in the next chapter, that these dead ones are already "made perfect?" and that, "without us?" The advocates of the common theory, to keep up the appearance of the importance of resurrection, say, that the saints will be more glorious

and happy after the soul reënters the resurrection body. If so, then the spirits of just men are not yet made perfect; and, of course, Paul was not speaking of the present condition of these just men.

It is evident that the apostle's object was to impress the mind with the mighty difference that exists between the dispensation by Moses and that by Jesus Christ, and the contrast is clear and perfect—"For ye are not" [to] "come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire," &c., "but ye are" [to] "come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the spirits of just men made perfect," &c. When is this "coming to mount Zion," &c., to take place? Not till God shall "set His king upon His holy hill of Zion;" Psa. 2: 6; for that was David's throne, which He hath sworn to give unto David's son—Jesus, the Messiah. Not till then, will the spirits of just men be made perfect; which will be "at the last trump," when "this mortal shall put on immortality," and "death shall be swallowed up in victory." See 1 Corth. 15: 52-55. To this blessed state believers in Jesus are *coming*, or are "to come:" this is specially their high calling under the gospel; hence, go not back to mount Sinai, for we are coming to mount Zion—to that perfect state which God hath promised, when "the kingdoms of *this* world are become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ:" when "the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem:" see Rev. 11: 15 and Micah 4: 2. As yet, the promise of coming to mount Zion is future; but faith anticipates it—as if present—to fire her zeal and stimulate to a course of action worthy of those who are soon to inherit the promises. For this purpose did the apostle draw the contrast between the two dispensations, and not for the purpose of teaching anything of the present state of the dead just ones. As a *fact*, the living saints had not come to the spirits of just men made perfect, nor to mount Zion, nor to the heavenly



Jerusalem ; but they were coming, or to come to that glorious condition—"Wherefore," he adds, "we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear."

Thus, we think, we have given—very briefly, it is true—the true sense of the apostle on this interesting subject ; and we find no ground, whatever, of support to the common theory of a perfection of disembodied spirits : the subject looks directly to the passing away of the present order of things, and the shaking to a removal of whatever can be, that the "things which cannot be shaken may remain," in that perfected state immediately to follow the overthrow of hades and death ; being the release of the universal church of Christ from death's dominion and power, when "the general assembly" of believers are forever perfected. Glorious hour—blessed hope. Let it stimulate us to a patient endurance of whatever of trial attends our present state, as pilgrims looking for the restitution at the return of our Lord to reign on mount Zion.

Acts 23 : 6-8 is urged as proof that Paul believed in the conscious existence of dead men. The eighth verse says, "The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit ; but the Pharisees confess both."

It is said by those who believe the dead are in a state of consciousness, that Paul believed in the conscious existence of the "spirits" of dead men, because he declared, verse sixth, "*I am a Pharisee.*" But if that declaration is to be taken in an unlimited sense, Paul must have been one of the most wicked and heretical of men ; for the Pharisees are denounced by our Lord as "hypocrites"—as compassing sea and land to make proselytes, and when made, they were children of hell : yea, our Lord denounced them as "*fools and blind*"—as "full of hypocrisy and iniquity," &c. See Matt. 23. He also warned his followers to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees as well as of the

Sadducees ; and defined that leaven to be their "*doctrine.*" The Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls—and among other parts of their "leaven" was their belief in the conscious state of dead men ; in the face of their own Scriptures, which declare "there is *no knowledge in sheol*"—in the state of the dead.

With these facts before us, shall we assume that Paul believed in the conscious existence of spirits of dead men, because the Pharisees did ? even if we admit Acts 23 : 8 teaches that to be the belief of the Pharisees—which may be doubted. Paul states a fact, verse 6th ; it is this—"I am a Pharisee, *the son of a Pharisee.*" This fact relates to his *birth* and *education*. He then states another fact, which is this—that he was still in *agreement* with them as to the *fact* of a "*resurrection*"—nothing more. He gives not one hint that he intended to be understood as indorsing any of their other views, whatever they might be ; nor did he adopt their notions of the *manner* of the resurrection ; which was by transmigration ; and in fact was not dissimilar to the notions of Davis, Swedenborg, Bush, and others of that school, in these days. Paul says, it is "of the hope and *resurrection of the dead* I am called in question." This was *the question*, and not about "angels, nor spirits." In the previous chapter Paul had declared his conversion, and how he heard Jesus speaking unto him, with a "voice ;" and that afterwards, at Jerusalem, he "*saw him,*" and was told by him to "Depart" from that place. When Paul saw the violence to which he was exposed by the malice of his enemies, and perceived that they were divided into *two sects*, Pharisees and Sadducees, he exclaimed, "I am a Pharisee," &c. This had the desired effect : it set his enemies at war with themselves ; and the strife was their own and not his. Paul had not said a word of any belief in "spirits" of dead men—he confined his expression of faith to the "*resurrection* ;" but the Pharisees, instead of admitting that it was Jesus, raised from the dead, that

had spoken to Paul, as Paul had affirmed, immediately used their false doctrine, of belief in such spirits, to say, verse 9, "If a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him," &c. ; thus, by their tradition, doing despite to the doctrine Paul had taught, that it was one raised from the dead who had spoken to him. Here again we see the evil fruits of the Pharisaic doctrine of the conscious state of dead men : it led them to reject the grand doctrines of the Gospel, "Christ raised from the dead," and "no future life except by a resurrection." Such is the legitimate fruit of the doctrine that dead men have conscious spirits.

It is asked, "Did not Stephen believe in consciousness after death when he called upon the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit?" Acts 7 : 59.

We can see no necessary connection between Stephen's request and a belief of consciousness when dead. If we were dying we could utter the same language most fervently, fully believing that all our future life depends upon our Lord Jesus, who has promised to *raise up* his followers "at the last day." Till then, and in the confidence that Jesus will fulfill his word, to whom should we commit *ourselves* but unto Him whom God hath appointed as *the head* of the church—*the members of Christ's body*. But it may be remarked, that the original word here translated *receive* is *dechai*, and signifies also *accept*. The phrase "my spirit" is only a strong expression for *me* or *myself*. Thus Mary says, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and *my spirit* hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour." The plain sense of which is, *I myself, Mary in person*, do these things. So the sense of Stephen's language is clearly this, "Lord Jesus, receive or *accept me*." As though he had said—"Lord Jesus, I suffer, I die for thy name, for thy truth—here I am, an offering unto death upon *the altar* for thy cause—*accept me*—receive this sacrifice of myself." It is then recorded—"When he had said this *he fell ASLEEP*:" and he will doubtless sleep till the Lord Jesus, who did "receive" Stephen's offering of *himself*, shall call him from "the dust of the earth," where he now rests.

## CHAPTER VI

## MAN IN DEATH.—THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

THE case of the *Rich Man and Lazarus*, Luke 16, is urged as proof of a soul-survivance, in consciousness, when men are dead. Some contending that this Scripture is a real history, while others admit it to be a parable ; but they say, "parables are taken from something that has been or may be." Before we have done with it, however, we shall show that such is not always the case.

Those who maintain that it is a literal relation, have no less difficulty in explaining it than their opponents : they cannot explain it all literally, and yet they are bound to do so, to be consistent. Let them make the attempt. *Lazarus*, covered with sores, died and was carried *into Abraham's bosom*. Will they pretend that is literal? O, no, they say, "it was Lazarus' *soul*!" But our Lord says, *Lazarus* was carried into Abraham's bosom. Our opponents have to say—"Not so, Lord—it was his *soul*:" thus, they contradict our Lord to establish their "own traditions." Let us see whether they succeed any better with their real history of the rich man. He died. What became of him? He "was buried:" the *rich man* was buried, remember. What next? "In" [*hades, the grave*, of course, where he was buried ; improperly translated] "*hell* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom," &c. *The rich man* did this. They say—"It was his *soul*!" but our Lord says it was the rich man. Thus again they make void the words of Christ to establish their tradi-

tions, if our Lord did really give a "literal history." But for the sake of showing the folly of their tradition about the soul, we will suppose it was Lazarus' and the rich man's souls or spirits, disembodied, that are in hades. We now ask—Are their disembodied souls or spirits material or immaterial? That is, are they matter or not matter? We are answered—"They are immaterial." If so, they have *no substance!* Can that which has no substance be seen or touched? If not, the "literal history" advocates have an immaterial rich man, with immaterial eyes, looking afar off, and seeing immaterial Lazarus, or no-substance Lazarus! Truly, these immaterial souls must have sharp eyes to see *nothing!* and an equally sharp understanding to know that it is Lazarus! But that is not all. The immaterial rich man desires that immaterial Lazarus should dip his immaterial finger in literal water, and cool his immaterial tongue! And all this is "literal history"!!! We have not placed the subject in this absurd light with any other view than merely to show the "literal history" advocates that they are, at least, as much involved in difficulty in explaining this scripture as we, who believe it to be a parable, and that it has no reference to man's state in a future life.

That it is a parable, the context shows. It is in a group of them, viz.: the lost piece of silver—the lost sheep—the prodigal son, and the wasteful or "unjust steward," with an admonition against serving mammon, or riches. The Pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things, and they derided him. Our Lord then proceeds in his discourse with special reference to the change about to take place in the dispensations. He says—"The law and the prophets were [preached] until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached," &c.

Before proceeding to an explanation of this scripture, we will present the remarks and admission of eminent

men, who have been considered orthodox, relating to its being a parable.

LIGHTFOOT says, "Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the 'rich glutton' stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them—nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evidenceth what it aimed at: If they hear not Moses and the prophets, &c."—*Heb. and Talm. Exerc. in Luke xvi. 19.*

WHITBY says, "That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: 1. Because we find this very parable in the Gemara Babylonicum, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his Joma. 2. From the circumstances of it, viz., the rich man lifting up his eyes in hell, and seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, his discourse with Abraham, his complaint of being tormented with flames, and his desire that Lazarus might be sent to cool his tongue; and if all this be confessedly parable, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the Gemara, be accounted history."—*Annot. in loc.*

WAKEFIELD, on ver. 23, says, "In the grave; en to hade: and, conformably to this representation, he is spoken of as having a body, ver. 24. It must be remembered, that hades nowhere means hell—gehenna—in any author whatsoever, sacred or profane; and also that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, (Matt. xiii. 34,) and not a piece of real history. To them who regard the narration as a reality, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the purgatory of the papists. The universal meaning of hades

is the state of death ; because the term sepulchrum or grave, is not strictly applicable to such as have been consumed by fire, &c. See ver. 30."—*Note in loc.*

Dr. ADAM CLARKE remarks on Matt. 5 : 26—"Let it be remembered, that by the general consent of all, (except the basely interested,) no metaphor is ever to be produced in proof of a doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most pointed and express evidence on which to establish the faith of our souls."

Bishop LOWTH says, "Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of fictitious or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

We state it then as a principle, that no parable is to be used as teaching doctrine not elsewhere explicitly revealed. Parables are used only to illustrate some truth already known, or partially so, or to prepare the way to present a truth not yet fully developed, but about to be, either by facts or explicit instruction. The scope or design of the parable is what we are to seek, and not pervert the truth of God by the *assumption* that the parable is a *reality* that "has been or may be : " nor, yet, that every item in it was ever designed to have an application to the subject it was intended to illustrate. By such assumptions discredit has been thrown on revelation, the truth of God been converted into food for the most fanatical, and men have turned to "cunningly devised fables." If any doubt whether parables are not sometimes purely *fictitious*, let them read the parable of the eagle's cropping the cedar, Ezk. 17 : 1-10 ; the parable of the "ewe lamb," 2 Saml. 12 : 1-7 ; and the parable of the trees choosing a king, Judges 9 : 7-15.

If it be replied that, "Jesus would not use *fictitious* characters and circumstances in his parables ;" we answer, that JEHOVAH, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has done it, and why not His Son ? See the parable we have just referred to, Ezk. 17. "The word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, put forth a riddle, and *speak*

*a parable* unto the house of Israel ; and say, Thus saith the LORD God—A great eagle \* \* \* came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar \* \* \* and carried it to a land of traffic ; he set it in a city of merchants : " [say, for example, in the city of New York ! Think you the eagle would be likely to prosper in such a literal work ? But we proceed.] "He"—the eagle—"took of the seed of the land and planted it in a fruitful field ; he placed it by great waters, and set it as a willow tree : and it grew, and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned toward him," [the eagle. These branches must have had "souls," doubtless, that were intelligent thinkers, to turn toward the eagle that planted the seed ! But, let us see.] "There was also another great eagle \* \* \* and behold, this vine did bend her root toward him, and shot forth her branches toward him," &c. Thus the same vine works for both eagles, with all the intelligence of a most intellectual being. Does any one believe this is a literal history of the action of two eagles and a vine ? or, that such a thing "has literally been, or may be ?" No one can doubt but that it is purely *fictitious*. If JEHOVAH thus instructs men, shall we affirm His Son does not ? Of like character do we regard the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus, because the positive testimony of scripture is, as we have fully shown in our previous chapters, that "there is no knowledge in sheol," the state of the dead ; and that "in death there is no remembrance of God." See Eccl. 9 : 10, and Psa. 6 : 5.

It is said the rich man must be conscious, for he sees, feels and talks. We reply—It was common among the Hebrews to represent things without life as knowing, feeling and conversing : see Gen. 4 : 10 ; Hab 2 : 11 ; Isa. 14 : 8 ; Psa. 93 : 3 ; Prov. 8 : 1-3 ; Prov. 9 : 1-5, &c. Our Lord, then, was in no danger of being understood, in this parable, as teaching the consciousness of dead men, and especially, as the Hebrew scriptures expressly taught, "the



dead praise not the Lord"—that "their thoughts perish in the very day" they die—that "the dead know not anything"—and that "there is no knowledge in sheol," where dead men go : and further, inasmuch as Jesus uses the expression in Greek, to show the state of the rich man after death, that exactly corresponds with the Hebrew *sheol*, viz, *hades*, he could be understood in no other way than as using a fabulous discourse—like that to which we have previously referred in the Old Testament—to illustrate an unpalatable subject to his deriding hearers.

We will now, before giving our present view of this parable, present explanations and admissions of eminent men, whose "orthodoxy" in regard to the conscious state of the dead is undoubted ; yet their view of this parable goes to show that they suppose it may have a different interpretation from that usually given.

The first author is Dr. GILL, who makes a two-fold application of it, and supposes it may apply to the torment of wicked Jews after death, or to calamities that were to come upon them in this world. He says :—

"*The rich man died* : 'It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship, and of the whole ceremonial law : a Loammi was written upon their church state, and the covenant between God and them was broken ; the gospel was removed from them, which was as death, as the return of it, and their call by it, will be as life from the dead ; as well as their place and nation, their civil power and authority were taken away from them by the Romans, and a death of afflictions, by captivity and calamities of every kind, have attended them ever since.'

"*In hell—in torments*. 'This may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land, and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains ; and the

whole land became brimstone, salt, and burning, and they were rooted out of it in anger, wrath, and great indignation—see Deut. xlix. 23, 27, 28 ; xxxii. 22—or rather the dreadful calamities which came upon them in the times of Adrian, at Bithur ; when their false Messiah, Bar Cochab, was taken and slain, and such multitudes of them were destroyed, in the most miserable manner, when that people, who before had their eyes darkened, and a spirit of slumber and stupidity fallen upon them, in those calamities began to be under some convictions.'—*Expos. in loc.*

THEOPHYLACT.—This ancient writer first applies the parable to the concerns of the next life. He then says :—

"But this parable can also be explained in the way of allegory ; so that we may say, that by the rich man is signified the Jewish people ; for they were formerly rich, abounding in all divine knowledge, wisdom, and instruction, which are more excellent than gold or precious stones. And they were arrayed in purple and fine linen, as they possessed a kingdom and a priesthood, and were themselves a royal priesthood to God. The purple denoted their kingdom, and the fine linen their priesthood ; for the Levites were clothed in sacerdotal vestments of fine linen, and they fed sumptuously, and lived splendidly, every day. Daily did they offer the morning and the evening sacrifice, which they also called the continual sacrifice. But Lazarus was the Gentile people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gates ; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, we read that it was alleged against Paul, that he had introduced Gentiles into the temple, and made that holy place common or unclean. Moreover, those people were full of fetid sores of sin, on which the impudent dogs, or devils, fed, who delight themselves in our sores. The Gentiles likewise desired even the crumbs which fell from the tables of the rich ; for they were wholly destitute of that bread which strengthens the heart of man, and wanted even the smallest morsel of food ; so that the Canaanite woman, (Matt. xv. 27,) when she was a heathen, desired to be fed with the crumbs. In short, the Hebrew people were dead unto God, and their bones, which could

not be moved to do good, were perished. Lazarus also (I mean the Gentile people,) was dead in sin, and the envious Jews, who were dead in sins, did actually burn in a flame of jealousy, as saith the Apostle, on account of the Gentiles being received into the faith, and because that those who had before been a poor and despised Gentile race, were now in the bosom of Abraham, the father of nations, and justly, indeed, were they thus received. For it was while Abraham was yet a Gentile, that he believed God, and turned from the worship of idols to the knowledge of God. Therefore, it was proper that they who were partakers of this conversion and faith, should rest in his bosom, sharing the same final lot, the same habitation, and the same blessedness. And the Jewish people longed for one drop of the former legal sprinklings and purifications, to refresh their tongue, that they might confidently say to us, that the law was still efficacious and availing. But it was not ; for the law was only until John. And the Psalmist says, sacrifice and oblations thou wouldst not, &c." *Annot. in loc.*

JAMES BATE, M. A., Rector of Deptford, says :—

" We will suppose, then, the rich man who fared so sumptuously, to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. The poor beggar who lay at his gate, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge. The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, and which the beggar was so desirous of picking up, were such fragments of patriarchal and Jewish traditions, as their traveling philosophers were able to pick up with their utmost care and diligence. And those philosophers were also the dogs that licked the sores of heathenism, and endeavored to supply the wants of divine revelation, by such schemes and hypotheses, concerning the nature of the gods, and the obligation of moral duties, as (due allowance for their ignorance and frailties) did no small honor to human nature, and yet thereby plainly showed, how little a way unassisted reason could go, without some supernatural help, as one of the wisest of them frankly confessed. About one and the same time, the beggar dies, and is carried by the angels (i. e. God's

spiritual messengers to mankind,) into Abraham's bosom ; that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. And the rich man also dies and is buried. He dies what we call a political death. His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar son of God. The people whom he parabolically represents, are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime ; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law. Whereby it came amazingly to pass, that these people, though dispersed, yet still dwell alone and separate, not being reckoned among the nations, as Balaam foretold. The rich man being reduced to this state of misery, complains bitterly of his hard fate, but is told by Abraham, that he slipped his opportunity, while Lazarus laid hold on his, and now receives the comfort of it. The Jew complains of the want of more evidence, to convince his countrymen, the five brethren, and would fain have Lazarus sent from the dead to convert them. But Abraham tells him, that if their own scriptures cannot convince them of their error, neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. And exactly so it proved in the event. For this parable was delivered toward the end of the third year of our Lord's ministry ; and in the fourth, or following year of it, the words put into the mouth of Abraham, as the conclusion of the parable, are most literally verified, by our Lord raising another Lazarus from the dead. And we may presume, that the beggar had the fictitious name of Lazarus given him in the parable, not without some reason, since the supposed request of the rich man was fully answered, by our Lord raising another, and a real Lazarus, from the dead. But what was the consequence ? Did this notorious miracle convince the rich man's brethren ? No, truly. His visit to them from the dead was so far from convincing them, that they actually consulted together, that they might put Lazarus also to death ; because that, by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus."

So much for the true sense of this parable. After such testimony, we trust we shall not incur the censure of her

esy if we state our conviction of the true intent and scope of it.

The *key* to a parable is either in itself or in the discourse connected with it. In the case before us, it is in the context. The *scope*, or design of the parable was to teach the effect to follow upon *two classes of men* by a change from the Mosaic, or Law-dispensation to the Christian, or Gospel dispensation ; which new dispensation was "the mystery, which in other *ages*" [or dispensations] "was not made known unto the sons of men," but being now about to be "revealed unto holy apostles," would change the condition of both Jews and Gentiles. This fact is clearly set forth in the 16th verse, which is the *key* to the parable, and unlocks it perfectly. That verse reads thus—"The law and the prophets were" [preached] "until John : since that time the kingdom of God is preached." That is, a new dispensation of God's favor is now opened ; no longer to be confined to the Jews, or *one* nation, but to embrace "all nations" in its offered benefits. This change would affect very differently two different classes of men ; viz., the Jews, who were under the law, and the Gentiles, who are to be embraced under the gospel, or to be made partakers of those peculiar blessings which had been hitherto so exclusively confined to the *sons* of Abraham. The effects of this change are illustrated by the parable under consideration. Let the reader note how our Lord introduces it.

After having spoken of the law and the prophets being preached until John, and that since that time the kingdom of God was preached, he intimates that the law was about to have its last and perfect accomplishment—that the last "tittle" of it was about to be "finished : " that then the Jews would be like the wife whose husband was dead, the law not binding them any longer ; and that God, who had dealt with them under the title of husband, would be at full liberty to select a new bride out of all

nations. Thus Paul reasons, Rom. 7 : 1-4. "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth ? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth ; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress : but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law ; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

Now read the verse with which the parable of the rich man is introduced, Luke 16 : 18. "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery : and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." So long as the law given by Moses continued, the Jews were chargeable with adultery if they lacked in fidelity to that law as unto God their husband ; but nationally they had often been wanting in fidelity, and the law was no longer to be the marriage contract ; a new covenant, ratified by the blood of Christ, and not by the blood of bulls or goats, was to form the ground by which the new bride was to hold her relationship to God, and through which she was to receive the blessings promised. The law being dead "by the body," or death, "of Christ," still to cleave to that law, as the Jew did, was to commit adultery, and bring upon themselves all its curses : they died unto Christ, by rejecting him and putting him to death, and "were broken off" from Abraham's bosom, or from all spiritual connection with him, and have been in "*torments*" unto this day in consequence : while the believing soul, who received Christ, even though he had been a polluted

Gentile, "full of sores, died" unto the law [see Rom. 7: 4,] and was grafted into the good "olive tree," or was translated through the instrumentality of angels [messengers, or ministers of Christ,] "into Abraham's bosom," became a child of Abraham, and an heir, according to the promise, to the kingdom of God.

The parties concerned and to be affected are distinctly marked. The items relating to the rich man clearly mark him as the representative of the Jews, as a people. We note his case first. *His dress.* He was "clothed in purple and fine linen." Now turn to "the law" that was "until John," and see what was the clothing of the priests under that law. See Exodus 28, where Moses was commanded to make for Aaron and the other priests "garments for glory and beauty." Verses 5, 6, 8 and 15—"and they shall take gold, and blue, and purple, and scarlet and fine linen. And they shall make the ephod of gold, blue, and purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen. \* \* And thou shalt make the breast plate \* \* of purple \* \* and fine twined linen." Such were the peculiarities of the dress, or clothing of these representatives of the law and the Mosaic dispensation, or Jewish system. These peculiarities our Lord commences with in his description of the rich man; and they are sufficiently striking to satisfy the unprejudiced inquirer after truth, that the Jews, nationally, were to be represented by the rich man in the parable. The Jews were rich in those abundant communications of truth, knowledge, and peculiar privileges which God had endowed them with by direct communications, or through the prophets whom He had raised up to instruct them from time to time, till at length He spake unto them, "by his Son." Rich were they, indeed, in these high and exalted advantages over all other nations and people. It were easy to enlarge here, but we forbear. The period of their exclusive enjoyment of those peculiarities was their 'life-time:' but the time came that those peculiarities were

to pass away; and that period is represented as a death. It was the death of their whole ecclesiastical polity—it was now to be superseded by a more spiritual and universal system, embracing other people: the "life-time" of their peculiarities is ended—the change has come over them, symbolized by a death and burial. Where next is this once rich man found? Is it in the *theological hell*? No: it is not even in *gehenna*; but, in *hades*. We have spoken so often and fully on *hades*, elsewhere, that we do not deem it necessary to say anything more here than simply to state, it is the Greek word corresponding to *sheol* of the Hebrew, and signifies the covered state, or state of death; in which, the Old Testament positively affirms, "there is no knowledge." See Eccl. 9: 10; Psa. 6: 5, with our remarks on these, and similar texts, in our previous chapters, as well as what we have presented in the previous part of this chapter.

The rich man is alive after his ecclesiastical death; but is stript of all his peculiarities and reduced to a state of wretchedness and torment. And does not the history of the Jews, as a people, from the overthrow of their temple, city, and sacrifices there, unto this day, or present century, fully justify the parabolical description given by our Lord of the misery to which they would be subjected under the new dispensation which was to follow theirs? No one can doubt this who has any knowledge of their history for the last eighteen hundred years: and if we have not understanding of their history, read the prophecies of the judgments threatened them, Lev. 26th and Deut. 28th chapters, and "be no longer faithless but believing." "Wrath has come upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thess. 2: 16. And Jesus said, relative to the overthrow of their city and the tribulation to attend and follow that event—"These be the days of vengeance that ALL THINGS which are written, may be fulfilled." Lk. 21: 22.

Since the ecclesiastical and national death of the Jews



—the rich man—there has been a claim maintained among them that “Abraham is their “father ;” but no relief has come to them from that quarter.

The desire expressed by the rich man, that further light or information should be given to convince the nation or people of Jews, by a resurrection of one from the dead, is met, in the parable, by showing that no further information would avail with those who had rejected all the previous light God had given them : and the answer—“neither will they be persuaded though *one rose* from the dead” —was shown to be true by the conduct of “the chief priests and pharisees,” when Jesus actually raised a “Lazarus” from the dead, [John 11th,] they called a “council,” and “from that day forth took counsel together for to put Jesus to death.” How true that they would not “be persuaded though one rose from the dead ;” and after they had accomplished their bloody purpose, and put Christ to death, and he also had been raised from the dead, under such circumstances that there was no chance to doubt the fact, the same obstinate unbelief remained ; and they gave large sums of money to the soldiers to tell the most silly and improbable *lie* that was ever invented ; viz., That the disciples of Jesus came by night and stole Jesus away while they slept !!

The Jews, as a nation, had their “good things” in their “life time,” or while they held the relation of bride to their Maker ; but now being dead, nationally, in reference to that relation, they are tormented, grievously and sorely tormented ; and all their appeals, as to their relation to Abraham, have proved unavailing ; and it has added not a little to their torment and sorrow to see the Gentiles enjoying rich blessings from which they find themselves shut out. We speak, of course, particularly of social, civil, and political blessing, in which they possessed “much” advantage “every way,” in the days of their national prosperity. But an impassable gulf exists between

them and the Gentiles now : but even that is no where said to be eternal. It will indeed continue to the end of this age, or dispensation ; or till the Redeemer returns to Zion. Till that time there will be no *national* repentance ; but, then will be fulfilled the prophecy of Zech. 12 : 10–14.

The Jews, as a nation, hitherto have professed that their rejection of Jesus as the promised Messiah was want of evidence ; like the rich man, in the parable, they have constantly cried, from the days of Jesus, for more evidence. “Let him come down from the cross and we will believe.” But when he “rose from the dead,” as the rich man is represented as desiring one to do, to convince the unrepenting Jews, instead of repentance being produced in them, as a nation, they put to death the witnesses of that glorious event. Who can contemplate the untold sufferings of that nation from the time Jerusalem was compassed about with armies, and their city destroyed, to the present generation, and not discover the propriety of the parable our Lord employed to illustrate those torments and their hopeless state ?

Thus the parable, so far as the rich man is concerned, has a fair and full application, and illustrates the obstinate unbelief and consequent misery and torment of that people, after their final refusal to receive Jesus as the Messiah. Well did Jesus say to the Jews—“Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me ; for he wrote of me : but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words.” John 5 : 46, 47. These words illustrate what is said in the parable—“They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them ;” and “if they hear not” them, “neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.”

It only remains now briefly to consider that part of the parable relating to the poor man, or Lazarus. Prior to the change in the dispensations, from the Mosaic to the Christian, the Gentiles were poor indeed in religious know-

ledge, and excluded from the *peculiar* privileges of the Jews—the rich man. They could only approach the “*outer court*”—or “*gate*”—of the Temple service : where some of them sought the “*crumbs*” of knowledge which might better their condition. Still their general condition in regard to divine “*things*” was “*evil*.” The time at length arrives when they are no longer to remain in this condition, and that change—to keep up the harmony of the parable—is represented by a death. They pass out of their previous state and find themselves in “*Abraham’s bosom*”—*partakers in that covenant* God made with Abraham ; for, “*If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.*” Gal. 3 : 29. To this honor they are brought through the ministration of angels—*aggelion*—*messengers*. Christ gave his *messengers* commission to “*go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.*” Under this commission they brought many Gentiles into the Abrahamic covenant ; for, “*The Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen*” [the Gentiles,] “*through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.*” Gal. 3 : 8. And the apostle adds—“*So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham :*” they are in “*Abraham’s bosom :*” a phrase which imports a partaker of his blessings and being in the same covenant relation to God. In this condition are all believing Gentiles, and are now “*comforted ;*” while the obstinate unbelieving Jew from the time of Christ, or from the introduction of the Christian dispensation, has been “*tormented :*” and the “*gulf*” between the two dispensations is “*impassable*”—they cannot be joined in one : to come into the blessings of the Christian dispensation is impossible to any one still cleaving to the Mosaic for justification ; and to return from the Christian to the Mosaic is to “*fall from grace,*” and to be swallowed up in the gulf.

We might greatly enlarge the proof that the foregoing is the true scope and design of the parable ; but we believe enough has been said to satisfy the candid inquirer after truth, and we have no expectation that obstinate bigotry will be removed, even though another Lazarus should arise from the dead and affirm the truth of the *ex position* we have here given.

## CHAPTER VII.

## MAN IN DEATH.—MISCELLANEOUS TEXTS CONSIDERED.

It is urged that Rev. 6 : 9–11 shows that dead saints are in a conscious state. The souls of them that were slain for the word of God, are represented as seen, and crying for vengeance on their murderers.

In the first place, these “*souls,*” whatever else they may be, are not theological souls, for those are represented as immaterial, occupying no space, and not to be seen : but John “*saw*” the souls he speaks of, and describes the space they occupy. If these were the souls of deceased men, they were *entirely* different from those of which theologians speak.

Moreover, if they were the theological souls of saints, they seem to be very far from being “*made perfect*” by passing into that state ; for “*they cried with a loud voice*”—which imports earnestness and anxiety—“*how long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood,*” &c. They not only seem disquieted by the delay of vengeance on their murderers, but they speak of their “*blood.*” Theological souls, surely, have no blood, and never had. Bible souls do have blood, and differ as widely from the theological ones as substance differs from nibility.

Again, these souls had “*white robes given*” them, *after* their cry. So they are not such souls as theologians talk about ; for, even if these robes are symbolical of righteousness, men do not receive such after death, but before, and while in this state of trial. It is in this life we are to wash our robes and make them “*white in the blood of the Lamb :*” see chap. 7 : 14.

Finally, this whole scene was laid under the opening of the fifth seal, embracing the time of pagan and papal persecutions, being far in the future when John wrote; so that these souls had no existence at all at the time Revelation was written; and as it was a symbolical representation of a bloody persecution, of long continuance, it presents not the state, feelings, or condition of the dead, but of the living and suffering saints under that persecution, showing the terrible trial of their faith and patience, when the "Lord, holy and true," seemed to abandon them to the vengeance of their persecutors. Seeing this bloody persecution so long protracted, with no apparent end to it, they cry, "HOW LONG!" The answer is, "until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they, should be FULFILLED." They were pointed forward to the completion of this bloody scene, as the time when God would avenge them, and in this trial of themselves, God designed to purify them, and make them white, or give them "white robes," after which "they should rest" awhile "in the dust of the earth," (see Dan. 12 : 2,) and then "awake to everlasting life."

On this scenic representation of a bloody persecution and its final result, we might greatly enlarge, but we think enough has been said to satisfy the candid inquirer after truth, that there was no design in the revelator of representing the state of death as being one of consciousness, but only the feelings and hopes of the living and suffering Christians under a most unparalleled and protracted persecution. "The souls" are the *persons*, in their visible, tangible, and suffering state; but when made "white" they were to rest till all that was written should be "fulfilled:" then would come their reward.

On our Lord's promise to the DYING THIEF, Luke 23 : 43, we need say but little. Having demonstrated that the Old Testament condemns the idea that the dead know anything, unless it can be shown that Jesus taught the contrary,

explicitly, no one has the right to claim the text in Luke, as proving a living existence when dead. Jesus did teach distinctly, that the "resurrection, at the last day" is the hope of a future life. What he said to the thief, therefore, is to be interpreted in harmony with all his other teaching. He never promised his followers their reward till "the resurrection of the just:" see Lk. 14 : 14; John 6 : 40; and Math. 16 : 27. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon THE THRONE of his glory;" then will be the time of "his appearing and KINGDOM." The thief prayed, "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." "Into," says Archbishop WHATELY, "is a mis-translation; it should be, 'in thy kingdom:' the meaning is—at thy second coming in triumphant glory." See his "Future States," p. 324. Jesus' answer is in harmony with the prayer—"Verily I say unto thee to-day," or *this day*—what day? the day they hung upon the cross? No: but the day just spoken of, viz: when Christ shall come "in his kingdom." The answer is, in the day of Christ's coming into, or in his kingdom, the thief should be with him in paradise: i. e., in that delightful place.

The idea that paradise is the theological heaven, of disembodied souls, is an assumption, without one text in the Bible to sustain it. Three days after Jesus' death he declared to Mary, John 20 : 17, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." He did not, then, ascend to paradise the day he died, and had not for three days after; hence if the thief went there, he did not find Jesus, and the promise failed. There is no evading our Lord's words, to Mary, by saying, "Jesus meant he had not been to heaven in his body." He speaks of his personality—"I am not yet ascended," &c. Jesus—the *person*—had not been to paradise. He said to the thief—"Thou shalt be with me." Not, thy *soul* shall be with my *soul*. Three days after the same *me*, saith, "I am not yet ascended." Here is demonstration of the incor

rectness of the common construction of this scripture. There is no proof from it of the survivance of a conscious entity, called the soul, in death. Jesus saith nothing of a soul or souls in the entire account. We might extend our remarks greatly on this text, but we judge enough has been said to show its utter irrelevancy as proof of the common theory of going to heaven at death.

The case of MOSES, at the transfiguration, is urged as proof that souls, disembodied, do live, and are conscious when men are dead. It is however maintained, theologically, that souls are immaterial; hence, it would be impossible for them to be seen by material eyes; therefore, it was not Moses as a disembodied soul, that was present on that occasion; for the disciples *saw* "two men, who appeared in glory;" Luke 9: 30, 31; hence Moses had been raised from the dead for the occasion, or it was a sight in *vision*. Christ appeared in glory at that time; but that was not his *permanent* condition—for he afterwards died.—Moses, if really there, was so "*in glory*:" so saith the text; therefore he had been raised from the dead for this manifestation; though this was not yet his permanent state, any more than that of Jesus at that time. It is then perfectly clear, that Moses was there by a revival from death, or he was there only by a representation in *vision* of that glory which is to be possessed by the followers of Christ, when he shall actually appear *in glory*—"When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory;" Col. 3: 3. See also 2 Peter, 1: 16-18. *Moses* was dead—*Moses* was buried; but *Moses* appeared in glory at the transfiguration—not Moses' soul: no; it was *Moses*—the same that died and was *buried*. If he really appeared, in person, then it is manifest, he had been revived from the dead, though he might fall asleep again, to wait the revelation of his Master in his permanent glory.

## THE CONTRAST.

THE cry, that the idea of unconsciousness in death is comfortless and gloomy, has deterred not a few from allowing their convictions of the truth to settle down into faith, that a future life is dependent on a resurrection from the dead: thus they have had their faith weakened, or destroyed in the Scripture doctrine of a literal resurrection "at the last day."

We propose, therefore, to discuss, as fully as our space will permit, the Comparative Merits of the doctrines of the disembodied consciousness, and human unconsciousness, between the periods of Death and Resurrection; from which we think it will be seen, that the doctrine of human non-existence, and therefore, of necessary unconsciousness in death, is a doctrine *less gloomy* than that in which the popular faith so implicitly reposes.

By non-existence, we do not mean to assert, nor do we imply anything touching the respective destiny of the component parts of man's nature. All we mean is, that after the dissolution of death, the conscious being, MAN, ceases to retain his consciousness. That this is a mystery, and a very great mystery, is readily acknowledged, but not such a mystery as cannot be believed. No less a mystery, certainly, is the popular opinion of the elimination of the human spirit, as a distinct being from the material organization of man, at the moment of death, but which, nevertheless, receives the faith of the great mass of Christian men. Of this latter opinion, it may be said with truth, that it is the greater mystery of the two, baffling every attempt at intelligent conception. The former—and which we maintain is the Scriptural view of the state of man in death—is supported by the phenomenon of death itself, and of the preliminary circumstances of dying. The gradual decline of the expiring life—showing at every step of its progress, a farther withdrawal from all external things, until at last, all consciousness of what is beyond itself seems entirely to have ceased, even while the pulse continues its feeble vibrations—should encourage rather than forbid the conclusion, that death itself is a total cessation of the conscious being, and not a more complete retention and development of it.



How tenacious is the material organization of the life that animates it ! And how, apparently at least, does the self-consciousness decline as life ebbs from its high mark. Even *before* death, self-consciousness is again and again destroyed, and in the case of the swoon and delirium, and *because* of disease and derangement *in the material organization*. Is it then reasonable to conclude, in the presence of such phenomena as these, that self-consciousness only seems to, but does not really, decline, until in death it actually expires ? The phraseology, and entire reasoning of the Bible, bid us deny a condition of life for man *in*, or during the continuance of death, and therefore the popular theory, which maintains this doctrine ought to be prepared to show that it is more rational to accept than reject it. Moreover, the mystery of absolute non-existence of the human consciousness in death, is commended to our intelligent faith by the fact, that previous to our human birth, we had no conscious existence. There has been a time when we were not, why should there not be a time again when we shall not be conscious ? What has been may be repeated. The doctrine of the soul's survivance as a separate being after death, has neither reason, analogy, nor scripture, for its support, unless it be again absurdly maintained—as some of the ancients held—that the human soul had a pre-existence.

That this doctrine is gloomy and repulsive, arises, not so much from the view we take of the state of man in death, as the fact that the doctrine *concerns death itself*. The subject is necessarily a gloomy one in *itself*, and whichever view we take, we cannot divest it of its essential gloominess. To our life-loving natures, death must ever appear as the king of terrors ; and it argues no little against the popular faith, that they, who believe that death is but a new and higher development of life, have as strong an instinctive dread of it, as those who deny this doctrine. They who regard death as *the door of life*, and who believe that death introduces immediately to the bliss of the heavenly world, ought to welcome, rather than strive to shun it ; and the fact that they do not so welcome its approach, is a strong presumptive evidence against the truth of their opinion. The natural instincts give the lie to the artificial faith. We do not forget indeed, that some have died in

triumphant anticipation of a glory immediately following their decease, but this is no proof that their faith was right ; all this fact proves, is, that death did not, and could not destroy their hope in the future realization of immortality. It is true they were expecting it at the moment of death, but the *time* of possessing their reward was less the occasion of their dying joy than the *certainly* of possessing it. These happy deaths are, however, comparatively rare, which ought not to be the case ; they should be the rule, not the exception, where the popular faith is professed.

It should, therefore, be distinctly pointed out, that those who believe in a state of life for the soul after death, and before the resurrection, view the fact of death with as much dread as those who regard the intermediate state as one of unconsciousness and non-existence. Like Hezekiah, they think it a greater blessing to live than to die—although they profess to believe that death removes them from a scene of suffering and sin, to the presence of God and His Son, and the companionship of the holy and blessed. They rejoice also in the recovery of their dying friends, and, like Paul of Epaphroditus' recovery, speak of it as an act of God's "mercy." Here are ample evidences that a deep instinctive dread of death exists in the human nature, and which, despite a false though fondly cherished faith, expresses itself on all suitable occasions. The instincts of humanity are against the dogmas of false religion. Facts therefore prove, that even the *popular doctrine* of death is regarded as a *gloomy and repulsive* doctrine ; so that there is no advantage enjoyed by the believer in the soul's separate life after death, over the believer in a state of entire cessation of conscious existence. No accommodating theology can convert the curse of God into a confection ! Death is the curse, "the wages of sin," which we can never treat as a guest, but must ever dread as an enemy. The Christian consolation which the Bible administers is the assurance to all who are in Christ Jesus, that though they die, they shall live again, when Christ, who is "the Resurrection and the Life," shall come to raise the dead saints, and invest them with their "building of God"—their "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens ;"—their "spiritual body " or perfect resurrection and incorruptible nature.

So far, then, the practical advantages of both theories

are equal. The disciple of the one theory, can be as hopeful and joyful in the hour of his mortality, as the disciple of the other. Nor is the disadvantage greater in the one case than in the other, for both theories recognize the necessity of dying—of passing through the pains of dissolution—and of quitting this scene of things forever. Each theory has its coffin and its grave. In both, corruption and the worm have their work to do. In these respects, neither has the advantage of the other ; both alike are gloomy ; and from one as much as from the other, our natures instinctively recoil. But beyond this point, there is a difference in the respective theories. According to one, the man has ceased to be ; he is from this time, the subject neither of hope nor fear ; of pleasure nor pain ; of satisfaction nor disappointment. The “*shadow of death*” has cast its sable mantle over him ; and the “*gates of death*” have opened to welcome him. He has gone down “*into silence*.” (Psa. 115 : 17.) his dwelling is “*in the dark*,” in “*the land of forgetfulness*.” (Psa. 88 : 12.) He is registered among “*the congregation of the dead*.” (Prov. 21 : 16.) He is where there is “*no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom*,” (Eccl. 9 : 10.) for “*the dead know not anything*.” (Eccl. 9 : 5.) We are disposed, and naturally so, to turn away from this vision of death : we say it is cold and gloomy. It is so : but call it not the writer’s theory, nor a human theory at all, for its description is given in the language—not of speculative man, but of the infallible Word. The language and imagery are from the Bible. Turn away, we may, after learning the solemn lesson of our guilt, to seek deliverance through Him who is “*the Resurrection and the Life* ;” but turn away to another theory, we cannot, without discrediting the revelation of God, and reposing in a mere fond conceit. This, however, is not the place for entering upon the proof of our theory of death—we will keep to our professed purpose, which is not to discuss here the truth of the doctrine, but the comparative advantage of the two theories.

We have admitted then, that our view of the state of man in death, is most repellant to human feelings. But be it acknowledged, that both theories stand on an equal footing up to a given point—the point of actual decease. Beyond this point, whatever repulsiveness may attach to our theory of death, does not, let it be observed, affect

him who is the subject of death, but only those who are living, and may be contemplating it. To the deceased, who is deprived of consciousness, there can, of course, be no painful experience, whatever. All the repulsiveness that is peculiar to this theory, is in the aversion with which we contemplate the extinction of our being. The thought of not being is the painful thought—and the *whole sum* of the gloominess of this theory of death.

We turn now to the popular theory of a state of consciousness for man in death, as a separate spiritual existence, or soul. Of this condition of the human being, we can form only a vague idea. It is beyond possibility for us to conceive of a condition of being apart from a material organization of some sort. To have an idea of personal existence, we must have both material and form. It may be of a texture as pure and impalpable as light, but a material there must be, however subtle, and of necessity our conception invests it with form, and gives it locality. Of a pure immaterial essence, we know nothing. They who believe, therefore, in the soul’s separate state after death, as the human personality, conceive of it, we apprehend, in a human form—the express image of that possessed before death, but of a substance altogether different—ethereal. The common notion of an apparition is probably that which generally prevails with respect to disembodied souls. In this condition of existence, then, it is presumed, that man passes after death. The human being becomes an apparition, a “*shade*,” as the poets represent. Will it be maintained, that so far as this change of the mode of human existence is concerned the popular theory of the state of man in death, has an advantage on its side ? The *perpetuation of life* is an advantage, unquestionably, (supposing it to be a fact) but is *such* a perpetuation of the living being an advantage ? Without offering any opinion on the reality of apparitions or ghosts, we merely ask, does the expectation of becoming one of these mysterious beings after death, invest the state of death with attractiveness ? The popular theory holds out the prospect of an intermediate state in the society of shades or ghosts, into one of which we ourselves are to be transformed. This is a feature in the popular theory which does not belong to what we believe to be the Scriptural theory ; is this feature, then, such as commends the popu-

lar theory of the state of man in death? Our's is condemned as gloomy—is this more inviting to human nature? If we may judge by our present views and feelings, we should be disposed to decide that such a prospective condition and companionship as the popular theory holds out, is rather *against*, than in favor of, its doctrine of death. It is natural to us to have a fear of supernatural existences. The disciples, when they saw their Lord walking on the sea, felt as we should have felt under such circumstances: "They were troubled, saying, 'It is a spirit,' (some have erroneously concluded that the word "spirit" here means the disembodied human spirit. If the disciples had meant the spirit of Christ, they would not have said "a spirit," but "his spirit." The meaning is, they supposed they saw *a being of a different nature, a spirit,*) and they cried out for fear." With respect, therefore, to the *personal nature*, and *society* of the intermediate state of conscious existence, the popular doctrine rather loses than gains by the comparison. Our human sympathies pronouncing the judgment of this view of the comparison, decide *in favor* of unconsciousness, rather than *such an existence* of man between death and resurrection.

And if we examine the other characteristics of the popular representation of the intermediate state, we shall be prepared to admit that the advantages are decidedly on the side of the unconscious state of man in this solemn interval in his history. The period between death and resurrection is of necessity—even according to the popular belief—a unique condition of existence—constituting a second estate, perfectly distinct from the first and last estate of the human existence. In religious phraseology it is termed "the intermediate, or disembodied state." During the continuance of this state—which must be long or short, according to the distance of the decease of any individual of the human family from the final consummation of all things—there is a complete separation, in the experience of the blessed dead, from all painful experience of the former life in the body; but no less separate and distinct is this intermediate condition from that which is to distinguish the life to come. While, therefore, this second condition of human existence is represented as a higher condition than the first, being exempt from all its painful contingencies it is yet but an *imperfect* state, and

awaits some unknown, distant period, when its condition shall be perfected. It is sometimes, in general discourse, called heaven, and a state of glory; but when its teachers enter upon an explanation of their theory, they always, as they are compelled to do, admit that it is but an imperfect condition—not that perfect state of glorified existence which shall be introduced after the resurrection of the dead. As man carries with him into this new state of existence his characteristic nature as an intelligent and emotional being—which his organic change leaves unaffected—he must be still the subject of hope, desire, and of all other emotions proper to him, as possessed of a mental and moral nature. By the aid of memory he can recall the past, and by the faculty of foresight he can anticipate the future.

Think of the patriarchs immured in this state—cherishing ardent hopes of the future bliss—through thousands of long years. Paul tells us that these ancient worthies "having obtained a good report, through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, (in these last days,) that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. 11: 40. Is such a state of hope deferred consistent with a state of blessedness? Since there must be a lapse of time for the accomplishment of the beneficent purposes of God concerning the human race, the consciousness of this long lapse of time, which is the vaunted quality of the popular doctrine of the intermediate state, is rather to be deprecated than desired. To the Divine Being "a thousand years are as one day," but not to the human being: to the latter it is the long, slow-moving series of ages, especially if a prospective good is at its farther end. This doctrine of a conscious state for a fractional part of man between death and resurrection, is like all attempts at patching God's revelation—a most miserable mistake! Blessed it cannot be to live in a state of almost perpetual hope deferred; rather, "blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, for they rest"—in unconscious repose—"from their labors," awaiting "the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give" them "at that day"—the day of his appearing.

The popular doctrine of a state of consciousness for man between death and resurrection, when examined on its own professions, is evidently rather an evil than a good. To



the doctrine of a cessation of consciousness in this interval, which the Scriptures most decidedly teach, must be given the ready choice of every rational mind. On this latter, and unpopular, yet Scriptural theory, the holy man who died five thousand years ago is at no greater advantage or disadvantage with respect to the future reward, than the last man who shall die in this life. To borrow the words of Archbishop Whately, "The moment of our sinking into this state of unconsciousness will appear to us to be succeeded by that of our awaking from it, even though twenty centuries may have intervened; of which any one may convince himself by a few moment's reflection." On the theory we advocate, the moment of death is virtually the moment of resurrection, and the instantaneous realization of the great reward. Not so, on the popular theory. The moment of death is to dismiss the conscious being to an intermediate state of imperfection and discontentment, possessed of a nature, and destined to be the companion of natures, from which our human sympathies instinctively withdraw, as both unnatural and undesirable. The state of glory, according to the popular doctrine, is far distant in the unknown future—waited for by the disembodied soul, but still disappointing its hopes, and prolonging its patience. We leave it therefore, with the candid and intelligent reader to decide which, on its own independent merits, commends itself most to our approval as human beings—the popular theory of a state of consciousness, or the unpopular theory of a state of unconsciousness for man, between the periods of death and resurrection.

From our "WATCH TOWER," we learn what is the State of Man in Death, and what the hope for the future is for him. We conclude our observations, from our stand-point, by a Sermon on *The Hope of the Gospel*; which, we trust, will satisfy all candid and impartial minds, that future life depends on the *return* of Christ from heaven, and the resurrection from the dead, by Him who is "the resurrection and the life." If there be no return of our Lord from heaven, and no revival into life by Him, death holds eternal dominion, and the whole race of Adam perish, or cease from life eternally. But thanks be to God, that in Christ there is hope: that hope is the *glad tidings* of revelation. Let the following Discourse be duly pondered; and may God apply it to the reader's heart by His Holy Spirit.

## THE GOSPEL HOPE.

TEXT.—"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and reverence."—1 PETER iii. 15.

The exercise of *hope* is common to man. It is well understood to be made up of *desire* and *expectation*. Neither of these *alone* constitute hope. The first without the last would be *despair*; and the last without the first would be *aversion*. The two must be combined to form hope. The principle is well defined in the minds of men in relation to the ordinary affairs of life; and the man who should tell us he hoped to possess ten thousand dollars on the morrow, we would conclude had not only a desire for that sum, but a *reason* for his expectation; and if he had none, or no good reason for it, we should not hesitate to say he is a fanatic or a fool. Why should we expect less in matters of religion? Men say they hope to be saved, they hope to go to heaven when they die, &c.: that is, they *desire* and *expect* to go to heaven when they die.

Now, we ask such, a *reason* of the hope that is in them? A good reason must be based first, on a *promise* of God. If there is no promise of such a remove at death, then the expectation of it is without foundation, and the exercise of mind is *presumption*, and not the gospel hope. The promise of such a remove at death must not be a matter of mere *inference* or *conjecture*; it must have a '*Thus saith the Lord.*' God does not leave his creatures to mere conjecture, or the traditions of men, in matters which relate to blessings he



designs for them: he gives the most plain and positive assurances or promises. Thus the Apostle speaks, Heb. 6: 17, "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us."

Here we see, for the existence and stability of hope, God does not leave us without a certain and definite promise. Hence if we have a hope of entering heaven *at death*, we shall be able to fix on a clear promise of God to that effect; else we have no well-grounded expectation of such an event, and our hope is *baseless*. Where is such a promise? With *meekness* produce it, and let us have the *reason* of such a hope. We do not ask you for the *traditions* of men on the subject, but for a Bible promise. Will you give it? You are bound by the gospel to do it, if you can. Can you produce such a promise? If so, where is it? We wait for an answer. But, alas, we wait in vain! No such promise is found in the Bible. The notion stands in the wisdom and traditions of men, not in the truth and power of God. If we are correct, then the hope of going to heaven *at death* is not a "good hope;" there is no gospel *reason* for it: it is a *fancy*—yea, it is *presumption*.

The gospel hope, then, is quite another matter from the hope of a large part of the professedly Christian church. The gospel hope is that of *Eternal Life* THROUGH AND BY A *Resurrection from the dead*, and not of an entrance into heaven when we die. For this hope we have clear promises in the Bible.

*What are the promises?* We will give you a few examples. Luke 14: 14. The Saviour had commanded concerning feasts not to call the rich, &c., lest a recompense be made thee; but call the poor, &c., and "thou shalt be blessed for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recom-

enced [when you die? No, but] AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST." Here is a clear promise of the *time* when the reward of well doing is to be bestowed; and it is as wide of the common notion as the resurrection day differs from the day of death. That we do not mistake in this matter, we turn to John 6th. In this chapter, four times our Lord states the time *when*, and the means *by which*, his followers are to receive their reward; and we ask, if it looks like a promise of going to heaven *at death*? See verses 39, 40, 44, and 54. "This is the Father's *will*, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should LOSE *nothing*, but should RAISE IT UP *at the last day*." Here is no intimation of going to heaven at death; but there is a clear intimation that without a resurrection from the dead, Christ's followers would be *lost*. Yet, as it is the Father's *will* that they shall not be lost, he has given to his Son power and authority to raise them from the dead at a stated period of time, viz: "*at the last day*." In the next verse he is still more definite as to what he raises them up for. "This is the *will* of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have EVERLASTING LIFE: and I will raise *him* up at the last day." Does Jesus say, I will *re-unite* his soul and body again in the last day? No. "I will raise *him* up." What does *him* signify? Is it *his body*? *Him* is, *that man*; not that man's *body* merely. He is raised up, and is at the last day, and for the purpose of giving *him* that which the Father hath *willed*, viz: Everlasting Life.

That our Lord's followers thus understood the matter is evident in the discourse of Martha with him, John 11th: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died," said Martha, verse 21. "Jesus said unto her, [thy brother has gone to heaven? No, but] thy brother shall *rise again*." "Martha said unto him, I *know* that he shall rise again in the resurrection AT THE LAST DAY." Such was her faith, and such her *hope*; and such is *the hope* of the gospel. Remember Jesus had declared "*Lazarus is dead*." But he

does not flatter with the fallacious hope that he had gone to heaven, but he does comfort with the true hope—The Resurrection.

Another case in point is the question of Peter, Matt. 19: 27, "Peter said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; *what* shall we have therefore?" Here is a plain question about the reward to be *hoped* for. Does our Lord say, Ye shall go to heaven when ye die? No such thing. How unlike the theology of this age is his answer. Mark it well. "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, *in the regeneration* WHEN THE SON OF MAN SHALL SIT IN THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY, *ye also* shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." From Matt. 25: 31, we learn *when* Christ will sit in the throne of his glory. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." It is not till his *return* from heaven; his promise to Peter and the other Apostles was not of heaven in an intermediate period, but looked down to the time of his return *from* heaven. This point is clear; but we shall have occasion to insist upon it more fully as we proceed.

We have glanced at some of the promises, and see that none of them look like an assurance of a reward prior to the resurrection. We will now examine the *type* and see if that is not as clearly against the idea of any man entering into heaven till Christ returns. To understand this part of the subject the type and antitype are to be taken in connection. We shall hence notice the law of the holy of holies, and the high priest's entrance therein, with Paul's remarks on the subject in Hebrews.

In Leviticus 16th we have the law referred to, which relates to the offering of the high priest, first for himself and then for the people. In the holy of holies was the mercy-seat and the *Shekinah glory*, or symbol of the presence of God. It was there the blood of the slain victim was to be

carried by the high priest and sprinkled upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat, to make an atonement. Now mark verse 17, "There shall be *no man* in the tabernacle of the congregation when he [the high priest] goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, UNTIL HE COME OUT," &c. So sacredly was the holy of holies guarded by the law that even the two hundred and fifty Levites, connected with Korah claiming that "all the congregation were *holy*," when they approached the door of the tabernacle, to intrude into the holy place, there came out a fire from the Lord and consumed them: see Numbers 16th. The people of Israel generally were prohibited, on pain of death, coming nigh the tabernacle: see Numbers 18: 22. But the main point to which we call attention is the fact, no man was permitted to enter the holy of holies while the high priest was therein, nor *until he came out*. Now if we find this is truly a type, we may learn that it is no small sin to attempt to enter heaven before Christ the High Priest comes out. We now turn to Heb. 8: 1, "We have a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary—*agion*—holy—and of the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the *example and shadow* of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle, for See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the PATTERN showed thee in the mount."

Here we learn the fact that the Mosaic tabernacle was but the type of the true; and we may also learn that the Aaronic high priesthood was a type of that of Jesus; for, saith Paul, ch. 9: 11-12, "Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands; that is to say, not of this building; neither

by the blood of goats and calves, but by *his own blood* he entered in ONCE into the HOLY PLACE, having obtained eternal redemption." He adds, verses 23, 24, after having spoken of the Aaronic offerings, "It was therefore necessary that the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures of the true*; but INTO HEAVEN ITSELF, *now to appear in the presence of God for us.*"

Thus have we a clear statement of facts, and find the anti-type of the entrance of the Aaronic high priest into the holy of holies. Christ has entered the *true* holy of holies, even heaven itself; and no man is to be permitted to enter there till he comes out: *the attempt of itself is sin*; though it may be it has been the sin of ignorance; of that God only is judge. We fear it is the result, in many, of *wilful* ignorance. Christ is gone into the holy of holies; are we to see<sup>k</sup> to enter there? If we do, it is at our peril. What s<sup>t</sup> all we do? Do as did the people of Israel when their high priest was in the holy place. They waited without, *watching and praying till he came out*. Thus Paul, in closing Heb. 9th, says:—"Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many—and unto them that *look for him shall* he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

This is a clear reference to the work of the high priest under the law. With the blood of the offering for sin he went into the holy place, and sprinkled it upon and before the mercy-seat, while the people prayed, confessed their sins, and waited, looking for the high priest to come out. So Christ has gone into the true holy place, even heaven itself, and there appears in the presence of God with his own blood; and to those who acknowledge him as their high priest, confess their sins, watch and pray and *look for him to come out*, he will appear in due time *from* heaven, for their salvation.

How blasphemous and presumptuous to attempt to enter the holy place, *heaven*, while our High Priest is there. May Christian men be made aware of such presumption, and cease to talk and act in such an unscriptural manner. They may flatter themselves that it is very innocent to teach and talk about going to heaven at death; yet we venture the affirmation, that it is not only sinful to do so, but tends to subvert the gospel hope, by substituting another and entirely different hope; and hence is "another gospel" than that which Christ and his Apostles preached. This we are aware is a heavy charge; yet we believe we have fully sustained it, but shall now proceed to confirm and strengthen it.

Let us look at Paul's language relating to the gospel hope. Acts 23: 6, "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Then surely he preached the resurrection of the dead as the gospel hope; unless he was called in question for something he did not preach. But let us see, Acts 26: 6-8, he says, "Now I stand and am judged for *the hope* OF THE PROMISE made of God unto our Fathers: unto which our twelve tribes, instantly serving, day and night, hope to come. For which *hope's sake*, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should *raise the dead*?" Here again is seen the burden and hope of Apostolic preaching. It is a future life, by a resurrection from the dead. He adds, verses 22 and 23, "Having obtained help of God I continue unto this day *witnessing* to both small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be *the first* that should RISE FROM THE DEAD," &c. Not only is the resurrection the Apostolic burden and hope, but he affirms the same things were the theme of the Prophets and Moses: *the hope is one*. Not an intimation thus far of the notion of entering the holy of holies—heaven—at death, or at all: it is the hope of the resurrection. He has shewn us *that* was "the hope of Israel," as well as the

hope of the gospel; and chap. 28: 20, in his bondage at Rome, he saith, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain."

But we will now see whether Paul does not with equal clearness state the hope of the gospel in his Epistles. 1 Corth 15: 12-19, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen \* \* \* then is your faith vain \* \* \* then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*," i. e., they are lost out of being—there is *no hope* for them; for, "If in this life only we have *hope* in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." That the Apostle has reference to the hope of a future life by a resurrection is clear from what he saith at verse 32, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, [exposing my life] what advantageth it me **IF THE DEAD RISE NOT?**" Plainly affirming he had no hope of going to heaven at death, and that he had acted a foolish part in hazarding his life at Ephesus, if there is no resurrection. Such a course would be folly indeed; rather "Let us eat and drink," if there is no resurrection, "for to-morrow we die," and there is no hope beyond that. Such is the Apostle's conclusion if there is to be no resurrection of the dead. But this reasoning is both absurd and false, if he could or would go to heaven at death.

But again, Paul saith, Rom. 8: 23, after speaking of the groaning creation, "And not only it, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting [to go to heaven at death? No, but] for the adoption, to wit, **THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY:**" not its dissolution at death. He adds, "For we are saved by *hope*; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." And what does the Apostle affirm he and the Christians of his

time were "*waiting for?*" Answer, "The redemption of our body," that is, for the coming of Christ *from* heaven and *the resurrection*. This will be clearly seen by comparing what he saith here with Phil. 3: 20, 21, "Our conversation is in heaven; **FROM WHENCE** also *we look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," &c. Here is no ground for mistake or doubt. Paul was not expecting to go to heaven at death, nor at all; but he was looking for Christ to come *from heaven*—not when his vile body should go to corruption, but when the time should arrive for it to be fashioned like to Christ's glorious body, which is not till the resurrection. This is further confirmed by his language, in the same chapter, where he tells us how he labored and suffered, "If by any means I might *attain unto the resurrection of the dead:*" verse 11. How unlike is all this to the common idea of an entrance into heaven at death. The hope of Paul is thus distinctly stated: and it is the *gospel hope*, and demonstrates that modern Christians are as ignorant of what that hope is as the pagans themselves. In fact the theology of these days has substituted an *immortal soul* for, or instead of Christ; and hence a hope of going to heaven at death instead of a future life by a resurrection from the dead, at the last day, as Christ has promised. A fatal mistake this, by which Christ is robbed and dishonored; while **DEATH** is crowned "*Prince of Peace*," and as the *door* into heaven! Christ, however, declares himself to be **THE DOOR**, and affirms that those who climb up any other way are thieves and robbers. He is "the resurrection and the life;" without him, and without that resurrection which he has promised at the last day, there is no *gospel hope* of a future life or immortality. Let men beware how they attempt to approach the holy place into which Jesus our High Priest has entered. That is no part of the work of a Christian even to attempt an entrance into heaven at death, or any other period. Paul states again, 1 Thess. 1: 9, 10, what the work is that we have



to do: "For they themselves show what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead," &c. Here the work of a Christian is distinctly stated: and it is no part of his business to be looking, expecting, or hoping to go to heaven at death. Let this be remembered.

To the Colossians Paul saith, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory:" not at death; but when Christ returns "from heaven;" it is then, and not till then, that he will appear in glory.

Once more. Paul, in writing to Titus, states clearly what is the *gospel hope*, and what is the work and duty of Christians in relation to it. Titus 2: 11, 13. Among the things which the grace of God teacheth is, "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts"—to "live soberly \* \* \* in this present world"—*aiōni*, age, or time—"looking for that blessed hope, and"—*kai*, even—"the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Here we see what the *gospel hope* is. It is the return of Christ in his glory, at which time he will raise the saints who are dead and change the living ones, as Paul clearly states, 1 Thess. 4: 16, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trumpet of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first," &c.; also, 1 Corth. 15: 51, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment \* \* \* at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed," &c.

Thus Paul's testimony is uniform. It is the hope of eternal life, by a resurrection from the dead, at the return of our Lord Jesus Christ in his glory. If no resurrection, *no hope*: if no return of Christ in glory, *no resurrection*; then, all who have died are perished out of being, and will live no more forever. In all this there is nothing to sustain the

fable of going to heaven at death. No—men must wait till our High Priest comes out of the holy place where he has entered; even out of heaven itself. If he never comes out, our hope is vain, and we perish.

We will now see if other Apostles are in agreement with Paul on this subject. 1 Peter 1: 3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a *lively hope*," or, *a hope of life*, an immortal life—"by THE RESURRECTION of Jesus Christ from the dead." Here we see the resurrection and the life subsequent to it; and dependent upon it, is the *gospel hope*. Following that, is "An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you"—in the hands of him whom God raised up from the dead, and who, as our High Priest, has entered heaven, or the holy place. In his hands is the inheritance reserved, "ready to be revealed in the last time:" in the hope of which, Peter saith, "Ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness \* \* \* that the trial of your faith \* \* \* might be found unto praise, and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ:" i. e., when he shall come out of the holy place, or, *from heaven*. Peter adds, v. 13, "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace"—*favor*—"that is to be brought unto you at" [death? No, but at] "*the revelation of Jesus Christ*." Thus we see to what the *gospel hope* has reference, and when it is to be realized: not at death, but at the return of Christ from heaven. So again Peter expresses this matter clearly, in Acts 3: 20, where he saith, God "shall send Jesus Christ \* \* \* whom the heavens must receive, [or retain] until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken," &c. Thus, turn which way we will, the great truth, that the *gospel hope* is "*the return of Christ from heaven and the resurrection of the dead*," meets us in full view. Alas, that men should turn off their eyes from it to deify death, and steal a march to heaven by means of the King of Terrors!

Let us turn to one more witness on this subject. 1 John 3: 2, 3, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when" [we die? No, but when] "*he shall appear*, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." Surely we shall not be like him at death; for he has his resurrection and glorious *body*. Death, then, is not the point of time John speaks of. No—it is when he shall appear—when he comes out of the holy of holies, "*from heaven*:" that is the *gospel hope*; and John adds, "Every man that hath THIS HOPE in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure;" that is the effect of this hope; its tendency is to promote holiness. Such is the character and influence of the hope of the gospel. Let all remember this truth, and lay it to heart. Men professing the hope of the gospel, who are not made Christ-like by it, have reason to call in question the reality of their hope. If we hold the hope, we have been speaking of in *theory*, the greater will be our guilt if we do not let it have its *practical* result on our hearts and lives. Again, we repeat the apostolic affirmation—"Every man that hath *this* hope in him *purifieth himself* EVEN as he"—Christ—"is pure." No other standard will answer. How much reason have we to bewail our past shortcomings. Let us haste to God, through our High Priest, while he is yet in the holy of holies, for that mercy which shall blot out our past sins, and enable us for time to come to walk as Christ also walked: that when he shall appear—come out of the holy place—we may meet him with joy, and receive the crown of life.