

**"Take Heed How Ye Hear."** The Temptations of a London Sunday. Price 1d.

**"The Marriage of the Lamb."** Rev. xix. 7. An Advent Sacramental Address, delivered at Eaton Chapel, on Sunday morning, December 3rd, 1871. Price 1d.

**The Moral Value of an Hereditary Monarchy.** A Sermon preached at Eaton Chapel, December 24th, 1871. Price 6d.

**The Glory of Christ in the Creation and Reconciliation of all Things.** With Special Reference to the Doctrine of Eternal Evil. Third Edition. With a notice of some Replies. Price 5s.

The object of this volume is to maintain the two great truths of Revelation, namely:—

1. Conditional Immortality; Salvation from sin and death being offered to every man through Christ: those who neglect it being "destroyed body and soul" by "the Second Death," and not, as tradition teaches, preserved alive for ever in misery.

2. The ultimate reconciliation of the universe by Christ, so "that God may be all in all," and "there shall be no more curse."

**A New Bible; or, Scripture re-written to prove the Doctrines of necessary Immortality and Eternal Evil.** (Reprinted from *The Rainbow*). With an Appendix, showing the doctrine taught by the Early Fathers, by many eminent modern Theologians, and by the Church of England. Second Thousand. Price 4d.

"A settlement of the question."—Correspondent of *The Rainbow*.

**The Eternity of Evil.** Ninth Thousand. Price 1d.; 6d. per dozen; 3s. per 100.

**Immortality: an Appeal to Evangelists; with a Letter from the late Rev. Dr. MORRIS.** Fifth Thousand. Price 1d.; 6d. per dozen; 3s. per 100.

**The Power of Prayer.** Third Thousand. Price 1d.; 6d. per dozen; 3s. per 100.

**"The Way Everlasting."** A Review of the Controversy upon Eternal Evil. New Edition, Revised. Price 1s.

"The subject is deeply interesting and important. . . . It is difficult to see how God can be 'all in all,' if millions of human beings are to be the objects of His wrath to all eternity."—From a *Professor of Divinity*.

"I candidly admit that I have been much shaken by what you have advanced. The subject has taken strong hold of me."—From an *Archdeacon*.

"I have never before been able to feel my feet touching the ground, not of human reason merely, but the holy ground of revealed truth. . . . I saw at once this was the missing truth, which I had long been wanting. The good moral effect of this doctrine of the soul's conditional immortality would, I am persuaded, be unspeakably great if it were to become the popular belief. Accept my gratitude for your manful endeavour in the cause of truth."—From a *London Clergyman*.

"The most convincing and irrefragable arguments I ever read."—From a former *Member of Parliament*.

\* \* \* The above are taken from a large number of similar testimonies which the author has been constantly receiving since the publication of *The Glory of Christ* in 1868.

# EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

NOT

## "ETERNAL TORMENTS."

BY ROBERT ROBERTS,

(OF BIRMINGHAM).

BEING A REPLY TO THREE LETTERS,

WRITTEN BY

THE REV. J. ANGUS, D.D.

(President of the Baptist College, London), and published in the "*Christian World*," to prove the doctrine of Eternal Torments.

DR. ANGUS'S LETTERS CAN BE OBTAINED IN PAMPHLET FORM, PRICE SIXPENCE, FROM JAMES CLARK AND CO., 13, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

London:

GEORGE JOHN STEVENSON, 54, PATERNOSTER ROW.

NICHOLS, SON, & Co., 11, LONG ACRE.

BIRMINGHAM: R. ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

1871.

# EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

NOT "ETERNAL TORMENTS."

IN three letters which appeared in the *Christian World* some months ago, the Rev. J. Angus, D.D., President of the Baptist College, London, has come forward in defence of the popular doctrine of eternal torments. The reputation and acknowledged ability of the writer, and the fact that he was writing in opposition to the "annihilationist" theory of the Rev. E. White, afford a guarantee that he has said the best that can be said in support of that doctrine; and invest the examination of his arguments with interest and importance. The argument is clearly and dispassionately put, and marshalled in a style admitting of easy analysis. That his argument is a failure, we propose to show beyond a doubt, notwithstanding an appearance of force which passes for demonstration with those who sympathise with the doctrine, and who have not given it a critical consideration. To do this, it will be necessary, at the risk of tediousness and occasional apparent repetition, to follow him, sentence by sentence, examining each argument at its inception, and strictly scrutinising every passage of Scripture he brings forward in support of his positions. The great importance of the subject, and the certainty that Dr. Angus has done the best that can be done on his side of the controversy, make the effort worth all the pains that can be bestowed upon it. If Dr. Angus have the truth on his side, the position of those who oppose him is lamentable indeed. On the other hand, if he but reflect the mistakes of a past in which a confessedly perverted theology has changed the form and colour of the Christian religion, his attempt to establish the doctrine of eternal torments is hurtful beyond the power of language to exaggerate. If Dr. Angus has failed to make out his case, it may be safely assumed that no one else can hope to succeed. Hence the

interest attaching to the task, which we will now proceed to fulfil.

The assaults now a-days made against the doctrine, he dismisses with the trite remark that there is "nothing new under the sun." This is intended to cast a shade of insignificance to begin with, over a controversy which is certainly troublesome to the leaders of popular religious opinion, and which is making a deep mark on the religious thought of the times. It has really the opposite effect. If a denial of natural immortality, and the consequent denial of eternal torments, were a thing of the present century merely, there would be ground for suspecting it, so far as absolute novelty justifies suspicion in such a matter. But Dr. Angus himself admits that the controversy "dates as far back as the second century." There must be some reason for a controversy which has kept alive so long. If the doctrine of eternal torments were as expressly taught in the Scriptures as in modern sermons, there would be no room for the argument that seeks to get rid of it; or if artificially raised, it would soon die. The fact, therefore, that the current hostility to the popular doctrine on scriptural grounds, is not "a new thing under the sun," is evidence that there is something in it deserving serious consideration, instead of justifying the summary and unconcerned dismissal that Dr. Angus's words suggest.

A much more useful lesson from the antiquity of the "annihilationist" is that deduced in the following words: "Specially instructive will it be, if it teach us to think less of great names on either side, and send us away to study God's word with renewed humility and prayer." The question is only to be settled by a close adherence to the Scriptures—an adherence which, however, to be of any use, must be founded on that process of treatment indicated in the

words of Paul, as "rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Timothy ii. 15); or to put it into modern phrase, a logical treatment of Bible statements. Dr. Angus does not exemplify this valuable process, but adopts the style of argument which is known as "reasoning in a circle." He defines a pre-conceived sense to terms, and then quotes the terms to prove the sense, which leaves the matter exactly where it was. So much the worse, it may be said, for Dr. Angus. True; but the results may be unfavourable to truth. There is, in such an argument an appearance of force which is very telling with a certain class of minds. Although in reality it proves nothing, to the uncritical reader it proves the writer's case entirely, and imposes on those who write on the other side of the question, a task so much the more onerous. The fallacy, however, is real, and therefore capable of demonstration.

Dr. Angus opens his argument by remarking that "the doctrine itself is highly reasonable." Understanding by "the doctrine itself," the doctrine of eternal torments, as opposed to those who hold that death is the punishment of sin, the assertion is a very equivocal one indeed. That the aberration of a weak nature in a mortal state, surrounded with evil, should be visited with exquisite and immortal anguish, seems "highly unreasonable." If "reason" were to adjudicate on the point, it would prescribe a very different retribution for the transgressions of finite mortals, than endless and objectless and excruciating suffering. If by "the doctrine itself" Dr. Angus means the doctrine of retribution in the abstract, without reference to the nature or duration of it, the remark might pass unchallenged; but this bearing of his observation is not apparent, and it is therefore open to the remark we have made.

That he means the doctrine of eternal torments, is evident from the remarks he proceeds to make to sustain his assertion. "The existence of the soul after death," he says, "*which future punishment pre-supposes*, is found among nearly all nations." The words in italics mark the first flaw in his argument. They constitute a mistaken premiss which deprives his conclusion of all force. It is a mere assumption that there can be no "future punishment" without disembodied existence so-called. It is opposed to the fact which Jesus declares, that "they that have done evil shall come forth to the resurrection of condemnation."—(John v. 29).

Here is future punishment without the recognition of disembodied existence. It is a future punishment connected with resurrection of "the body," which excludes the notion of disembodied existence as necessary to future punishment, and logically excludes the notion of disembodied existence at all; for if "future punishment" is endured by "the soul after death," how can it be said that the wicked dead "come forth" to it at the resurrection? If Jesus teaches future punishment to be connected with resurrection, obviously "future punishment" need not "pre-suppose the existence of the soul after death." Sufficient that it "pre-supposes" the renewed existence of the wicked by resurrection at some future time, which is what the opponents of eternal torments contend for. They believe in future punishment as much as Dr. Angus, and it is a little unfair that he should represent them in the light of denying it, in denying "the existence of the soul after death." It is an injustice to them to lay it down as a maxim that the doctrine of future punishment cannot be held unless the classical doctrine of the immortality of the soul is received. The New Testament doctrine of future punishment is the great thing to be known. The doctrine of the Pagans on the subject of future punishment is no more likely to be true than their doctrine of God. The doctrine of the New Testament, whatever it may be, is the true one. This doctrine is not a doctrine of "the existence of the soul after death," of which it says, nothing—eminent divines being themselves the witnesses. The opponents of eternal torments believe the testimony that "there shall be a resurrection of the just and unjust (Acts xxiv. 15); that the unjust shall be condemned in the judgment (Ps i. 5; Matt. xxv. 41); that their condemnation will end in their destruction.—(Phil. iii. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 12.) In all of which there is no pre-supposition of the sort involved in Dr. Angus's doctrine. His doctrine of future punishment "pre-supposes" the existence of the soul after death." He does not prove this vital antecedent to his theory. He takes it for granted. Hence if his unproved basis is wrong, the superstructure he rears is certain to fall.

He assumes the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Why should he? Is it because the doctrine is so clearly taught in the Scriptures as to make it superfluous for him to prove it? On the contrary, Dr. Angus knows it is never mentioned, and will probably agree with an orthodox

writer, who declares, "The immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible."—(Bishop Tillotson's Sermons, vol. ii. 1774.) The teaching of God's word upon the question of the human constitution, is in direct antagonism to the theory promulgated by the Greek philosophers, and endorsed by the majority of moderns. It represents man as an organic unity, subsisting in three elements, "body, soul, and spirit"—a description applicable to every living creature. This organic unity is liable to disruption, upon which death, or the cessation of the creature, occurs. The elements of his being have no individual existence when disunited. The body breaks up, the life evaporates, and the mental phenomena developed in the body by the life, are suspended. The notion that the spirit separately or the soul separately, is the individual man, is a speculation of philosophy. It is no part of scriptural teaching.

Moses defines man to be "a living soul"—*nephesh chayiah*.—(Gen. ii. 7.) This term, generally supposed to sanction the current notion of an immortal soul, is applied to the inferior creatures—(Gen. i. 3), and therefore either proves too much or nothing for the popular view, in either of which case it is fatal. In point of fact, *nephesh chayiah* imports the idea of life by breathing. It has nothing to do with the notion of durability, long or short. It defines the nature of the creature while it exists: it discloses nothing as to the length of time it may exist. It tells us that the creature so designated lives by the act of respiring the vital air: on the question of how long, it is silent.

Man is declared to be a creature formed from the ground (Gen. ii. 7); "of the earth, earthy;" (1 Cor. xv. 47) living by the spirit which animates the beasts of the field; (compare Gen. ii. 7, with Gen. vii. 15; Eccle. iii. 19.) His being "a living soul," therefore, involves no more than to be a living creature formed out of the ground. The correctness of this view is shown by the use Paul makes of the statement of Moses "that man became a living soul." He quotes the statement (1 Cor. xv. 45) to prove that there is such a thing as a NATURAL BODY. Ergo, in Paul's judgment, "living soul" and "natural body" are synonymous. A secondary use of the term "soul" as applied to the mental faculties appertaining to the creature formed from the ground, does not upset the fundamental fact. The greater must rule the less. A

creature that lives by breathing cannot possess an immortal life which is independent of breathing. None of the secondary uses of "soul" favours the popular view. The term "immortal" never occurs in connection with any of them. The "soul" of the Bible is never affirmed to be deathless or ever-living. On the contrary, it is represented as capable of being given over to death (Ps. lxxviii. 59); of being poured out unto death (Isaiah liii. 12); of drawing near to the grave (Ps. lxxxviii. 3); of being delivered from the power of the grave.—(Ps. xlix. 15.) Immortality as a present attribute is affirmed of God only (1 Tim. vi. 15), who is termed "the King Immortal."—(1 Tim. i. 17.) In relation to mankind, immortality is spoken of as a thing to be "sought for" (Rom. ii. 8): as a thing brought to light through the gospel (2 Tim. i. 10), as a thing to be "put on" at the resurrection.—(1 Cor. xv. 53.) Apart from this change, which is in store for the righteous only (Phil. iii. 21; Gal. vi. 8), mankind are declared to be "like grass which groweth up in the morning, and in the evening withereth away;" (Ps. xc. 5) "like to vanity, and his days, as a shadow that passeth away (Ps. cxliv. 4); in his best estate, altogether vanity (Ps. xxxix. 5); dust and ashes (Gen. xviii. 27); less than nothing.—(Isaiah xl. 17.)

If Dr. Angus relies on philosophy, he has to be reminded that philosophy of the modern type, which discards theories and searches into facts, refuses to lend its countenance to the Platonic doctrines of human immortality, and declares through Professors Tyndal and Huxley that for aught science can discover, man is constitutionally of kin with the meanest reptile, and essentially related to the physical forces which govern the planet—a view which exactly represents the teaching of Scripture, though those gentlemen are probably unaware of it. Dr. Angus, therefore, did unwisely in assuming, instead of proving, the doctrine of natural and inherent immortality. The doctrine is so apparently opposed (to say the least) to Scripture and nature, that he ought to have taken special pains to clear his ground on this point before starting; for this is the foundation. If man is immortal and disembodied, future punishment is "eternal torments." Prove the one, and the other follows. Dr. Angus, however, has not proved either. He contents himself with knowing that "the doctrine is found among nearly all nations." The prevalent belief in future retribution only proves that in the

infancy of mankind, there was a doctrine of future retribution of some sort. It does not prove that the modern form of that doctrine is the true one, any more than their idolatrous superstition indicates the nature of the worship observed in Noah's family. Paul expressly teaches that all the nations in his day were in darkness on these subjects. He called these times "times of ignorance."—(Acts xvii. 30) He said they were "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that was in them" (Eph. iv. 18), and that "the wisdom of the world was foolishness with God."—(1 Cor. iii. 19.) The concurrence of barbarism is, therefore, rather a wonderful argument to use in support of a doctrine. One would imagine that such a concurrence is rather a damaging kind of support. From a scriptural point of view, it tells in the opposite direction from that in which Dr. Angus uses it.

Dr. Angus, failing to deal with the argument at its really vital point, his endeavour throughout is an inevitable failure. He leaves his flank unprotected, and admits of his whole position being turned; for suppose it be proved that man is not immortal, but mortal—that death makes away with him for the time being as entirely as it does a beast (which the Scriptures declare—Ps. xlix. 14, 20; Ecc. iii. 19), then the doctrine of future punishment is placed on an entirely different footing. It leaves the door open for it to be shown that Paul's statement is true—that "the wages of sin is DEATH."

"What all men feel to be reasonable," continues Dr. Angus; "what good men trust is just \*the New Testament reveals as true." Understanding this to apply to future retribution in the abstract, without involving the popular notion of eternal torments, no reasonable man will demur to it; but if it is intended to refer to that notion, it can only be properly dealt with by a prompt and emphatic denial. It is a pity Dr. Angus did not make his meaning more apparent. He talks of "future punishment;" he cordially dislikes to use the phrase "eternal torments." Why should he if it is that he means? "Future punishment" is by no means the synonym of "everlasting misery." It expresses the punishment which is future, whatever that may be. It defines nothing. Yet Dr. Angus employs it in a definitive sense; which is a pity; it entangles the controversy with doubtful terms. This is, doubtless, a protection to Dr. Angus from any consequence that may befall the

doctrine of "eternal torments" pure and simple; and excellent, diplomatically considered, but it is scarcely the course of a man seeking to grapple with the naked issues of truth.

It is clear, on the whole, that by "future punishment," Dr. Angus means eternal torments—understanding by that phrase, unending conscious misery in "hell." His expression that good men "trust" it is just, shows that it is this that is before his mind, for as 'trust' implies an appearance of things contrary to the direction of the trust, the "future punishment" he is discoursing must be that form of it which apparently seems unjust, which is just the case with "eternal torments."

His remark, then, that the New Testament reveals eternal torments to be true, is to be strenuously denied. The evidence he produces is no evidence at all, in the direction in which he applies it (a remark justified by an investigation of it, to which we shall proceed *seriatim*); while there is hostile evidence of a decisive character which he has passed unnoticed in the course of his argument. It is true, as he says, that Jesus speaks of "wrath to come," a state of being "accursed," and that its penalties are in proportion to wrong doing." There is also force in his remark, that "deny that the world is perishing, and the love which dies for it becomes unmeaning," but the force of the truth of these allusions tells against universalism only, and not against the position of those who believe that "there shall be a resurrection of the unjust."—(Acts xxiv. 15) who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of His power when He comes."—(2 Thess. i. 9). If Dr. Angus could prove that the "wrath to come" and the "accursed state" mean eternal torments, his citation of these things might avail him, but he cannot; he tries to do so, but the very attempt to do it is destructive of his position.

He enquires, "What do the Scriptures say of the nature of this punishment, and duration of it?" This most pertinent question he proceeds to answer by making quotations from the New Testament; but with what surprise must those have read these quotations who expected to find in them proof of the doctrine that Dr. Angus labours especially to prove, which analysed is as follows:—

- 1.—*The existence of the soul* (an immortal disembodied entity, presumed to reside in every human breast) *after death.*
- 2.—*Its departure, in the case of the*

wicked, to a state of torment.

3.—*That the torment will be as endless as God Himself.*

The whole of the thirteen proofs, except one which is non-specific, treat of punishment *at the resurrection*, when Christ comes; and the punishment is declared to be *the destruction of those who are the subjects of it.* As it is of the first importance to show this to be true, we will set forth the thirteen passages *seriatim.*

I.—Jno. v. 28, 29.—"All that are IN THE GRAVES shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, to the RESURRECTION OF LIFE, and they that have done evil, to the RESURRECTION OF DAMNATION." This teaches that the righteous do not enter into life, nor the wicked into condemnation, until they come out of the grave. Dr. Angus quotes it to prove that they enter into reward and punishment *when they die!*

II.—Mark xvi. ii.—"He that believeth not shall be *condemned.*" This does not inform us of the nature of the condemnation, and, therefore, proves nothing for Dr. Angus. Elsewhere—(Gal. vi. 8; Rom. vi. 23; viii. 13)—we are informed that it is corruption and death, which being the second time it is experienced by those who suffer it, is called "the SECOND DEATH."—(Rev. xx. 14.)

III.—Matt. xiii. 41, declares that "AT THE END OF THIS WORLD (Mosaic), the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." This depicts an event (of which more hereafter) to occur at the end of a dispensation. Dr. Angus quotes it to prove what happens to the wicked *when they die!*

IV.—Matt. xxv. 46, informs us, that WHEN THE SON OF MAN SHALL COME IN HIS GLORY (y. 31), "these,"—a certain class—shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into "life eternal." Dr. Angus quotes this to prove *the existence and punishment of the soul after death!*

V.—Luke xii. 47, says, that WHEN THE LORD COMETH, the servant who knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, shall be beaten with many stripes. Dr. Angus quotes this to prove, that the wicked soul will be beaten with everlasting torment *after death!*

VI.—Rom. ii. 12-16.—As many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law . . . IN THE DAY WHEN GOD

SHALL JUDGE THE SECRETS OF MAN BY CHRIST JESUS." Dr. Angus takes this to prove that wicked souls will be tormented for ever after death!

VII.—2 Thess. i. 8-9.—"WHEN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST SHALL BE REVEALED FROM HEAVEN with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of His power." Dr. Angus understands this to mean that the soul, *after death*, will be punished with eternal torment.

VIII.—Heb. x. 27.—"There remaineth (for the impenitent) a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall DEVOUR THE ADVERSARY." This does not say when the devouring indignation is to come forth, and therefore, does not help Dr. Angus. It speaks of it as a dispensational event in reserve,—a thing that "remains" to be looked for. Jude 13 informs us, judgment is to be executed *when the Lord comes.*

IX.—2 Pet. ii. 9.—He reserveth the unjust UNTO THE DAY OF JUDGMENT to be punished. Dr. Angus asks the reader to receive this as proof that the unjust are eternally punished *when they die.*

X.—2 Pet. iii. 7.—"The heavens and earth, which are *now* (in contrast to those which existed in the days of Noah, which, physically, were the same, but not socially and politically) are reserved unto THE DAY OF JUDGMENT AND PERDITION of ungodly men." Does this prove that the "soul" is eternally tormented after death? From Dr. Angus' quotation of it, it would seem as if he thought so.

XI.—Jude 13.—"THE LORD COMETH to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all that are ungodly of their ungodly deeds." Surely this does not prove that judgment is executed *when a man dies.*

XII.—Rev. xx. 13-15, informs us that WHEN THE SEA GIVES UP ITS DEAD, whosoever is not found written in the Lamb's book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire, WHICH SYMBOL IS, OR REPRESENTS, THE SECOND DEATH. Does the sea give up its dead when a wicked soul "leaves the body?" Does a "deathless soul" then *die* a SECOND time?

XIII.—Rev. xxi. 8, describes the class of people who are to be subjects of the lake of fire, which is the second death.

These are the thirteen passages which Dr. Angus cites, without note or comment, to prove "the nature of future punishment." His object is, of course, to prove the popular view of that question—that punishment consists of torment, torture, misery, suffering, pain, agony, "hell fire," feeding upon, but never consuming its wretched victims, though he is suspiciously chary of the ordinary terms by which that view is expressed. Do the passages answer the purpose for which he quotes them? Do they prove the doctrine of eternal torments? Dr. Angus has taken no pains to show that they do. He quotes them in the lump, apparently distrusting their effect in detail. His policy savours of good generalship, for when we come to consider the passages singly, all their apparent force in Dr. Angus' favour, vanishes, and their teaching is found to be the very reverse of that which they are quoted to illustrate. To show this, we shall examine them one by one in the order in which Dr. Angus has quoted them.

#### DR. ANGUS'S TEXTS IN PROOF OF ETERNAL TORMENTS, EXAMINED.

I.—"They that have done evil (shall come forth) to the resurrection of DAMNATION"—(Jno. v. 29). It is not to be supposed that a man of Dr. Angus' scholarly attainments quotes this passage for the sake of the word "damnation." That word, to illiterate minds schooled in current theology, doubtless conveys the notion of unending woe of the sort Dr. Angus defends; but Dr. Angus is aware that the original word is *krisis* (Gen. *krisos*), having the force of judgment or condemnation simply, without defining the nature or duration of either. The passage simply affirms, that at the resurrection, a certain class shall come forth to condemnation, without informing us what the condemnation is. Even if there were no light as to the nature of the condemnation, the time of its occurrence is sufficient to show it is not the "damnation" of Dr. Angus' theory. The condemnation of the passage is associated with resurrection, while Dr. Angus' system brings damnation upon the wicked as soon as death is supposed to have disengaged their immortal persons from "this mortal coil." The "condemnation" of the passage has to do with living men just emerged from the state of dead men, while the "damnation" of established theology has to do with dead men who have just passed out of

the state of living men. The one has to do with the "body"; the other with a supposed "immortal soul." These are damaging points of contrast. And when we come to enquire into the nature and effect of the condemnation, we see how purposeless is Dr. Angus' quotation of this passage. The wicked dead will come forth to judgment. Their life, and consciousness, and identity will be restored as completely as in the case of the righteous; but will they, like the righteous, live for ever? Will they be kept alive to suffer endless torture, or will they be destroyed, dying a second time in dishonour, after enduring merited retribution? Nothing is more explicit than the teaching of Scripture on this point. "They shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord and the glory of His power" (2 Thess. i. 9); "They shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch" (Mal. iv. 1); "They shall perish; they shall be as the fat of lambs: into smoke shall they consume away" (Ps. xxxvii. 20); "They shall pass away like a dream: yea, they shall be chased away like a vision of the night" (Job xx. 8); "As drought and heat consume snow waters, so doth the grave those who have sinned" (Job. xxiv. 19); Jesus says, "They shall be DESTROYED, BOTH SOUL AND BODY, in Gehenna" (Matt. x. 28); he further says, "the broad way leadeth to DESTRUCTION"—(Matt. vii. 13.) Paul, employing the same term concerning the wicked, says, "their END IS DESTRUCTION"—(Phil. iii. 19.) Adopting other terms, John compares the wicked to chaff, to be burned up with fire unquenchable (Matt. iii. 12); and Jesus, to useless salt, to be thrown out.—(Luke xiv. 35.) Paul says, they shall "reap corruption" (Gal. vi. 8); Peter says, "They shall utterly perish in their own corruption."—(2 Pet. ii. 12.) By a simpler set of terms, it is said, "they shall die" (Rom. viii. 13); "the end of these things is DEATH" (Rom. vi. 21); "the wages of sin is death."—(Ibid. vi. 23.) The wicked rise, are confronted by the Judge, condemned, and put to shame (Dan xii. 2; 1 Jno. ii. 28); they receive in body according to their deeds—(1 Cor. v. 10); having sown to the flesh, they reap corruption—(Gal. vi. 8) The process of corruption ends in death: hence they die again, and are thus said to be "hurt of the second death"—(Rev. ii. 11). They have their part in the symbolic fire-lake of the

Apocalypse, which is there explained to mean "the second death" (Rev. xx. 14), or death a second time. The resurrection of the righteous leads to very different results, even incorruptibility (1 Cor. xv. 53) and life everlasting. Hence, the phrase "resurrection of condemnation," used by Jesus, is naturally expressive of the end of the wicked, as revealed by Scripture, and affords no countenance to the idea of a disembodied (or embodied) state of torment everlasting.

II.—(Mark xvi. 16.) "He that believeth not shall be condemned." This passage is of like character with the last, and comes under the same explanations.

III.—(Matt. xiii. 41.) "All things that offend, and them that do iniquity, shall be cast into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." This appears, at first sight, somewhat in accordance with the popular view; but close inspection will reveal entire dissimilarity. In the first place, the words are explanatory of a parable in which tares (representative of "all things that offend, and them that do iniquity") are "bound up in bundles to be burnt."—(verse 30.) Now, the burning of tares is the destruction of them, and analogy would require a similar fate to the class represented by the tares. The occurrence of "weeping and gnashing of teeth," on their part, is not inconsistent with this, since these are the manifestations of disappointment and despair at finding themselves rejected, and condemned to the supreme retribution of the hour. These manifestations continue as long as the occasion that creates them. That occasion will not last for ever. Christ will not always be judging the wicked. He does this once for all when he appears. Fire will destroy the wicked, as it destroyed the Sodomites, who are set forth as an example of what it is, in scriptural language, to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire.—(Jude, verse 7.) The subjects of the fire will not outlast the action of the fire. The wicked are not incorruptible or fire-proof. They will be consumed (Psalm xxxvii. 20), burnt up, (Mal. iv. 2), devoured (Heb. x. 27.), destroyed with an "everlasting destruction" in the "flaming fire," which will attend the revelation of the Lord Jesus.—(2 Thess. i. 9.) The mind conceives a wise object in this consummation; for with the destruction of the wicked, wickedness disappears, and both God and man are delivered from its sore evils. But

the popular view presents the opposite picture, to the great perplexity of those who cannot see their way out of the mist and horror of great darkness. An eternal hell shows us evil permanently triumphant, in its most perfect form, with the sanction, and even the intention of the Creator (as some say), and belies the teaching of Scripture, which assigns to Jesus the work of destroying the devil and all his works.—(Heb. ii. 14; 1 John iii. 8), taking away all sin (John i. 29), all death, (1 Cor. xv. 26), and all curse.—(Rev. xxii. 3.)

IV.—(Matt. xxv. 46.) "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal." This is indefinite. "Punishment" may take a variety of forms. Its meaning here is subject to whatever clearer information we may get in other parts of Scripture. That information is abundant. Paul gives it in a condensed form in the following statement: "They shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION."—(2 Thess. i. 9.) From this, it is evident that "everlasting punishment" and "everlasting destruction" are equivalent terms. That this is no accidental concurrence of texts is evident, when we come to ask the broader question: what is the scripturally revealed punishment, penalty or wages of sin? This is categorically answered by Paul: "The wages of sin is DEATH."—(Rom. vi. 23.) "By one man sin entered into the world, and DEATH by sin; and so death hath passed upon all men.—(Rom. v. 12.) Now destruction is death, for to destroy a creature is to kill it; and as death is the wages of sin, it follows that it is the punishment of it, and that thus "everlasting punishment," "everlasting destruction," and "everlasting death," are interchangeable terms. "Everlasting destruction" (2 Thess. i. 9) is the punishment inflicted, and is, therefore, everlasting punishment. It is nothing to the point to say that death is no punishment. It is the punishment from which, above all others, men most shrink. Indeed, it is no uncommon thing for those who oppose the doctrine of destruction, to say they would rather live in hell for ever than be "annihilated."

V.—(Luke xii. 47.) "When the Lord cometh, the servant who knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, shall be beaten with many stripes." "Many stripes" is the language of parity, expressive of intensity in the degree of punishment to be awarded, but not

defining the form of it. The nature of the punishment is elsewhere made plain. It may be observed, in passing, that if it were "eternal torments," there could be no such thing as "many" or "few" stripes. There would be no scope for variation. Hell would damn all its inhabitants alike for ever. If it be retorted that there are no degrees in destruction, it is but needed to point to the judgment, at the coming of Christ, as involving conscious shame and suffering, and an interval between rejection and final disappearance in the second death. This interval may be made long or short, in individual cases, and the suffering more or less severe; so that the appropriateness of the figure of few or many stripes is entirely apparent.

VI.—(Rom. ii. 12-16.) "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men." This only affirms the judicial responsibility of those who sin against the light. It does not define the nature of the punishment awarded to them; still less does it teach the doctrine of eternal torments, which Dr. Angus has quoted it to prove.

VII.—(2 Thess. i. 8-9.) "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, &c." If "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord" mean eternal torments in hell, then does this text prove the "nature" of "future punishment" to be what Dr. Angus assumes it to be. But we have given many reasons for declining to fall in with this suggestion. Probably, none of these reasons would have been necessary if Dr. Angus had been unable to quote any other passage than this. The good sense of even Dr. Angus himself would have prevented him from supposing that Paul, in these words, meant to teach anything else than the destruction of the wicked. As to the fire, that, in this passage, has more to do with the mode of Christ's appearance than with the treatment of the wicked. Yet, if it could be shewn it had to do only with the wicked, there would still remain the question, how is it to be employed? in stewing the wicked in endless torture, or in destroying them? We have already dealt with this question in a sense unfavourable to Dr. Angus's ideas.

VIII.—(Heb. x. 27.) "If we sin wilfully, after we come to the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversary." "Judgment and fiery indignation" is not denied or called in question. What is denied is that "judgment and fiery indignation" will torture the "damned" for ever. The contention is, that it will "DEVOUR" the adversary and all found with them. The passage supports this contention, though Dr. Angus quotes it for the opposite purpose.

IX.—(Heb. x. 27.) "The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished." This, again, is a common ground of agreement between Dr. Angus and those in opposition to his views. The question is, will the unjust be tormented for ever? Dr. Angus quotes the passage to prove they will: but it proves nothing beyond the fact, that there will be a punishment for the unjust in the day of judgment. It does not say what the punishment will be. This we have to learn from other sources, which inform us it will be "death," "everlasting destruction."

X.—(2 Pet. iii. 7.) "The day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." There is a day of judgment and perdition to the ungodly. That day is to come. Will it be a day of eternal torture? Dr. Angus quotes this to prove it will. It proves the reverse, for the word perdition is in the original, *apoleia*, which means, destruction. It comes from the same root as *apollyon*, destroyer, and *apollumi*, to destroy. The day of judgment is to the wicked a day of destruction—a day to which they will sustain the relation of fuel to fire. "They shall be stubble, says Malachi—(iv. 1), "and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

XI.—(Jude ver. 13.) "The Lord cometh to execute judgment upon all." True, but this does not specify the nature or effect of the judgment, and, therefore, does not prove it to be hell torments. We have elsewhere seen that the judgment to be executed on the wicked will destroy them.

XII.—(Rev. xx. 13-15.) "Whosoever was not found written in the Lamb's book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." If this were to be understood literally, it might favour Dr. Angus's view, though even then it would be open to the opponents

of that view to suggest that the wicked cast into the lake of fire would not live in it, but be destroyed therein. But the statement is not literal. It occurs in the book of Revelation, and is as much a symbol as the candlesticks, the seven horns, the eight-headed beast, the glassy fire-mingled sea, &c. And it is a symbol which is accompanied in the same verse with the interpretation. "This is the second death," so called, because it brings death a second time on the bulk of those who become subject to it.

XIII.—(Rev. xxi. 8.) "All liars have their part in the lake of fire, which is the second death." This comes under the comment on the last verse. On what principle can the final judgment be described as a second death, consistently with Dr. Angus's theory, which recognises no "first"? The adjective numeral is entirely out of place in the light of a system which allows of no parallel between "perdition" and the event which "happens to all the living." But when we understand that death to be the wages of sin, which has come upon all men through Adam—(Rom. v. 12; Gen. iii. 19), it is easy to see that death to those raised from the dead is a second death.

On these thirteen passages, Dr. Angus relies for proof of the "nature" of the punishment of the wicked. He takes no pains to show, that the punishment described, is identical with the "damnation" which lights up Spurgeon's sermons with such glowing colours, and which Dr. Angus himself advocates, though in milder terms. He leaves and wishes the reader to assume that they are the same. He trusts to the combined effect of the thirteen texts, to produce this impression. He makes no attempt at demonstration. He does nothing to show that the "judgment," "perdition," "damnation," &c., of the passages means hell torments. There may be a reason for the omission of this important formality. There is a good reason. Whether it was Dr. Angus's reason is, of course, matter of opinion: and that is, that any attempt of the sort must inevitably have broken down. Like "cheap John's" wares, while they look well in a group and at a distance, they turn out to be something else when you come to inspect them in detail.

He does venture upon a summary of the things declared in the passages, but this is merely the same device in another form. Terms which have not been defined,

strung together in categorical array may be very weighty with those who assume a meaning to them; but they are utterly valueless as evidence, until their meaning is demonstrated, which is just what Dr. Angus has failed to do. Dr. Angus resembles the bishop who, to prove the episcopal practice of "confirmation," quoted all the texts where he could find the word "confirm," leaving his hearers to assume that the word in the text was used in the ecclesiastical sense he wished to establish. The bishop's evidence was gone, when it was shown that the word was used in its primitive sense. So is

#### DR. ANGUS'S CASE GONE.

when it is shown that the terms by which he endeavours to prove eternal torments, have no connection with the doctrine, beyond such as he creates to start with by begging the question,—a practice unworthy of a man enjoying the reputation of a great writer. A run through his category will show how empty are all its appearances of proof of eternal torments.

1.—*Condemnation.* Is this necessarily eternal torture? Is not a man "condemned" who is sentenced to be "hung?" and is not his sentence "condemnation?" And will not a sentence to second death be "condemnation?"

2.—*Judgment.* It will not be contended that this is eternal torments. As currently employed, it means (1) the faculty that weighs a matter, (2) the legal decision come to in a dispute, or (3) retribution. The nature of the retribution it does not define. Judgment fell on the cities of the plain and destroyed them (Luke xvii. 29); judgment overtook the Egyptians with a like effect (Ex. xv. 4-10); judgment came upon Korah and his fellow rebels, to their destruction.—(Ps. cvi. 16, 17.) This judgment of God in reference to sin is that "they who do such things are worthy of DEATH."—(Rom. i. 32.)

3.—*Complete condemnation.* Will it be contended that this means more than condemnation from which there is no escape? Who would dream, apart from tradition, that it meant everlasting torment?

3.—*Receiving fiery indignation.* With what result? "The devouring of the adversary" (Heb. x. 27), the destruction of the ungodly (2 Thess. i. 9), not their torture.

5.—*Shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* It is a curious

construction of this statement that makes it mean that the wicked, who shall not see life, shall live for ever in torment. The wrath of God "abiding" is, doubtless, the feature Dr. Angus quotes the passage for; but this does no more than merely intimate the continuance of divine displeasure toward the unbeliever, without defining the form it will take. We are all the children of wrath by nature.—(Eph. ii. 3.) By belief and obedience of the gospel, we enter a relation towards God in which this wrath ceases. By continuance in disobedience, the wrath "abideth." With what effect? With the effect revealed, or with the effect we may choose to imagine? The former, of course: and this is plain. "The wages of sin is death," and where "the wrath of God abideth" on an individual, it will end in his death" (Rom. vi. 21), consuming him to nothing (Psalm xc. 7; Jer. x. 24), sinking him in the destruction of the second death.—(Mal. iv. 1, 2; Rev. xxi. 8.)

6.—*Sent away into outer darkness.*—Is "outer darkness" a hell of lurid flames? Is it not a metaphorical expression, as Dr. Angus won't deny? and, being so, is it not a more appropriate figure of expulsion from the divine presence, ending in death, than banishment to unending existence in fire?

7.—*Cast alive into hell.* Dr. Angus commits an inaccuracy, or a small piece of uncandour, in representing this as a general statement of the destiny of the wicked. It is not even a correct quotation. The passage on which it is founded is as follows: "These both (the beast and false prophet) were cast alive into a lake of fire, burning with brimstone."—(Rev. xix. 20) From this it will be perceived that the statement is part of the symbolism of the Apocalypse, and as such, has a very different bearing from that which Dr. Angus gives it. The beast and false prophet are systems; the lake of fire, the divine judgments by which they perish, and in which the rejected of Christ's household are overwhelmed, even those terrible judgments which end in the second death.

8.—*Into everlasting fire.* In this detached form, the phrase seems to favour "hell," but its force diminishes when we remember that it is a peculiarity of Scripture to allege the perpetual continuance of an agent of destruction, as the equivalent for the destruction of the thing acted on. The following are illustrations of this peculiarity: "I will kindle a fire

in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."—(Jer. xvii. 27.) "I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree; the flaming flame shall not be quenched."—(Ezek. xxi. 47.) "My sword shall go forth out of his sheath against all flesh; it shall not return any more."—(Ezek. xxi. 5) "Mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place upon man and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn and shall not be quenched."—(Jer. vii. 20.) In all these cases the "unquenchable fire" went out at last, but not until the subjects of its action had perished, which shews the sense in which it was unquenchable. It was unquenchable in relation to its mission, and everlasting in relation to those upon whom it was sent; for it outlasted them and triumphed over them in their destruction. That this is the sense of the New Testament phrase *aionian*, (translated "everlasting and "eternal")—fire, is conclusively shewn by Jude's application of it to the fiery overthrow of Sodom, which he represents as "suffering the vengeance of eternal (*aionian*) fire."—(verse 7.) On the same principle, the "worm that dieth not" is metaphorical of corruption getting the upper hand, and expressive of death. If the worm died, decay would be arrested; but *their* immortality in relation to the victim of their operations ensures destruction. The undying worm and the unquenchable fire have relation to consuming carcasses, after the example with which the Jews were familiar in the valley of Gehenna, where the bodies of criminals were deposited among vermin-infested filth, amongst which fires were kept up to prevent pestilence. This is no mere assertion, for the words of Isaiah, quoted by Jesus, are: "And they shall go forth and look upon the CARCASSES of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."—(Isaiah lxvi. 24.)

9.—*Tormented day and night, for ever and ever.* This, occurring in a symbolical book, in reference to a symbolical object, is a symbolical expression. Dr. Angus quotes it without care or without candour, as if it were used literally. The symbolical book is the Apocalypse, in which only the expression is to be found: the symbolical object is the devil—(Rev. xx.

10); not the devil of popular belief, but a great red dragon, with seven heads and ten horns—(Rev. xx. 2; xii. 9), which is explained to represent a political constitution of things on earth—(Rev. xvii. 9-13). The expression "torment" denotes the judicial process of examination applied by Roman law to prisoners, as in the case of Paul—(Acts xxii. 29), where the word is translated "examined." The symbolical use of this process, in relation to systems, would import the triumph of divine law over them. "Day and night, for ever and ever," represents the perpetualness of the triumph, so that the systems shall no more arise on earth to deceive the inhabitants. There is an end of all mischief when this consummation is reached. "No more curse" is the climax. But Dr. Angus uses the symbolic expression in question with the effect of establishing just the opposite conclusion, namely, that there shall be no end to curse. There is a little recklessness in his literal employment of symbolic statements, because of their superficial resemblance to the foregone conclusion he labours to establish. The popular doctrine of eternal torments can only be supported by this style of argument; Dr. Angus has, therefore, to resort to it, or give up his case.

10.—*Sent away into everlasting chastisement—into everlasting righteous punishment.* In this, the original word is repeated in two English forms. When the nature of the punishment is settled, the everlastingness is an easy matter. This we have seen to be death. "Everlasting death" is intelligible from every point of view. Dr. Angus has not proved that "the wages of sin is torture," therefore, the everlastingness does not help his argument.

11.—*Sent away into everlasting destruction.* This surely does not prove everlasting existence in torture: the very opposite.

Thus, the array of scripturally-borrowed phrases, somewhat artfully strung together, which were to demonstrate the "nature" of future punishment, in harmony with Dr. Angus's theology, and which looked wonderfully formidable to minds not acquainted with the bearings of the subject, melts, as wonderfully away when subjected to the process of examination in detail. Let us look at

#### THE ETERNAL TORMENT PHRASES TRANSFORMED

by this process, and estimate anew their

weight as evidence of the popular theory of hell torments. To exhibit them effectually in their new light, let us paraphrase them with reference to their meanings, and imagine Dr. Angus rehearsing them thus in support of his argument: "The wicked are described (1) as having sentence passed upon them, as (2) suffering retribution, (3) retribution from which there is no escape, as (4) being devoured with the adversary; as (5) being excluded from life, having continued in that state in which the divine displeasure has not been averted; as (6) being exiled from the divine presence to suffer death. Then, (7) the systems represented by the symbolic beast and false prophet are to perish under the destructive and visible operation of divine judgment. Further, (8) the wicked are to be devoured by fire, which they cannot extinguish, and eaten up of worms, which they cannot kill. Then, (9) the eight-headed dragon system is to be finally and for ever crushed. Finally, (10) the wicked are to suffer everlasting death, being consigned at the judgment to everlasting destruction."

Dr. Angus could not hope to produce much effect in favour of eternal torments by marshalling the evidence in this form, and yet this is what it amounts to when defined with reference to the demonstrable meanings of the passages he has quoted. Instead of proving the "nature" of future punishment to be torture, he proves it to be what the opponents of his view contend for, viz., death—second death—differing from the first death in that it is violently and publicly inflicted at the hands of divine retribution in the day of account, and involving the restoration of life by resurrection, and appearance at the bar of divine judgment prior to its occurrence.

Failing to prove the "nature" of future punishment, his demonstration on the point of "duration" is, of course, futile. If death and destruction are the fate of the wicked, terms signifying endlessness in the duration of that fate (assuming for a moment that endlessness is the sense of the terms), would but teach the irretrievableness of the doom overtaking them. They would exclude the universalistic theory, but would not establish that of the tormentist.

#### IS DEATH THE DESTINY OF THE WICKED?

This question is decisively answered in the very passages Dr. Angus has quoted to prove eternal torments; but as it is the turning point of the controversy, we make

no apology for taking extra pains with it. It is a fact then, that so far as terms go, no declaration of the Scriptures is more frequent or emphatic than that which affirms the answer in question, viz, "The wages of sin is death." Thus:

"By one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin."—(Rom. v. 12.)

"The end of these things is death."—(Rom. vi. 19.)

"They that do such things are worthy of death."—(Rom. i. 27.)

"By man came death."—(1 Cor. xv. 18.)

"If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die."—(Rom. viii. 13.)

"To be carnally minded is death."—(Ibid 7.)

"Because thou hast done this . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—(Gen. iii. 19.)

"Man dieth, and wasteth away."—(Job. xiv. 10.)

"Drought and heat consume the snow waters, so doeth the grave those which have sinned."—(Job. xxiv. 19-20.)

"The triumphing of the wicked is short . . . his bones are full of the sin of his youth, which shall lie down with him in the dust."—(Job. xx. 5-11.)

"Shall MORTAL MAN be more just than God?"—(Job. iv. 17.)

"In Adam, all DIE."—(1 Cor. xv. 22.)

"What man is he that liveth, and shall not see DEATH?"—(Ps. lxxxix. 48.)

"In the son of man there is no help, his breath goeth forth: he returneth to his earth."—(Ps. cxlvi. 4.)

"He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption."—(Gal. vi. 8.)

"If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."—(Jno. viii. 24.)

"The soul that sinneth, it shall DIE."—(Ezek. xviii. 4.)

"All the sinners of my people shall DIE by the sword."—(Amos ix. 10.)

"The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead."—(Prov. xxi. 16.)

"The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it."—(Prov. ii. 22.)

"Thou, O God, shalt bring them down into the pit of destruction."—(Ps. lv. 23.)

"Like sheep, they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them."—(Ps. xlix. 14.)

"Evil doers shall be cut off: yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be."—(Ps. xxxvii. 9-10.)

"The worm shall feed sweetly on him, he shall be no more remembered."—(Job. xxiv. 20.)

"He that overcometh shall not be hurt of THE SECOND DEATH."—(Rev. ii. 11.)

These twenty-five texts are evidence in proof of the assertion that the scripturally-

revealed destiny of the wicked is death. Dr. Angus would, of course, assert that he believes the texts as much as those who use them against him, but disputes the meaning attached to them. It thus comes to be a question of the meaning of "death." What are we to understand by this, the leading term in all Bible declarations of the consequence of sin? This is a most important question; upon it hangs the whole scheme of religion. There can be no true understanding of revelation unless we understand the terms in which it is expressed.

### WHAT IS DEATH?

What then, we repeat, is meant by the Bible term "death?" We shall look first at Dr. Angus's answer, which seems to be contained in the following definition of the position of the wicked: "They are (1) dead in law—already sentenced, (Dr. Angus does not say to what) as is a condemned malefactor; (2) dead to holy feeling, as the blind man is dead to the beauty of colours, and a deaf man to the harmonies of music; (3) dead to practical holiness, as a man whose motive muscles are paralysed, is dead to activity; (4) dead to happiness, even though they may be living in pleasure." Dr. Angus makes no attempt to demonstrate this ingenious definition, which ignores the primitive sense of the word defined, and deals only with secondary applications. We dispense at once with those parts of the definition marked 2, 3, by reminding the reader that the death of the Scriptures is the END of the sinful conditions depicted, and, therefore, cannot be those conditions themselves. "The END of these things is death."—(Rom. vi. 19.) "THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH."—(26.) It follows there is a death which is not "deadness to holy feeling, practical holiness, or to happiness," for it is the result of those states.

In the sentence marked "1," Dr. Angus comes a little nearer the mark: "Dead in law as is a condemned malefactor" This is a clue which will lead us away from Dr. Angus's conclusions. Why is a condemned malefactor considered dead in the eye of the law? Is it because he is dead, or because he is about to die? The latter, of course. There is no actual death at the moment the language is used. Death impends, and is so certain of occurrence, that it casts its shadow, as it were, over the few remaining days of life.

Though actually alive, the malefactor is described as a "dead man," because the law has handed him over to death. The language has its basis entirely in a death that is to be.

The application of this style of language to mankind under sentence of death is perfectly scriptural. "Let the dead bury their dead."—(Luke ix. 60.) "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."—(Col. iii. 3.) But the question remains to be settled: what death is it, their relation to which leads to their being described as already dead? This touches the marrow of the subject; but here there is nothing to reply to so far as Dr. Angus's argument goes. He has not attempted a definition, far less a demonstration of this point. He contents himself with the obscure assertion that "eternal death (if the phrase may be allowed), is the consummation of the sinner's present condition." In this, however, he admits us to his notion of the final death to which the wicked stand related, viz., an evil condition of being. Herein, we have his theory narrowed to a point, and the issue made quite naked between him and his opponents, who maintain that death is the wages of sin. Dr. Angus denies the occurrence of actual death. He asserts a human being to be incapable of death. He maintains he is constitutionally immortal, and that, therefore, divine retribution, in relation to him can only take the form of endless suffering. Here, then, is the question: "Is there, or is there not, such a thing as real death to living man, who, having had a beginning, CAN (at least) have an end?"

### CAN A MAN DIE?

This is the real question. Dr. Angus's system meets it with a direct negative. It asserts the impossibility of a human being passing out of existence. It admits, as it is bound to, that human beings come into existence every day, but denies that any cease to be. It recognizes birth as the beginning, but refuses to accept death as the end. In vain is reason called for the position, so far as Dr. Angus's articles are concerned. A tenacious assumption is all that is put forward—an assumption based on ancient philosophy and theological tradition. Seekers for truth must, therefore, deal with the question on its own merits, in doing which they must, perforce, ask very simple questions, thus: *As there is such a thing as the coming*

*into existence of conscious, intelligent creatures, that had no existence before, is there no such thing as the passing of those creatures out of life into the non-existent state from which they primarily emerged?* The possibility of such a thing is admitted in relation to the animals; is it impossible in relation to man? As a question of philosophy, nothing certain can be arrived at, since the verdict of philosophy is conflicting. Philosophers of the Pagan school of ancient days (whose wisdom Paul pronounces to be foolishness—1 Cor. iii. 19) held that man was spiritual and immortal, and that death was merely his separation from the house of clay now inhabited. Some modern philosophers are of the same way of thinking; but a larger and increasing class of modern thinkers declare that there is nothing in the range of scientific observation to warrant the idea that man is more than a higher form of the vital forces at work in creation generally, and as transient as any—a conclusion that has this much in its favour, that we see man come forth, grow, die, and disappear as entirely as any animal. And nothing against this conclusion can be rested on man's superior faculties; for if God can endow the brain substance of an elephant with an intelligence so vastly beyond that possessed by the mollusc, He can equally endow the brain substance of the human creature with faculties transcending those of the elephant, without necessitating the immortality of the creature so endowed. If we doubt this, we limit His power, lay down the law for Him, and shut our eyes to the fact that, in spite of all theory, He has endowed earth-borns with intelligence and moral capacity, after the type of the Creator Himself.

The variances of philosophy make the teaching of the Scriptures of so much the more consequence, not that anything can add to the weight of revelation. Abstractly, the teaching of the Bible is conclusive on any subject with which it deals, because it is the voice of authority, but the value of that voice becomes more apparent when the highest forms of human reason arrive at conflicting conclusions upon scientific grounds, on matters concerning its province.

The question, then, is, do the Scriptures teach or recognize the possibility of actual death in relation to the being of man? To this question we might be content with recording a simple affirmative, on the strength of the twenty-five texts quoted on



the last page but one.\* But as Dr. Angus would refuse to accept the terms in those texts ("death" and "dying") as the equivalent of the death now contended for, we must relinquish so easy a way of settling the controversy; and, accepting a more roundabout way and a more laborious method, seek to compel, by process of argument, Dr. Angus and all others, to embrace the conclusion in question.

To start with, it will not be denied that there is a something in those passages styled "death," which is the consequence of sin. ("By man came death."—1 Cor. xv. 21. "The wages of sin is death."—Rom. vi. 23. "The end of these things is death."—Rom. vi. 19.) Neither will it be asserted that this death is sin, because it is the punishment of sin; nor that it is the "eternal woe" of popular religion, because it has "passed upon all men" (Rom. v. 12), righteous and wicked alike, and because Paul, who in the metonymical sense of Dr. Angus's first definition, had "passed from death unto life," said he had *the sentence of death in himself*, that he should not trust in himself, but in God who raiseth the dead. —(2 Cor. i. 9.) Is there no means of discovering what this death is?

Paul gives us the clue in 1 Cor. xv. 21-22, and Rom. v. throughout. He says death came by Adam's disobedience, and that with the being derived from him, we inherit the sentence passed upon him. The sentence is as follows: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Now, looking at this sentence, we see at a glance that it deals with the question of being—that as a sentence of death, it proposes the taking away of life, as the very first principle of language would require us to understand. The term "death" takes its natural position, and relieves the subject from the load of difficulty with which traditional theology has burdened it.

In antithesis to the sentence of death above quoted, Paul places the resurrection, thus: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."—(1 Cor. xv. 21.) This is logical. If death be the withdrawal of the life God has given, and the dissolution of our individual selves in the grave, restoration of life must be connected with resurrection, and can only be effected in that way.

The statement of one as the remedy of the other is appropriate. But if death be a depraved state of the soul, summarised in ultimate banishment to everlasting misery, the mention of the resurrection as a remedy is not natural, because, in the first place, it would not be a remedy—and because, as a matter of fact, it proves no remedy to sinners (according to the system, since they rise (or rather go into their bodies) to suffer a continuation of already-begun eternal torments; while as for the righteous, it is not needed as a remedy, and is no remedy, since they can and do (according to the system) go to glory when they die, without waiting for the resurrection at all.

The antithesis of Paul's words is also observable in Christ's discourse on the same subject: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."—(John xi. 25.) Again: "This is the Father's will, that of all that He hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day."—(John vi. 39.) Here death and resurrection—being lost and being raised—are put opposite one another, which is all very easy to understand when the teaching of Gen. iii. 19, is accepted—that death dissolves a man in the dust as completely as creation brought him from it at the first; but which is simply bewildering, if we suppose that a man's destiny (heaven or hell) is settled and endured without any reference to the resurrection whatever.

That which prevents the conclusiveness of such statements being perceived, is the established notion of a separable thinking immortal soul in mortal man. If this notion did not exist, there would be no room for the reservation by which the force of the testimonies in question is evaded. Unfortunately, it does exist, and with the result of upsetting the fundamental principle of the divine government, as revealed in the Scriptures, which is, that "the wages of sin is death." It does this by abolishing the possibility of death, and transforming death into a mere change of habitation—a death that is no death, but merely the liberation of the conscious person from the bondage of material relations, for enlarged existence in more perfect or more evil spheres. It thus changes death into life, and dying into the act of entering into life. This perversion appears the more pernicious as it is

investigated. It destroys the foundation of truth as affecting human destiny. The death which was passed upon Adam, and which through him has "passed upon all men,"—that death, viz: which Paul declares to be the wages of sin—is spoken of lightly as "the death of the body," as though it were an insignificant matter, which indeed it is, if there is a heaven and hell for those who are dead: the act of leaving the body, in such a case, is of no judicial character whatever, since it is the lot of the righteous equally with the wicked, and a punishment to neither, but mere introduction to the state that contains reward or punishment. But what, in that case, is the meaning of the New Testament declaration that this "returning to dust" has come as the wages of sin? Popular theology destroys the character of this returning to dust as the wages of sin, for it represents the redeemed as escaping the wages of sin in ascending to glory after death, while they return to dust as entirely as the wicked. Popular theology requires that hell torments should be put forward as the wages of sin. How then are we to deal with the fact, that in the sentence passed upon Adam, defining the wages of sin, no allusion is made to hell torments at all, or to any consequence beyond deprivation of being in dissolution? If Dr. Angus's theory is the truth, then all reference to the real calamity of sin is left out, in the sentence declaring the calamity, and prominence is given to the (in that case) insignificant incident of the body crumbling into dust.

Another element of confusion, little suspected and rarely confronted by the orthodox believer, comes out of the popular theory. It is testified that Christ suffered "the just for the unjust." He "laid down his life" for them. (Jno. x. 15.) He gave his life a ransom. He suffered the condemnation of sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), but the theological "condemnation of sin" Christ has not suffered, and the world must buy unredeemed, for Christ did not die what is known in theology as "eternal death," but merely what is, by the same system, spoken of as "the death of the body." But Christ did accomplish his mission. The confusion is created by false doctrine only. Christ did take away sin by suffering its condemnation, in a representative capacity. As in doing this, he merely suffered "death of the body," so-called, it follows that that very "death of the body" is the condemnation of sin—a death, which

is as really the death of the individual as his birth is the beginning of his life.

The marrow of the controversy lies here: "Is man an immortal being, or is he subject to death? Alive, can he die? Having come into existence, can he go out of it?" In the abstract, it will be admitted that anything created can be destroyed. God can unmake anything He has made. The simple question, therefore, is: "In the ordinances of the Almighty, is death His appointment in relation to man whom He has created, or has He willed that he shall always live, whatever his moral attitude to his Creator? Is death or torture the wages of sin? In another form, is the doctrine of the immortality of the soul true? In another form still:

#### WHAT IS MAN?

These questions are so important as to warrant attention, at the risk of repetition. They cannot be probed too deeply. If Dr. Angus had attempted the demonstration of the immortality of the soul from the Bible, the endeavour would have been more worthy of his ability, and his argument of more value to the reader. He has not done this: perhaps he knew it was difficult; perhaps, impossible. It is now commonly admitted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the Bible, even by those who continue to believe the doctrine to be true. It is a fact that the phrase is not to be met with in the Scriptures; and it is equally undeniable that man is nowhere spoken of as immortal or never-dying. Immortality is alleged to be the exclusive attribute of Deity, at present.—(1 Tim. vi. 15.) It is spoken of as a thing which, by man, has to be sought for (Rom. ii. 7), as a something to be "put on" at the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 53): all of which is incompatible with the notion that man is now naturally immortal.

The term "soul" occurs frequently enough in the Bible, but is never used in the popular sense. It is employed to express the idea of being, person, life, mind, appetite, sensation, &c., without reference to duration. (Illustrations: Job xii. 10; Isaiah xxix. 8; Prov. vi. 30; Lev. xvii. 10-12; Lev. xxii. 11; Josh. xi. 11; x. 32; Jer. iv. 10; Job. vii. 15; Ezek. xviii. 4; Matt. xvi. 25, 26.) It is applied equally to man and beast.—(Num. xxxi. 28; Rev. xvi. 3.) All the qualities which the word, as applied to

\* See page 14.

man, is used to express, are treated as qualities of THE MAN, and not of an abstraction within him. Whatever law of existence, therefore, man may stand related to, in the matter of life and death, will govern all the qualities appertaining to him. If he live, they live; if he die, they die. No one yet, in any other case, heard of the qualities of a thing surviving the thing itself, and the suggestion of such an idea would bring ridicule.

The Bible account of man's appearance on the scene is worthy of supreme attention, as furnishing the key to the Almighty's dealings with him. Did He make him an immortal being, and put him in a body according to established notions? The narrative bears this no countenance, but relates a circumstance which, so far as results are concerned, is within the comprehension of a child: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—(Gen. ii. 7.) The materials obtained from the dust are here represented as furnishing the basis of the creature made. This fact is indeed reflected in the name bestowed upon the creature man—*adam*—red earth. In the light of this, man is a groundling, a child of the earth, which is what Paul alleges: "The first man is of the earth, carthy."—(1 Cor. xv. 47.) The infusion of vitality into the inanimate earth-child (by "breathing into his nostrils the breath of life") did not convert him into a spiritual immortal being, or impart to him an immortal principle. It is sometimes attempted to deduce this idea from the phrase in question. That it cannot scripturally or logically be done is evident from Gen. vii. 15, which alleges the breath of life (or lives) to be in the lower animals, and would, therefore, prove them to have immortal souls, if the argument in question were correct. The result of infusing the vital air into the earth-formed man was to produce a "living soul" (or creature), not an immaterial, immortal soul, of the Platonic order. The "living soul," in the case, was the living bodily Adam. Paul settles this in 1 Cor. xv. 45, where he quotes this testimony concerning the first man (that he became a living soul), to prove the existence of such a thing as "a natural body." Paul's interpretation of "living soul" is "natural body." This is according to experience and good sense: a man is a living soul: a living soul is a man: and a man is a natural

body. So true it is, that we cannot conceive of a man apart from the body, constituting him, any more than we can conceive of a tree apart from root, stem, and branches. All we know of a man experimentally, is connected with the noble configuration of his person, and the qualities therein resident as manifested by external token. No one ever knew of a man apart from his body. We pass over the operations of "spiritualists" as foreign to the point. The rapping of tables, the movement of articles of furniture, and the indication of apparently intelligible communications, are referable to laws connected with the living brains related to the operations. The theory that disembodied spirits are the moving cause is an assumption which has been exploded by scientific test. It is not to be supposed that Dr. Angus would cite (so-called) "spiritualistic" phenomena as illustrations of the existence and consciousness of disembodied souls; though on the face of it there is a degree of plausibility in the idea of disembodied immortal souls (if they do exist) wishing to communicate with friends in the flesh. Dreams, ghosts, apparitions, &c., we also assume a man of Dr. Angus's education will refer to their proper respective causes. We presume he will be content to stand or fall with the record of Scripture, which is that man is a living soul (or natural body), formed of the dust. All our experiences are in harmony with this record. We are made to feel ourselves children of the dust, at every step, in spite of theories to the contrary. We depend for the vigour of our faculties upon the vulgar process of eating. Without food, our mental powers decline to nothing. Our noblest powers can be suspended by a blow on the head. The action of chemics—inhaled or imbibed—can derange or extinguish the intellect. Age deteriorates all—sinks us in a "second childhood," and finally lays us with the clods of the valley. This is experience, as it is Scripture teaching. It is only a theory of philosophy (and that a very old, and, in other branches, an exploded philosophy), that teaches the existence of a man in man—an immortal in the mortal—a thinking something underlying all the faculties of actual experience, which, at the dissolution of "this mortal coil," is set free for other states. The Bible teaches no such theory, but harmonizes with experience in all its allusions to the subject of our common nature. The truth of this remark will be realised in the perusal of the following passages:

"Behold, now I (Abraham) have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes."—(Gen. xviii. 27.)

"He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust."—(Psalm ciii. 14.)

"I also am formed out of the clay."—(Job. xxxiii. 6.)

"Whose foundation is in the dust."—(Job. iv. 19.)

"All flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass."—(1 Pet. i. 24; James i. 10-11.)

"All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."—(Eccle. iii. 19-20.)

"Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"—(Job xiv. 10.)

"Thou hidest Thy face, they are troubled; Thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust."—(Psalm civ. 29.)

"Lord, what is man that Thou takest knowledge of him, or the son of man that Thou makest account of him? Man is like to vanity. His days are as a shadow that passeth away."—(Psalm cxlv. 84.)

"All nations before Him are as nothing, and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity."—(Isaiah xl. 17.)

"The voice said, Cry! And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof as the flower of the field."—(Isaiah xl. 6.)

"Lord make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days what it is, that I may know how frail I am. Behold thou hast made my days as a handbreadth, and mine age is as nothing before Thee. Verily, every man, at his best estate, is altogether vanity."—(Psalm xxxix. 4-5.)

"Thou carriest them away, as with a flood: they are as a sleep: in the morning it flourisheth and groweth up; in the evening, it is cut down and withereth."—(Psalm xc. 5, 6.)

"Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down. He fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not."—(Job. xiv. 1, 2.)

"All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing."—(Dan. iv. 85.)

Accepting the teaching of the "holy men of old, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. i. 19), that man is a mortal being, whose existence, under the law of Eden, is bounded by the grave, we have a key to the teaching of Christ and his apostles, on the subjects of life, death, and resurrection. These subjects stand in the forefront of the scheme of truth enunciated by them. Those familiar with the New Testament will recognize the truth of this statement.

Those not familiar, will see the truth of the matter in former and the following citation of passages:—

"Since by man came DEATH, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."—(1 Cor. xv. 21.)

"Jesus Christ hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."—(2 Tim. i. 10.)

"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."—(John xi. 25.)

"The wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."—(Rom. vi. 23.)

"This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life."—(1 John ii. 25.)

"Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life, which is in Christ Jesus."—(2 Tim. i. 1.)

"In hope of ETERNAL LIFE, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began."—(Titus i. 2.)

"That being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of ETERNAL LIFE."—(Titus iii. 7.)

"He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."—(Gal. vi. 8.)

"God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have EVERLASTING LIFE."—(John iii. 16.)

"This is the record, that God hath given unto us ETERNAL LIFE, and this LIFE is in His Son."—(1 John v. 11, 12.)

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they might have right to the tree of life."—(Rev. xxii. 14.)

"He that believeth on the Son hath EVERLASTING LIFE, and he that believeth not the son shall not see life."—(John iii. 36.)

"He that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto LIFE ETERNAL."—(John xii. 25.)

"He shall receive . . . in the world to come ETERNAL LIFE."—(Mark. x. 30.)

"To them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality, ETERNAL LIFE."

"I give unto my sheep ETERNAL LIFE."—(John x. 28.)

"When he is tried, he shall receive the crown of LIFE."—(James i. 12.)

"There shall be no more DEATH, neither sorrow, nor crying."—(Rev. xxi. 4.)

From these passages it will be seen that the great feature of gospel teaching is the offer of immortality, which is highly intelligible when we realize that those to whom the offer is made are mortal. Death being the inheritance of Adam's children by nature, we can comprehend how life can be offered them through

Christ, and how those refusing the offer will "die in their sins." But neither proposition is intelligible, if we introduce Dr. Angus's theory of natural immortality, which makes humanity related only to happiness or misery, and beyond the question of life or death. Recognizing man as a mortal creature of earth, another feature of apostolic teaching falls into harmony, which is otherwise an anomaly, viz., the inseparable connection between resurrection and retribution. This connection will be seen in the following quotations:—

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—(Dan. xii. 2.)

"And shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation."—(John v. 29.)

"Thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."—(Luke xiv. 14.)

"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 AGAIN AT THE LAST DAY."—(John vi. 39, 40, 44.)

"What advantageth it me if the dead rise not?"—(1 Cor. xv. 32.)

"I have suffered the loss of all things . . . if, by any means, I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."—(Phil. iii. 8-11.)

"If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. . . . Then they also that are asleep in Christ are PERISHED."—(1 Cor. xvi. 18, 18.)

"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet, in my flesh shall I see God, whom my eyes shall behold, and not another."—(Job xix. 25-27.)

"The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; AND THE DEAD IN CHRIST SHALL RISE FIRST."—(1 Thess. iv. 16.)

"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, BOTH OF THE JUST AND THE UNJUST."—(Acts xxiv. 15.)

"Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust . . . the earth shall cast out the dead."—(Isaiah xvi. 19.)

These passages stand in logical relation to the doctrine of human mortality. If the death of a human being is his destruction for the time being, it follows that accountability can only be brought home to him by resurrection; for how can

he realise the reward of faithfulness or the punishment of evil-doing, if he be not raised again—again brought into being? But, introduce Dr. Angus's theory, and they are put out of joint with truth at once, for if a man goes to his account when he dies, and reaps the result of his earthly career, it is impossible to see any necessity or meaning in the arrangement which brings back his glorified or suffering self, for re-union with a body which only served to wall him off from spiritual relations, when he was in it before.

### LIFE AND DEATH.

What is Dr. Angus's reply to these things? That this argument (on life and death) "involves an entire misunderstanding of the use of terms." If Dr. Angus could show this, the controversy would be ended. But does he? He asserts it, which is legitimate enough as a prelude to demonstration, but where is the demonstration? The reader will look in vain for it. Dr. Angus, in this, as in an earlier branch of the argument, is content to assume a pre-conceived meaning to the terms in question, and even these he does not take the pains to define, but rather allows it to appear hazily, in the course of his argument. He uses the terms "life" and "death," without saying what he means by them, as opposed to those who believe in the simple sense, that "the wages of sin is death." This is a little unfortunate, to say nothing harsher. It leaves out of the argument the main element of conviction in favour of his views of truth; for Dr. Angus can scarcely expect his dictum to be accepted in settlement of the controversy. His omission is inexplicable on the supposition that he felt prepared to demonstrate the sense he attaches to the terms. Justice to his argument, success in the object of his writing, and kindness to his opponents alike, demanded that at so critical a point of the controversy, he should prove his premises if he were able. He has not done so. He says the disbelievers in hell torments entirely misunderstand the sense of "life" and "death" in the Scriptures. He gives us to understand, though he does not say, that their meaning is a good state of being and an evil state of being, but he takes no trouble to prove that his view of the case is right. So what can we do but say "Well, Dr. Angus, your opinions may be sound. If so, it is because of evidence you have failed to produce, and since

you make no pretensions to be an infallible Pope, you cannot find fault with us (your readers) for declining to be satisfied with your *ipse dixit*, and putting your opinion to the test of evidence." Being a man of ability, who could make no essential omission by inadvertence, he quite leaves it open for us to believe (and under the circumstances, he cannot impute "uncharitableness" to the belief), that he felt it rather difficult to prove the orthodox meaning of "life" and "death," and concluded it would be the safest way to use the terms in a vague, non-committal manner, that would leave the door open for any escapement that might subsequently appear necessary.

For instance, he says "No doubt, we who believe have *eternal life* before us, and are waiting for it?" What do you mean by *eternal life*, Dr. Angus? You don't tell us, and this is the dispute. This is the marrow of the controversy. This is the hinge the turning point, the great question. To fail here is to fail in the whole argument. Is "life" happiness? If that is your opinion, why? The reasons that satisfy you may satisfy us; but give us them. Don't beg the question. This is so tantalising, and a mistake in a man coming forward to championize a great popular doctrine. Again, he says "The finally impenitent and disbelieving have death and perdition before them." Again we ask "What do you mean by 'death'?" Define your terms. Is death misery, or is it the state produced by the taking away of life, and, therefore, the destruction of every element of well-being? Whichever opinion is to be adopted, let us have it defined and proved. Infallibility being out of the question, we can only go by evidence. Let us know what we are talking about. It is wasteful of words, time, and patience, to bandy words without a meaning.

"But," continues Dr. Angus, "these are only half-truths. If we have believed, our everlasting life is begun." Again, Dr. Angus, what do you mean? What is begun? "Everlasting life;" but what is that? Is it life without end? If so, how is it that those who have not believed also have life without end, according to your system—even life in torment? Ought it not to follow that those not believing have no life without end, and that therefore the immortality of the soul is a mistake? If, to get away from the force of this, you say "everlasting life" does not mean life without end, but a renovated state of the soul, let us have the evidence of it. Don't

assume anything. Don't content yourself with assertion. Since you are no infallible Pope, let us have proof that we can examine. It is most unsatisfactory in a grave discussion like this, to assume the very points at issue.

Dr. Angus may say he has not left his position unproved since he quotes the statement of John.—(1 Epis. iii. 14.) "We have passed from death unto life." But these words can only be to Dr. Angus's purpose on the understanding that they mean an actual accomplishment of the change expressed. If this be their meaning—that John and his fellow-believers had passed in the then present time, actually and literally, from a (condemned-to) death state, to an immortal state—the quotation amounts to proof for Dr. Angus's position; but if this be the meaning, all Scripture should accord therewith, and will; for there is no contradiction in the divine oracles. All Scripture does not accord therewith. Thus Paul shows that literally, believers are not yet in possession of the life, in these words: "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God, and when Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."—(Col. iii. 3-4.) With this agree many statements. Thus: "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour and immortality, (God shall reward) ETERNAL LIFE . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus."—(Rom. ii. 6, 7, 16.) "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory . . .

. . . the righteous (shall enter) into LIFE ETERNAL."—(Matthew xxv. 31, 46.)

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to EVERLASTING LIFE."—(Dan. xii. 2.) "They shall come forth, those that have done good, to the resurrection of LIFE."—(Jno. v. 29.) "He that soweth to the spirit SHALL OF THE SPIRIT REAP LIFE EVERLASTING." (Gal. vi. 9.) Many other statements of a like sort there are, showing the actual entrance into life to be at the resurrection. Hence, when Dr. Angus invites us to believe that John taught an *actual* entrance into everlasting life in this present state, he asks us to put John at variance with himself and other inspired men, which is an impossibility. We are rather to reconcile John's language with the system of teaching to which he himself contributed, in treating eternal life as a matter of promise.—(1 Jno. ii. 25.) And is there any difficulty in this? None in the rational treatment of the subject. The use of the present tense

in reference to a future event, to which our relation is determined by some present occurrence, is a peculiarity of speech to be found in even common discourse, such as where a rich man says to a poor legatee to whom he has willed his property, "I have made a rich man of you." But much more so is it the peculiarity of that system in which the purposes of the future have none of the uncertainty appertaining to all human arrangements. That peculiarity is defined by Paul in Romans iv. 17, as a "calling of those things which be not, AS THOUGH THEY WERE;" and is illustrated in the same verse, by the fact that God said to Abraham, "I HAVE MADE THEE a father of many nations," when as yet he had no son. The New Testament (and the Old too) abounds with instances of this description. Jesus says in prayer to his Father, "The glory which Thou gavest me, I HAVE GIVEN THEM;" (Jno. xvii. 22,) though the disciples were not yet partakers of the glory Paul even says this purpose and grace were "GIVEN US in Christ Jesus before the world began."—(2 Tim. i. 9.) Mary, describing the events guaranteed by the birth of Jesus, says "He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree."—(Luke i. 52.) This was applying the language of accomplished fact to future events, which is in no way unintelligible, when we consider that the incident celebrated in these words was destined to lead to those events. On the same principle, it is easy to understand the language which, describing the changed relation of believers to eternal destiny, affirms that they "HAVE passed from death unto life."

The phrase expresses an actual transition, but a transfer of relation and not of state. From heirs of death, those who "have passed from death unto life," have changed into heirs of life.—(Titus iii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 7.) Their crown of life is prospective.—(Rev. ii. 10.) Their life-reaping is at the end of Spirit-sowing of the present time.—(Gal. vi. 8.) They shall come forth from the grave to the resurrection of LIFE.—(John v. 29.) Then they "shall live."—(Rom. viii. 13.) In that *aión* (age, world, or state) "they shall not die any more."—(Luke xx. 36.) But Dr. Angus virtually throws overboard these undoubted facts to make way for the theory of present immortality, which he deduces from an incoherent statement. He, as it were, eagerly seizes an apparent apostolic concurrence with Platonism to fit Platonism into apostolic words, instead

of seeking to understand apostolic expressions in the light of apostolic first principles. The argument fails to serve him, nevertheless; for if "passing from death unto life" signify a change to actual immortality on the part of the righteous, it would prove the non-immortality of the wicked, and, therefore, destroy Dr. Angus's theory, which makes the wicked immortal equally with the righteous.

Experience disproves Dr. Angus's construction of the words in question. The righteous who "have passed from death unto life," die as well as the unjustified. This shews their *actual* relation to life is an affair of that day, when "mortality shall be swallowed up of LIFE" (2 Cor. v. 4.); *this mortal* putting on immortality.—(1 Cor. xv. 53.)

"Everlasting life," says Dr. Angus, is only the *perpetuation and completion of what we have already*," meaning, presumably by "everlasting life" (for again he does not define) that state into which, according to the view so generally reflected in tracts and sermons, a righteous man passes in the article of death. If this is true, how is it to be accounted for that the Scriptures represent everlasting life as a state entered into *at the day of judgment*.—(Rom. ii. 7-16; Matt. xxv. 46) If "everlasting life" is a perpetuation of life we "have already," why does the "body" die? Is bodily life no part of the life "we have already?" Death, instead of "perpetuating" it, ends it; instead of completing it, destroys it. Therefore, Dr. Angus's definition is at variance with at least one element of the case. If to escape the variance, he says the fate of the body is a secondary affair; that the state of the "soul" is the supreme consideration, he at once exhibits the unscripturalness of his theory, for the very sentence of death recorded in the Scriptures, refers to "the body," and "the body" alone. ("Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.") And the entrance into Scriptural "everlasting life" is connected with "the body;" for we read "*this mortal* (body) must put on immortality."—(1 Cor. xi. 53.) "He shall quicken *your mortal body*."—(Rom. viii. 11.) "He shall change *our vile body*."—(Phil. iii. 21) Then if he say that everlasting life includes the life of "the body," he is bound to admit that everlasting life is not complete till the resurrection; and if, without inconsistency to his theory, any part of everlasting life

can be wanting till then, (if there can be such a thing as "parts" and degrees in everlasting life) all parts may be wanting, and thus his foundation is destroyed by his own admissions.

#### EVERLASTING LIFE.

No wonder Dr. Angus fails to give a rational idea of everlasting life, and involves himself in continual difficulty. This is the inevitable fruit of the theory of natural immortality. If all men are immortal, and the righteous only attain to "life everlasting," obviously "life everlasting" is not immortality, and, therefore, a separate and unnatural meaning must be sought for it. And the difficulty is to get such a meaning; for if immortality is a state in which death cannot occur, that state cannot but be a life that ever lasts, and, therefore, everlasting life; and as the wicked are immortal, they have life that lasts for ever and, therefore, everlasting life, and yet the Scriptures declare that none but the righteous "shall have everlasting life." On the other hand, if life does not mean life, but holiness, then the contrast of everlasting (in the case of the righteous) with short-lasting or losing, (in the case of the wicked), is perplexing, for the wicked are supposed to have no holiness at all, and then it would be a little baffling to conceive a dispensation in which the punishment of sin should be that the sinner should lose his holiness. But how the mist clears off when we believe that man is mortal, and that such of his race as please God, will be made immortal.

#### DEATH AS ANNIHILATION.

On the subject of death, there is, in Dr. Angus's dissertation, the same confusion and failure, and some approach to artifice and quibble. He seeks to fence off from death the notion of destruction. How does he do it? By first laying down that the wicked are dead in their yet living state, which is correct enough in the sense in which the righteous have passed from death unto life, but not correct in the final sense required by Dr. Angus's argument; for is there not a death which is "the end" of the sinner's course? Dr. Angus cannot deny it?—(Rom. i. 32; vi. 21.) Therefore, there is a death not realised by the wicked in their lifetime, and how can there be any argument from present experience to a result not yet experienced?

Is this death (which is the wages of sin) destruction or torment? Dr. Angus says it cannot be destruction. Why? "Because," says he, "as the present state of death and destruction in which the wicked exist, is not annihilation, neither is the *perpetuation* of that state." This is a logical artifice, at once seen through when its false assumptions are perceived. The first false assumption relates to "the present state of death and destruction in which the wicked exist." Dr. Angus says it is not "annihilation?" Let us see. What is the wicked's "present state of death," &c. Dr. Angus has defined it, and we will now put him to the test by his own definitions. He says they are "dead to holy feeling, dead to practical holiness, dead to happiness." Admitting, for the mere sake of argument, that these definitions are correct, is it not obvious that the state of death in question has been reached by the *death of the qualities* referred to in the minds of the persons? And what is this death? Is it not the *extinction* of "holy feeling, practical holiness, happiness?" the "*annihilation*" of these qualities in the "souls" of the wicked? or to put it with the utmost refinement of language Dr. Angus could himself employ, the cessation, the putting-end-to of that relation between the soul and spiritual excellence, that admits the latter to a controlling influence in the former? And is not a causing to cease, or putting an end to, a "destruction," an "annihilation" of the thing caused to cease, or put an end to? There can be no candid faltering here? To cause to cease, is to destroy; to put an end to, is to annihilate. Therefore, "annihilation" is as much an article of Dr. Angus's creed as of those he opposes. Only there is this difference: he believes in the annihilation of "holy conditions," but not of unholy sinners; and there is this contrast between the death of the Bible and the death of Dr. Angus's theology; Dr. Angus' "death" is the existence of sin in the souls of the wicked, while the death of the Bible is the "wages of sin," *paid to sinners themselves* BECAUSE OF SIN, and there is no obscurity as to the nature of the death so inflicted, for it is expressly defined and elaborated in the sentence of death passed upon Adam: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;" thus rendered by Paul, "In Adam all die."—(1 Cor. xv. 21.) As applied to holy feeling, Dr. Angus understands death to mean annihilation; but he refuses to allow

this meaning as applied to man himself, and thus he is inconsistent.

"Eternal death," says Dr. Angus, "is the consummation of the sinner's present condition." How can that be, seeing that one feature of the "sinner's present condition" is mortality—(returning to the dust), when in the "hell" of Dr. Angus's theology, there is no mortality, but an immortal fire-proof bodily existence.

Dr. Angus makes confusion at every step. His theory is responsible for it. He himself is a man of ability. Well may his opponents return his remark upon himself—that his argument "involves an entire misunderstanding of the meaning of terms." The terms referred to in the remark are "death and life." In the doctrine which Dr. Angus says is based on "an entire misunderstanding of the meaning" of these terms, "death" means death, and "life" means life. According to Dr. Angus, these terms mean neither death nor life, but a good and a bad state of being. On which side is the "entire misunderstanding"?

As for Dr. Angus's answer to those who hope for "restoration" for the wicked, nothing can be logically said by way of demur. The doom of the wicked is certainly final. The great question is, What is it? Dr. Angus says "torture;" the Bible says, "death." With this important qualification, his remarks on the finality of perdition will be endorsed by those who understand the subject.

#### A MYSTERY CONFESSED AND CLEARED UP.

Dr. Angus concludes his first letter with two lessons, which he deduces from his argument in favour of eternal torments, which he characterizes as "the explicit teaching of Scripture." When, however, the argument is dissipated, and the "explicitness" of Scripture made to appear in opposition to Dr. Angus's theology, the "lessons" fall through entirely. The lessons are: first, "a rebuke of the style of talk in which many indulge," who "scruple not to speak of this terrible ending (?) of human life, (?) in any case, as unjust or revolting to charity." Dr. Angus does not enforce this "lesson" in the way that would be effectual, viz., by shewing that eternal torments are just and charitable. He does not attempt the task. He virtually admits the impossibility of doing it, by adroitly

walking to the door in this manner. "The existence of moral evil is a far greater mystery than the punishment of it." This is admitting that the doctrine of eternal torments is a mystery—a something not to be explained—a something in which it is impossible to discover the wisdom and love of God; for if the wisdom and love of God were discoverable in it, there would be no mystery. Here, then, Dr. Angus has to confess to a great weakness, and here the doctrine he opposes has a wonderful vantage ground. It exhibits wisdom and love, and prevents mystery. It shews evil extirpated by the process of its treatment, and the universe ultimately cleared for the triumph of goodness. "But then," says Dr. Angus, you have "the greater mystery of the existence of evil at all." This mystery belongs only to Dr. Angus's theory. If mankind have a spark of divinity in their bosoms, it is certainly incomprehensible that evil should have such a preponderating empire on earth. But man, as we have seen, is no native of the skies, but an earthborn, endowed with sundry propensities and faculties, which will stunt or develop according as they are exercised, and in the exercise of which, he possesses a certain amount of "free agency." In the development of his career, influenced by the promptings of his propensities, he has ignorantly employed his freedom in disobeying the divine law. Disobedience is sin against God. The punishment of disobedience is evil while alive, and death at last. The state of evil incident to the entrance of sin, affords scope for divine benevolence, in the development from a race of sinners of an indebted family through Christ, in whom the law has been vindicated; and it affords scope for the principle of "trial," by which God is pleased to develop this family, and from which glorious results will come at last, in "glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and goodwill among men." Thus, there is no mystery in what Dr. Angus, borrowing the phrases of the schools, styles "the existence of moral evil." It is an intelligible and beautiful feature of the divine plan: so that Dr. Angus is caught again, to his own confusion. He attempts to get away from the confessed mystery of eternal torments by alleging another that does not exist. This attempt was, no doubt, perfectly *bona fide* on his part, and made in all honesty, but it is none the less a manoeuvre, in a logical sense—illustrative of the dilemmas into which

the most logical of minds are forced by false theories.

#### ETERNAL TORMENTS INCOM- PATIBLE WITH THE DIVINE CHARACTER.

The alleged incompatibility of eternal torments with the divine benevolence is, therefore, unanswered. It is an objection of some force. God is just; God is kind, and any construction of His dealings, involving the imputation of injustice and unkindness, must be a mistake. Can it be said that the destiny of the wicked, according to orthodox theology, is free from, (at least) apparent injustice and unkindness? So obviously does it appear to involve both, that much self-violence is needed to reconcile the thoughtful mind to the acceptance of the doctrine, and even when the point of reconciliation is reached, the result is one-sided. The reconciliation is theoretical, not actual. The devout believer in eternal torment thinks it must be kind and just because God is just and kind. He does not see or feel that it is either. Looked at fairly in the face, it will be seen to be neither. Sinners are born such. They inherit constitutional weakness in the direction of sin. They find themselves in circumstances that foster the natural bent; and the vast majority of mankind die without coming in contact with any corrective. Where is the justice of consigning them to eternal suffering for being as helplessly what they are as a cow is helplessly a cow? If sinners pre-existed from all eternity, there would appear to be more evenhandedness in eternal suffering. An eternity of wickedness might square with an eternity of torture; but mortal delinquencies seem monstrously dealt with by immortal pains and penalties. "Death" meets the requirement of the case from every point of view. Dr. Angus, in further and futile attempts to escape the meshes, points to Jesus and Paul. The Saviour was more just and merciful than the "annihilationists" can be, and Paul was certainly not behind them. Well, what of that? They spoke most of "wrath to come." Therefore, argues Dr. Angus, mercy and "wrath to come" are not incompatible. True; but is "wrath to come" "eternal torment?" Dr. Angus has failed to shew that it is. We have endeavoured to shew it is not. We have shewn that "wrath to

come" is a wrath that "destroys," and, therefore, operates mercifully and justly; for it is merciful to put an end to a wretched state, and it is just to deprive a created being of existence, when he uses his powers in antagonism to the will of the Creator. To what purpose, then, is Dr. Angus's allusion to the discourse of Paul and Jesus? It amounts to this: that he feels so incapable of giving a reasonable account of eternal torments, as a dispensation of divine wisdom and goodness, that he prefers blindly casting the dreadful weight of the imputed injustice of it on the shoulders of those whose character for justice he knows will not be questioned. But he cannot do this until he has shewn that they taught the doctrine. This he has not done, and cannot do. The injustice which would doom untold millions of Adam's feeble race to untold tortures of eternity for being what they could not help—"made subject to vanity, not willingly"—belongs to Dr. Angus's theology, and not to the religion of Jesus Christ. Jesus and Paul preached "condemnation," "perdition," "destruction," "judgment," "perishment, death, &c., but they did not preach eternal torments. Dr. Angus has, therefore, failed to saddle what he almost admits to be "harsh thoughts of human destiny" on their shoulders, and must carry the dreadful weight himself, in common with the millions of oppressed souls who groan under the horrible nightmare of hell-fire theology.

Dr. Angus's "second lesson" is just enough in the premisses, but unneeded when the truth shines. "If," says he, "the doctrine of a future punishment (meaning eternal torments) be scriptural, ought it not to be preached as Scripture reveals it?" If eternal torments are true, they certainly ought to be heralded through the land unceasingly, in trumpet tones; and those clergy who profess to believe it, and say so little about it, are self-convicted incapables. Dr. Angus's "lesson" is for them; but as to "preaching it as Scripture reveals it," sermonising of the orthodox type would be at an end to-morrow, if this suggestion were to be acted upon. To preach "future punishment as Scripture reveals it," would be to entirely do away with the fervid sketches of hell-torments, by which the more earnest preachers seek to scare the people into "religion," and to proclaim the sober fact that the end of all sin will be corruption and death. Many are coming to this.

## SECOND LETTER.

In his second letter, Dr. Angus supplies "Notes," in which he repeats much of the argument contained in the first. For this reason, it will not be necessary to follow him in detail, but merely to notice new matter, or old arguments with new supports. Passing over his "canons of interpretation" as, on the whole, unobjectionable, we observe his failure to answer an important question propounded by himself—

"WHAT IS THE MEANING OF  
LIFE?"

He "turns to the Concordance," and finds it is "a special blessing given to all who believe." Upon this he remarks "they were living men before they received it," from which he would appear to wish it to be inferred that after all, life is not life but spiritual condition. He, however, enlarges this idea, and destroys his own theory, in the next sentence. "Life is not existence, but something which, WHILE IMPLYING EXISTENCE, is something more." If life "implies existence," does not the absence of life imply the absence of existence, as in the case of the wicked who, while saying their life now, are to lose it at the coming of Christ? If so, what becomes of the theory which represents the wicked as retaining existence while losing life? Again, if life "implies existence," does not death as comprehensively imply "non-existence?" If so, how can sinners have eternal existence in torment, seeing "the wages of sin is death?"

But, returning to the "living men" to whom he finds life is "a special blessing given," were not those living men "under sentence of death?" Had not death passed upon all men? Were they not, therefore, in the sense formerly defined by himself—"dead in law," in the sense recognised by Jesus, when he said, "Let the dead bury the dead?" These things cannot be gainsaid, from which it follows that Dr. Angus makes disingenuous use of the fact of their being "living men." Again, as to the "special blessing given"—life—was it not merely given in promise? "This is the promise which he hath promised us, eternal life."—(1 John ii. 25.) "According to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus."—(2 Tim. i.) Justification coming to condemned men, has "fruit unto holiness, and THE END everlasting life."—

(Rom. vi. 22.) But Dr. Angus would make it appear that the "special blessing given" was an actual life, instead of an actual promise, decree or guarantee of life wherein he again argues fallaciously, and divides not rightly the word of truth. "Occasionally," continues Dr. Angus, "the word—(*zoe*)—is used of the life we all live on the earth"—the life "which is as a vapour that passeth away—but the deeper meaning is the common one." What he means by the "deeper meaning" he does not explain. It might be presumed he means the immortal soul, but that the connection limits it to the "all who believe," who, according to his system, have neither more nor less an immortal soul than the wicked. It cannot be the sense defined a few sentences earlier, because that he makes to include the idea of existence, which is also common in his system to righteous and wicked. It is indeed hard to extract a rational explanation from so contradictory a system. As to the two senses of *zoe* (life) there is no difficulty, except such as has been created by the corrupted theology of centuries. We have *zoe* now; and we shall have *zoe* at the resurrection, only *zoe* now is of short duration, and developed through our animal body; and *zoe* then will be everlasting, and manifested through a corruptible body made incorruptible by divine energy.—(1 Cor. xv. 33; Phil. iii. 21.) There is this much in common between the *zoe* that now is, and that which is to come—that both express the idea of existence; only the life we now have, is existence in a state that is frail, and comes to an end, while the life that is to come for the righteous, is existence in a state in which there is no weakness, and which never comes to an end. In this there is nothing strained or unnatural. The two uses of the term are analogous; but on Dr. Angus's principle, there is no analogy. If what he calls "the deeper meaning—the common one," is *spiritual energy in the soul*, its "occasional" meaning, as "*the life which is as a vapour that passeth away*," is obviously exceptional and unnatural—a discrepancy of itself strongly suggestive of the fallacy of Dr. Angus's theory. He admits that the common meaning of his theory, "*may not be found in Lidell and Scott*"—another damaging admission—but adds, "it will be found more than fifty times in the New Testament, and is the common meaning

there." This assertion, of course, goes for nothing in the absence of proof. The word "life" doubtless occurs more than fifty times, and as undoubtedly expresses "a special blessing given to all who believe;" but we have seen that this blessing lies not in *zoe* actually bestowed, but in *zoe* pledged, which excludes the sense vaguely contended for but not defined by Dr. Angus.

As to "salvation" and "destruction," as Scripture terms, he alleges that "the spiritual meaning is the most common." He does not say what this meaning is, nor prove his statement. His assertion must, therefore, be treated as worthless.

THE PUNISHMENT OF THE  
WICKED UNENDING.

Similarly must be treated his remark on the applicability of "everlasting" to the destiny of the wicked. The remark is true enough in the abstract, but purposeless in the application given. The term "everlasting" is truly associated with the matter in question, but this is nothing in favour of eternal torments, until it be shown that the wages of sin is torment. The punishment of the wicked is an "everlasting" punishment (treating *aionos* for the sake of argument as the equivalent of unending); but it remains to be separately considered what that punishment is. We have seen it to be death—destruction, which gives a new sense to everlasting as applied to the fate of the ungodly. We quite agree with Dr. Angus, but in a sense very different to the purport of his remarks, that "if we take the words, life, death, salvation, destruction, everlasting, in their *common meaning*, the discussion is at an end."

THE LIFE OF MAN AND BEAST.

Passing over his sensible enough remarks on the fallacy of attempting to settle the controversy by preconceived generalization, we come to his remarks on the term *psyche*, the Greek term most commonly translated "life" and "soul" in the New Testament; and here are observable a randomness and inaccuracy somewhat surprising in a man of Dr. Angus's scholarly reputation, yet not surprising, when his task in hand is considered—that of proving the unprovable—nay worse—establishing the explicable—giving the colour of truth to falsehood. "The notion," says he, "that the life (*psyche*) of the brutes is

the same as the life (*psyche*) in man, is not so much humbling as degrading." This, as a matter of sentiment, is not worth much notice; but it may not be beside the question to ask why the notion should be considered degrading, that man exists by the power that upholds the brute creation? Has not one God made all? Are not "in His hand the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind?"—(Job xii. 10.) Has He not "sent forth His spirit" to create "things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts" (Ps. civ. 30, 25), equally with man, who shares the same breath with them?—(Eccles. iii. 20.) Is there not one pervading spirit-presence in creation, from which we cannot flee?—(Ps. cxxxix, 7-8.) One universal God, in whom all things live and move, and have their being?—(Acts xvii. 28.) These questions cannot be answered in the negative, even by Dr. Angus. They are the testimony of revelation; the declaration of experience. In one atmosphere do man and beast exist. By a common law of respiration and nutrition is their being maintained, and in the interruption of either, they die together. Indeed, one is as much a marvel of creative power as the other. The unpalatableness of their generic identity is due, not to reason or Scripture, but to the abnormal sentiments of superiority created by the Pagan doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

"But," says Dr. Angus, "it is largely contradicted by all nations." Little stress can be laid on this fact. All nations would have contradicted the rotundity of the earth a few centuries back. "All nations" are the aggregation of much ignorance in relation to things divine and "scientific," especially the former. Paul pronounced them ignorant in his day (Acts xvii. 30; xiv. 16; Eph. iv. 17-18), and they have not much improved since. Their verdict, therefore, on such a question is of little consequence, except as indicating the direction in which the truth is probably not to be found.

"Then," says Dr. Angus, "it is contradicted by Scripture itself." This is more to the point, but not true. Dr. Angus does not produce a single proof that it is contradicted by Scripture. We will produce indubitable evidence that it is not only not contradicted by Scripture, but expressly taught by Scripture. The evidence is in a nutshell. Thus every term employed in the Hebrew original to define the element of life or spirit in man,

is similarly employed with respect to the animals.

*Nepheesh chayiah*, the breath of life (or lives), is said to have been breathed into Adam.—(Gen. ii. 7.) The same *Nepheesh chayiah* is also said to have been in the animals that went with Noah into the ark (Gen. vii. 15), and in the nostrils of the cattle, &c., drowned by the flood.—(verses 21, 22.)

*Nepheesh*, separately spoken of in connection with man (Gen. ix. 5—"I will require the life [*nepheesh*] of man"), is also recognized in connection with animals—"Every creature wherein is life (*nepheesh*)."—(Gen. i. 30.)

*Chayiah* also occurs similarly in connection with both. As to man, Gen. ii. 7, already quoted, is an example. As to the animals, the term occurs eight times in the following six verses; Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30, and more than a hundred times throughout the Scriptures.

*Ruach* (spirit), declared to be in man (Job. xxxii. 8), is also imputed to the beasts (Ps. civ. 29), translated "breath." On this point, it is expressly affirmed that they have all *one ruach* (Eccles. iii. 19), a statement confirmed by an observation in Job xxxiv. 14: "If He (God) gather unto Himself His *ruach* (spirit) and His *neshamah* (breath), ALL FLESH shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."

*Neshamah* (spirit or breath): Applied to man—"My breath (*neshamah*) is in me" (Job xxvii. 3); applied to animals—"All (cattle, beasts, creeping things), in whose nostrils was the breath (*neshamah*) of life, died."

These comprehend all the terms in Hebrew translated spirit, soul, life, &c., and occur as we have seen, in connection with both man and animals—a circumstance not unintelligible in view of the fact that both exist by means of the process (breathing) expressed by the roots from which, with one exception, these terms are derived. A circumstance, too, which constitutes the proof we promised to produce.

As to the New Testament—being a record of operations and sayings exclusively related to men dealing with one relation only—there was not the same scope for illustrating (incidentally) the common relation of man and beast to the *nepheesh*, *neshamah*, *ruach*, &c., of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the *psyche*, *zoe*, and *pneuma* of the Greek. There is, however, some indication even here. In Rev. viii. 9, *psyche* is directly attributed to the fishes of the sea; and by

implication, Paul (in 1 Cor. xiv. 7) makes the distinction between inanimate and living things to consist in the latter having *psyche*. *Zoe* is employed in 1 Pet. iii. 10, as the translation of the Hebrew word *chayiah*, and as *chayiah* is about as often employed in the Old Testament, in connection with beasts as with men, it follows that *zoe*, its Greek equivalent, might be so used when the subject demands it. In the same way is a parallel established between the Greek *pneuma* and the Hebrew *ruach*. In all New Testament quotations from the Hebrew, *ruach* is rendered by *pneuma*; so that whatever is affirmable of the one is affirmable of the other.

Dr. Angus denies that *psyche* is ever used in the New Testament, "of the life of brutes." This is a mistake as we have seen, and as he virtually acknowledges in the pamphlet edition of his letters, in which "never in the New" is changed to "only once in the New." He, however, admits that its Hebrew equivalent is sometimes so used in the Old Testament, but treats the fact very lightly, which is surprising where an important controversy is made to turn on the meaning of words, as determined by their use. It naturally occurs to common sense, to think that if the term can be applied to brutes without carrying the idea of immortality with it, it need not necessarily carry that idea with it when applied to man; and that if the doctrine contended for by Dr. Angus, is to be established, it must be proved by something more convincing than the mere use of a doubtful term. But Dr. Angus disregards this self-evident reflection, and takes the whole matter for granted. This no doubt, simplifies his task, but so far as thinking men are concerned, it deprives the argument of any value.

#### DESTRUCTION.

Dr. ANGUS's next endeavour is to get rid of the terms "destroy" and "destruction" as proofs that the wicked, of whom they are affirmed, cease to exist when made finally subject to them. His effort is of the same character as that by which he sought to disprove the natural sense of "life" and "death." He ignores the primary sense of the terms, and rests his opposition to the "destructionists" on the demonstration that there are secondary senses. This is futile as an argument. There are secondary meanings to most words, but the primary meaning is not thereby brought into disuse, or diverted

from its natural applications. On the contrary, the secondary use keeps the primary in view as the source in which the secondary meanings have their origin, and in the light of which they are to be understood. Thus, when it is said a meeting had no life in it, the mind naturally thinks of the warmth and animation which are the characteristics of literal life, as opposed to the coldness and stillness of death.

Dr. Angus admits, as he is bound to admit, that the Scriptures teach that the wicked are to be destroyed—given over to destruction—walking, as they are, in the broad road leading thereto. But he objects to understand these statements as of the being of the wicked, insisting that they are to be understood only of their condition. He contends that it is the WELL-BEING of the wicked that is to be destroyed—not the wicked themselves. How does he fortify his position? He "turns to Liddell and Scott" and "finds that the Greek verb means to kill, to lay waste or ruin, to bore one to death, to perish or die, to be undone or ruined, to be lost." Surely these definitions do not help him much. He then quotes Wahl's opinion as to what the word means in the New Testament, which is rather more in his favour, but of no more weight than his own. Rightly discarding the lexicographers as mere witnesses, he turns to the Scriptures to ascertain the meaning as determined by actual usage, or rather to demonstrate what it does not mean, for he is more careful to show that destruction does not mean annihilation than to make plain what it is that it does mean. He quotes Prov. i. 32: "The prosperity of fools shall *destroy* them," and asks "Is this always annihilation?" He does not answer the question. We, therefore, put the more pertinent question: What is the meaning of "destroy" in the verse quoted? We get the answer from the context. Solomon exhorts his son to "Consent not" when sinners entice. His reason for this advice he gives thus: "for they lay wait for THEIR OWN BLOOD; they lurk privily for THEIR OWN LIVES. So are the ways of every one that is greedy of gain, which TAKETH AWAY THE LIFE OF THE OWNERS THEREOF. "Therefore," continues Solomon, later in the chapter, "shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices; for the turning away of the simple shall SLAY them, and the prosperity of fools—the words quoted by Dr. Angus—shall

DESTROY them." Destroy is clearly used as the parallel of "slay," and "slay" is defined as *the taking away of life*, which is precisely the "annihilation" contended for by those whom Dr. Angus opposes. He next alludes to Jer. xxiii. 1: "Woe be to the pastors that *destroy* and scatter the sheep of my pasture," upon which, he asks "must the sheep be annihilated in this case?" The facts will answer the question. Israel, the sheep in question, were led astray by their leaders or shepherds. The result was they "became meat to the beasts of the field" (verse 5) or a prey to neighbouring nations sent upon them in punishment of their sins. This visitation involved their destruction. As a nation, they were broken up; as individuals, vast numbers were slain. Jeremiah depicts the calamity thus: "The young and the old lie on the ground in the streets; my virgins and my young men are fallen by the sword; Thou hadst slain them in the day of Thine anger; Thou hast killed and not pitied. Thou hast called, as in a solemn day, my terrors round about, so that in the day of the Lord's anger, none escaped nor remained. Those that I have swaddled and brought up hath mine enemy consumed."—(Lam. ii. 21-22.) Because, therefore, of the consequence involved in the wrong-leading of Israel's shepherd, they might well be termed "destroyers of the flock," in the very sense objected to by Dr. Angus, viz., "annihilators of the flock."

Again, he asks, did Christ come to seek and to save that which was annihilated? As a matter of destiny, yes; death had passed in prospect upon all men, and had so certain a hold on them that Jesus describes them as dead, saying "Let the dead bury their dead." It was this very state of things that required him to seek and to save. Thus he is "the resurrection and the life."—(John xi. 25.) "By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead"—(1 Cor. xv. 19.)

He next appeals to the case of the prodigal son, who was lost (original *destroyed*) and was found. This case only proves the secondary use of the word. When a man, abandoning himself to profligacy, loses health, character, and social standing, and brings himself to the depths of poverty and disgrace, it is not extravagant metaphor to say he has destroyed himself. A secondary use does not, however, supersede the primary and most common use, which, in this case, is to demolish, cause to cease, annihilate.

Even in its application to the prodigal son, there is more of the primary than the secondary sense, for the destruction operated on a life that was—a life that was surrounded by accessories of affluence—causing it to cease to exist. Another view of the case tends in the same direction. The use of the word "lost" (*destroyed*) in contrast to "found," would show that it is the Prodigal's relation to his father rather than to himself that is the subject of discourse; and in relation to his father, he had ceased to exist when he disappeared, and (for aught his father knew) was dead.

Dr. Angus's allusion to the question of the (supposed) demons "art thou come to destroy us before the time?" (Mark i. 24)—opens up a question which, being foreign to the present controversy, we must pass over with the remark that the destruction referred to was, undoubtedly, real, notwithstanding that in Matthew's account (Matt. viii. 29), "torment" is used as the equivalent of "destroy." The process of destruction causes suffering. "Destroy," therefore, includes "torment" as the beginning of the act. The "torment" of Matthew may also be said to carry the "destruction" of Mark with it, since the infliction of the one causes or characterizes the occurrence of the other.

"When Christ died for his people, was he annihilated?" asks Dr. Angus. The facts again supply the answer. The living Jesus of Nazareth ceased to exist when he expired on the cross. An inanimate body remained, which, but for divine interference, would have gone to corruption like other human bodies, but the Father, who tabernacled in him, in the days of his weakness (and withdrew from him at the crisis of his trial), returned to him in power at the end of three days, and caused him again to live, and show forth the wondrous works of God. While Jesus was dead, he was dead, or if Dr. Angus pleases, (though the term is not strictly applicable) "annihilated."

"Was it for the annihilation of the flesh that the incestuous member was excluded?"—(1 Cor. v. 5.) Certainly; the flesh was to be extirpated from among the Corinthians. "Purge out the old leaven" is the exhortation connected with it.

"Did God annihilate the men who perished in the flood?"—(2 Pet. iii. 6.) Certainly. "The flood came, and destroyed them all."—(Luke xvii. 27.) agreeably to the language in which the

flood was intimated to Noah, "The Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth."—(Gen. vi. 7.)

#### "ANNIHILATION" VINDICATED FROM PERVERSION.

"Have the Israelites whom God destroyed in the wilderness been annihilated (Jude 11) and all the unbelievers of Rahab's day?"—(Heb. xi. 31.) Yes. "Is there," then asks Dr. Angus, "for them, no resurrection . . . ?" Here, becomes, at once, apparent the unfair sense, in which Dr. Angus, in common with all who oppose the doctrine of no immortality out of Christ, use the word "annihilation." In fact, it is unfair to use the word at all. It is a word not used by the advocates of no immortality out of Christ, because of the false notion attached to it. It is a word put upon them by Dr. Angus's class, who treat it as involving a denial of resurrection and future retribution altogether. Those who deny immortality out of Christ do not contend for annihilation in this sense. They contend that death is the wages of sin, and that death is as much a ceasing to exist as life commenced is a beginning to exist, but that God is able and has declared His purpose to bring again from the dead "just" and "unjust," to receive "according to their works;" and that hence arises the doctrine of resurrection—the great feature of the Christian system. The dead, being dead, must be raised from the dead if they are to be the subjects of future retribution, which is not at all necessary in Dr. Angus's system. The righteous live again to receive immortality and inheritance in the kingdom of God. The wicked live again to suffer shame in a public judicial consignment to "second death," from which they never re-emerge. Surely it is not inconsistent with these views that the dead, while in the grave, should be considered as non-existent. It is their very non-existence that makes resurrection a necessity. And, surely, these are very different conclusions from those supposed to be carried with the word "annihilation."

"In all these cases," observes Dr. Angus, "the 'destruction' is said to be past." For an obvious reason, in the case of antediluvians, disobedient Israelites, &c., viz., that it is past. "And yet," he continues, "those to whom it is applied

are supposed to be still living—some to be saved and others still to suffer." If Dr. Angus had said and proved "those to whom it is applied are declared by the Scriptures to be still living," there would have been something to answer. "Supposition" is of no account in controversy. That dead men should be "supposed to be alive" is one of the anomalies of the age, resulting from the admixture of self-evident and Scripture fact with Pagan fiction.

#### "DESTRUCTION" IN RELATION TO "ANNIHILATION."

Where future destruction is spoken of, Dr. Angus denies that it means annihilation, (that is, *destruction*.) first, because *it is the thing threatened*. The force of this is not apparent. Destruction in the annihilationist sense can be threatened, in view of the everlasting life to be manifested in the day of Christ, with as much propriety and effect as torment. His second ground of denial is because *it is described in words that imply conscious suffering*. This is equally weak. The objects of divine vengeance will be intensely conscious of their doom, when pronounced and being entered upon. There will be "weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth," but this is not inconsistent with the fact that the judgment overtaking them will destroy them. He next objects that they are to be "punished" with it; to 'suffer' to 'go away' into it." The answer is obvious: these descriptions are as much applicable to destruction as torment, and therefore of no weight on either side of the controversy. "They are cast alive into it," he continues. This is not a correct application of Scripture as was shown at an earlier stage of the argument. The words quoted are used of a symbolic "beast and false prophet," and not of the literal doom of the wicked. Dr. Angus is, therefore, prohibited from using them. The same remark applies to the quotation, "They have no rest, day nor night." The statement applies to the Apocalyptic "worshippers of the beast and his image," and to a judicial retribution to be inflicted in "the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb," at his coming, and is, therefore, not applicable to a process limited by Dr. Angus' theology to the cavernous depths of the Satanic abyss, and bearing indiscriminately on sinners of all time and throughout all eternity. Next, he quotes "Their worm

dieth not; their fire is not quenched." This will not serve him unless understood literally. Does Dr. Angus mean it to be taken literally? He does not say. He is carefully non-committal throughout, which is, of course, very prudent in matters involving risk, but not commendable in the public exhibition of truth. If Dr. Angus take it literally, he is unlike his class, who treat it as a metaphor of like character (though of different meaning) with plucking out the right eye and cutting off the right hand; and he will be involved in the anomaly of worms in hell and worms that are immortal, for they never die. If pressed on this point, he would, doubtless, yield to a metaphorical construction. If so, his use of it is frustrated, for it cannot, as a metaphor, be admitted to signify the condition of blazing torture, which he quotes it to countenance. As a metaphor, it is metaphorical of the truth, and as to this, the wider argument already unfolded, points in a contrary direction to Dr. Angus's theology, and reveals a beauty in the metaphor which that theology destroys. A worm is the symbol of corruption. In Dr. Angus's future punishment of the wicked, there is no corruption, but a fire-proof immortality in hell, to which a worm has no natural relation whatever. In the system of the truth "he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption."—(Gal. vi. 8.) Hence, an undying worm is a natural metaphor of the fate which destroys them in the grave.—Job xxi. 26.) As to the unquenchable fire, fire is a symbol of destruction, for it is the most destructive element ordinarily known to men. Unquenchable fire is the symbol of irretrievable destruction. If a fire can be put out, the thing or person upon which it is preying may be saved, but if it get the upper hand, there is no hope. Both metaphors are in harmony with the revealed destiny of the wicked.

Dr. Angus next remarks, "It is after God has killed that He casts into hell. This, which is intended to be telling, is really very damaging to Dr. Angus. What does he here understand by "killed?" It cannot be spiritual killing, for those who are "cast into hell" are, according to Dr. Angus already dead in that sense. It cannot be killing with the so-called "eternal death," because on Dr. Angus's own shewing, it is before the so-called eternal death that this killing is inflicted. Dr. Angus won't admit it is the newly-raised bodies of the wicked that



are killed, for he teaches that they are to live for ever in hell. Consequently, he is shut up to a dilemma. The doctrine he opposes does not require to force a solution, for the words in question teach the doctrine. That doctrine is that God will kill the wicked and cast them into a dishonoured Gehenna, at the time when the righteous are exalted to honour. Of the people living under the rule of the righteous at that time, it is testified that "They shall go forth and look upon the CARCASSES (men having been "killed") of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched: and they shall see an abhorring unto all flesh."—(Isaiah lxvi. 24.)

#### PHILOLOGICAL DUST-THROWING FRUSTRATED.

Dr. Angus, in the straitness of his position, makes a remark to the "English reader" about the words "destruction" and "destroy," which simply amounts to throwing dust, and which "the English reader," if unable to deliver himself from Dr. Angus, must feel to be very distressing on the supposition that he is given to Scripture reading. He says "destroy" and "destruction" "are often used to translate Greek words which have no connection with annihilation at all. (Query: What Greek words, in Dr. Angus's estimation, have such connection? He has carefully repudiated such a meaning to all the words which could express it.) He refers to several passages illustratively, and observes: "It is unfortunate that words so different in meaning as the words found in these passages, should have been translated by the same English word." Now this is decidedly misleading. It has but the slenderest foundation. The words translated "destroy" and "destruction" are not always the same in the original, but they always express the ideas represented by these English terms, as is shewn by the fact of the translators selecting them, and shewn by a glance at the very passages instanced by Dr. Angus in illustration. Rom. iii. 16: "Destruction and misery are in their paths." The original word is *συντριμμα*, from a verb signifying to break in pieces or shivers. It may be more properly translated ruin, but, surely, ruin is destruction.—2 Cor. x. 8: Authority which the Lord hath given

us for edification, and not for your destruction." The original word is *καθειραεις*, from a verb signifying to take down, to put or pull down, to cast down, which, as used in contrast to building up (or edification), carries the sense of destruction to the thing pulled down.—2 Cor. xiii. 10: the word is the same. Acts ix. 21: "Is not this (Paul) he that destroyed them which called on this name." The original word is *πορθησας*, from *portheo*, to lay waste. Is not this to destroy? The sense of it is shewn in Paul's description of what he did in laying waste those who called on the name of Christ. He says "I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering unto prisons both men and women." (Acts xxii. 4.)—Gal. i. 23: "The faith that he once destroyed." The word is the same as the last.—1 John iii. 8: "that he might destroy the works of the devil." Here the verb is *λυο*, signifying to loose or dissolve, and when used in any antagonistic sense, to unloose destructively, and, therefore, destroy. The doctrinal meaning points to a destructive sense of the word. Surely the mission of Christ is not to liberate or set free the works of the devil, but to loose them in the sense of melting, dissolving, destroying.—Matt. v. 17: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets." Here the verb is *καταλυο*, a compound of *λυο*, having the sense of to dissolve, to throw down, overthrow, destroy.—Matt. xxvi. 61: "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God." The original word is the same as in the last, and, in this case, shews conclusively the sense attaching to it.—Matt. xxvii. 40. "Thou that destroyest the temple;" the same. Acts vi. 14. "Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place;" the same.—Gal. ii. 18: "If I build again the things which I have destroyed;" the same. Acts xiii. 19: "And having destroyed the seven nations of Canaan." Here the word is the same as in Matt. v. 17.

Thus in all the cases cited by Dr. Angus, the original words, instead of "having no connection with annihilation," directly express that meaning in relation to the several things spoken of. Doubtless the process of philology, applied abstractly, could be made to fritter that meaning out of them; but the original "usage," which is the conclusive test, is in favour of the construction Dr. Angus opposes. The "unfortunateness" that "words so differ-

ent in meaning, should have been translated by the same English word," is an unfortunateness that will be felt only by those who struggle to evade the natural meaning of "destroy" and "destruction." There is no misfortune or difficulty for those who yield to the claims of common sense. Dr. Angus alleges "one advantage" from the so-called unfortunateness. He says "it shows that the translators of the English Bible, who were masters of their own tongue, never supposed that destruction implied of necessity, annihilation." It only shows this if the original words do not mean destruction, as we have shewn they do; and if "destroy" in English does not mean to deprive of being, in the form or substance destroyed; which we all know it does. Finally, it is a matter of little moment what the translators of the English Bible "supposed." That Dr. Angus should take refuge in their opinion, shows he felt weak on the merits of the argument itself; and that he should beg the question by assuming what their opinion was, is still more conclusive on this point.

#### TORMENT.

Par. iii. on "Punishment," is unobjectionable. Aimed at the restorationist, it does not affect the position of those who believe death to be the wages of sin. The remarks on "torment" also concede all that the latter class contend for, as regards the meaning of the terms. They are so much to the point that we reproduce them. "The Greek word (translated torment) means to try sorely. [Footnote: "A glimpse of the old meaning may be seen in Robert of Gloucester's statement, that 'Peter tormented our Lord that they might not perish.'] Of old, jailors were empowered by law to whip or otherwise punish criminals. Hence they were called "tormentors," and hence "tormentor" is defined as "one who inflicts penal torture."—(Ogilvie). A form of the same word is used in the *Septuagint* for a prison-house—(Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 19); another form for grief or heavy calamity, and for trespass-offering or punishment.—(See 1 Sam. vi. 3-4, *Septuagint*.) If, therefore, "punishment" be used everywhere, we shall do more justice to the true meaning. The modern idea of gratuitous cruel suffering is not in the word at all." Nothing could more effectively than these words of Dr. Angus, dispose of any argument for eternal torments, founded on the occurrence of the

word "torment" in the Scriptures. It is unnecessary to add anything on this head.

#### EVERLASTING.

In the same way Dr. Angus puts an end to all argument turning upon the meaning of *aion* and *aionos*, translated "ever" and "everlasting." He quotes the definition of Aristotle (the tutor of Alexander the Great,) which goes to show that these terms did not in ancient usage, have the sense of absolute unendingness associated with them in modern views. True, he quotes the definition for the opposite purpose; but the result is none the less as stated. Having asserted (in opposition to the notion that the word translated "everlasting" may "mean anything"), that "it has a definite meaning notwithstanding," he says, "Aristotle, the tutor of Alexander the Great, has explained it at length. In describing the highest heaven as the residence of the gods, he says, that as to the things there, time never makes them grow old; neither is there any change of any of them. They are unchangeable and passionless, and having the best—even the self-sufficient life, they continue through all (*aiona*) eternity." For the word itself, according to the ancients, divinely expressed this. For the period which comprehends *the time of everyone's life, beyond which, according to nature, nothing exists*, is called his *AION*—(eternity.) And for the same reason also, the period of the whole heaven, even the infinite time of all things, and the period comprehending that infinity, is *aion* (eternity), deriving its name from (*aei etnai*) *always being*, immortal and divine. Whence also it is applied to other things, to some indeed accurately, but to others, in the lax signification of being and of living." The obvious remark upon this is, that if a creature with a limit to existence, "*beyond which, according to nature, nothing exists*," can be said to have an *aion* (eternity), it requires something more than the term *aion* to convey the English idea of absolutely unending duration. The authority quoted, declares that "the time of every one's life is his *aion*." The length of his life, therefore, determines the length of his *aion*. If his life is endless, so will his *aion* be. If it is "three score and ten," his *aion* is a limited time, which would be absurd if *aion* had the English idea of eternity. It is manifestly unavailing to base the doctrine of "endless torments" on the declaration that the wicked shall be punished in the

*aion* (translated "for ever"); or that they shall be subject to *aionion* (translated everlasting) punishment. These statements merely point to the fact that there is an *aion* appointed in the arrangements of God for the punishment of the wicked, viz., "the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus." The punishment pertaining to the age will be *aionion*, for two reasons; first, it appertains to the *aion* of divine retribution. Its nature we must learn from more specific statements, such as those submitted earlier in this reply; from which we know that that punishment is irremediable shame, corruption and death; and second, it will be all-prevailing over the wicked, leaving no room for escape or exemption—fully covering "the time of every (wicked) one's life," and sealing their existence for ever in destruction.

When it is said that this mode of treating *aionion* (everlasting), applied to the life of the righteous, destroys the guarantee of its unendingness, a mistake is made. The immortality of the righteous does not depend upon any construction of *aion*, and its derivations. It is plainly affirmed that "neither can die any more"—(Luke xx. 36); that "there shall be no more death" (Rev. xxi. 4); that "this mortal shall put on immortality."—(1 Cor. xv. 53.) For this reason, we know that *aionion* life—the life to be bestowed in the *aion* or age to come—is unending life—that the *aion* of the righteous is not a limited *aion* like that of the wicked which ends in death. Hence the argument that the death of the wicked necessitates the death of the righteous; or the immortality of the righteous that of the wicked; because the same term is applied to their several destinies, falls to the ground. Even if it were proved that the terms in question mean absolute everlastingness, the controversy between Dr. Angus and his opponents would still be unsettled, for there would remain the question, What is the everlasting lot of the righteous, and what the everlasting lot of the wicked? To these questions Dr. Angus himself could take no exception to this answer: The everlasting lot of the righteous will be LIFE; the everlasting lot of the wicked, DEATH. As to the nature of life and death in this connection, we have already said enough to show the weakness of Dr. Angus's position.

#### HADES.

This, one of the words translated "hell,"

receives but passing notice at the hands of Dr. Angus, and he makes it by no means clear what he understands by it. "It means properly," he says, "the unseen state," but what this is, he does not say. It is not the grave, and it is not "hell," in his opinion; for as to the former, he says it is "once translated the grave," in the New Testament, as much as to suggest that this is an exceptional use, and, as to the "hell" of popular belief, he makes a careful distinction between it and "hades," in commenting upon Rev. xx. 14, saying "it will be noted that the death and hell cast into the lake of fire, are simply death and *hades*:" upon which he straightway denies that the passage teaches there is an end of hell itself.

What then is this "*hades*" which is translated "hell" so many times, and by which the English reader understands the orthodox place of torment? Its meaning, as stated by Dr. Angus, is "unseen;" but in what relation? for many things and states are unseen. Its application to the grave settles the question.—(1 Cor. xv. 55.) This application is extensively illustrated in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. Dr. Angus admits this in saying "it is generally translated grave, in the Old Testament." There is, consequently, no need to show that this is the case. It is only needful to say that the New Testament furnishes abundant evidence of this same meaning. 1 Cor. xv. 55 gives us the word "grave" in the common version, and in many other places where it is rendered "hell," the meaning is self-evidently the grave. For instance, Peter proves the divine purpose to raise Jesus from the grave, by quoting Psalm xvi. 10: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell*—(*hades*)." Jesus says, "the gates of *hell* (*hades*) shall not prevail against his church," which, considering that his church never got inside the gates of hell, in the orthodox sense, is conclusive against *hades* meaning hell in that sense, and as conclusive of "grave" being the meaning; for the gates of the grave do close over his church, but shall not prevail; for he has the keys of *hell* (*hades*) and death; and opening the gates, will release his prisoners (Zech. ix. 11.) He is "the resurrection and the life," and says "I will raise them up at the last day."—(John vi. 39.) Again, "death and hell are to be cast into the lake of fire." The lake of fire is explained (Rev. xx. 14) to be symbolical of "the second death." This second death destroys the wicked, and, therefore, destroys death

and the grave; for when there are no wicked surviving, death and the grave disappear from earth's experiences.

There is sound sense in this use of *hades* to signify the grave. As Dr. Angus observes, it means the unseen state; and when does a man go into this state but when he dies, and is laid in the grave, and covered from sight and left to moulder into dust? Does it mean the disembodied state—the state in which Dr. Angus teaches all men continue to exist after death? If so, how are we to understand the statement upon which Dr. Angus has himself commented—that death and *hades* are to be cast into the lake of fire? Does it mean that the disembodied state is to be swallowed up in the hell-state? How can this be, when disembodied sinners are already in hell, according to Dr. Angus's theology. Still worse, according to the same system, the righteous are in the disembodied state as well as the wicked, and how are we to suppose that their disembodied state is to be merged in the fires of damnation?

If Dr. Angus says that *hades* is the intermediate state of the damned, he only kicks against the pricks in another direction, for surely Christ, whose soul in death was in *hades*—but not left there—was not among the disembodied ghosts of the damned at the time when Dr. Angus's system says he was "in Paradise," and surely, his church, against whom the gates of *hades* are not to prevail, is never immured in so horrible a confinement; and, surely, it is no part of Christ's office to liberate the justly-detained tenants of such a place.

If, with some others, he adopt the theory that *hades* is the general rendezvous of the immortal ghosts of the dead, good and bad alike, awaiting the general gaol delivery of "the last day," he places himself in opposition to his own professed theology, and the general tradition of Protestant Christendom, according to both of which, "the righteous, at their death, do immediately enter into glory." He then appears as the advocate of a new creed, and will quickly find himself as much at a discount as those who, in opposition to him, contend that "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." There is only one effectual escape from all these dilemmas, and that is, that *hades* is the grave or state of the dead in death, in which, as the Scripture informs us, "there is no remembrance of God" (Psalm vi. 5),

"and no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom" (Eccle. ix. 10); for "the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything \* \* \*; also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished."—(Eccle. ix. 5.) "Death cannot praise thee: the grave (*hades*) cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth."—(Isaiah xxxviii. 18.)

#### GEHENNA.

This is the other word translated hell. Dr. Angus admits that "as a word, it means [the fire of] the valley of Hinnom" or son of Hinnom; and that this valley lay outside the walls of Jerusalem, and received the deposits of the filth of the city, in which the worm revelled and the fire was kept constantly burning. He quotes the view that it is to be considered an emblem of hell, in the orthodox sense, and that, therefore, the term Gehenna is properly represented by the word hell, and refers at length also to Jewish opinions, but he is so entirely non-committal that there is nothing to answer. He has "laid no stress" on the opinions quoted. This he would have done, if they had been worthy of it. Therefore, they may be passed over without detriment to the argument. The only effort of his own is in this mild form: "It does not follow that there is no deeper, truer meaning" than that recognised by those who, hearing Jesus, "thought only of a local Gehenna." The answer to this must be in the same shape: "It does not follow because some have thought the local Gehenna a fit emblem of the hell of their creed, that Gehenna means the orthodox place of torture." This response is in the spirit of Prov. xxvi. 5. It is the only answer to such a limited argument. The weakness of the case for orthodoxy is very evident when a man of Dr. Angus's strength has nothing stronger to offer at this really vital point in the argument. He does venture to say that the Jews understood Gehenna "as well, and in senses as profound and awful" as modern Christians, but as this is a mere assertion and nothing to the point if proved, (seeing the Jews were declared by Jesus to have made void the word of God by their tradition), it may pass without further notice. If the local Gehenna of Jerusalem was used by Jesus as an emblem at all, it was surely an emblem of the death and corruption that reigned in it, and not of a torment that was impossible to the

dead bodies cast into it. Surely he used it to illustrate the fate of the wicked revealed in all the Scriptures—rejection, dishonour, and destruction, and not that imagined by the schools—objectless sufferings through endless eternity.

### THE WRATH OF GOD.

As to this phase of the subject to which Dr. Angus devotes seven paragraphs, it is not necessary to do more than admit the correctness of his definitions as a whole, but to say that they do not touch the controversy as to the destiny of the wicked. God's anger with them (Psalm vii. 1'), will be admitted by every one who reverences the Scripture. The question is, how will His anger take effect? In their torture or destruction? This has already been discussed with a result which it must be left to the reader to recognize for himself, and which probably he will see reflected in the statement: "Mine anger shall cease in their destruction."—(Isaiah x. 28.)

### THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

To this, Dr. Angus devotes paragraph viii. He does not attempt to show it is a doctrine of the Bible. He says it is wide-spread belief. This is a fact, but cannot be used as an argument, for ignorance is more wide-spread than knowledge. Ignorance is natural—knowledge has to be acquired. Therefore ignorance is wide-spread. The vast majority of mankind are content with that which they attain without effort, and to leave unattended to, that which involves labour. A wide-spread belief, therefore, on a matter requiring discernment, is likely to be a wrong belief. Illustration is to be found in the superstitions prevalent among ignorant people. Taking the population of the world as a whole, it is a wide-spread belief that there are many gods; it is a wide-spread belief that the earth is flat, and the sun a traveller round it; it is a wide-spread belief that the stars influence destiny. It is not much, therefore, but rather damaging, to say that the immortality of the soul is a wide-spread belief. It is to say that for that very reason, it is likely to be a false belief.

But, Dr. Angus says "It is sustained by all the arguments which a subject so difficult admits." He does not specify the arguments; therefore the statement is sufficiently met by the counter assertion that when put into the crucible of inductive philosophy, the doctrine disappears entirely,

since every argument proving the immateriality and immortality of man, has the same effect with regard to the brutes, and even vegetable forms. Probably in view of this, Dr. Angus puts the case for natural immortality a little timidly. "So far as we know," he says, "there is nothing in the make of the soul that tends naturally to death.

God, we have no reason to doubt, can destroy the soul, but to destroy it needs, so far as reason and analogy teach, some external interposition." [Note while passing, how easily Dr. Angus uses "destroy" in its natural sense, when untrammelled with the exigencies of a theory. The meaning he allows it when using it himself, he denies when the Bible uses it of the wicked. This is very significant.] What does Dr. Angus mean by "the soul?" He speaks of it as an entity known and recognized on both sides of the controversy, and therefore to be assumed. This is a mistake. It begs the question at the starting point. The existence of a separable thinking entity called a soul, is denied by those whom Dr. Angus writes to oppose. They contend that man is "of the earth earthy (1 Cor. xv. 47), formed from the ground (Gen. ii. 7), living substance" (Gen. vii. 4), and that this clay-formed man is the thinking creature as well as the living creature, and that his mental characteristics are no more separable from his constitution as an earth-born, than is the flexibility of his hair separable from his hair. The eye for seeing, the ear for hearing, the brain for thinking—God is equally the maker of all; but pagan philosophy atheistically denied the possibility of God making brain-substance think, and invented the speculation that the thinker was an immortal, immaterial man inside the mortal, material man, as if this made the matter any plainer! Surely if it is difficult to conceive of a finely-organised electrical instrument like the brain thinking (when we feel and see continually that it does), it is a million times more difficult to imagine an invisible shadow doing it! Dr. Angus has inherited the speculation of the pagans on the subject, and speaks of the "soul" as a thing to be taken for granted in the pagan sense. This confuses the controversy. The explanation of terms is essential to its disentanglement. There is a vital energy in man, but so there is in the beast. All vital energy is of God, and returns to Him when the creature dies. The spirit or mind in man is generated by the operations of his wonderful vital mechanism. It is interfered with when those operations are suspended,

as in the case of a sudden arrest of the circulation of the blood, producing fainting and unconsciousness; or concussion of the brain by violence, producing total insensibility. Death is a dissolution of the machinery that develops individual mentality, and a consequent lapse of individual life and consciousness. According to the machinery, organisation, or constitution, is the nature of the mentality exhibited. Thus a finely-developed brain, with corresponding completeness of bodily organisation, will exhibit power, where an imperfect brain shows idiocy. A human brain shows human mentality; a dog brain, dog mentality. The power is the same. Man and beast have all one breath.—(Eccles. iii. 19.) God created the beast by His power as well as man.—(Psalm civ. 30.) All things live in Him and by His life; and if He were to focally recal to Himself the outflowing energy of His spirit, all flesh would equally perish.—(Job xxxiv. 14.) Hence, when Dr. Angus talks of "the make of the soul," he speaks really of the life which every animate form derives from God. This life in the abstract is not an individual, which Pagan philosophy has made it; but a portion of the universal power which emanates from the Eternal Fountain of life.—(Ps. xxxvi. 9.) With this application, his conclusion is true enough—that "there is nothing in it that tends naturally to death." God is immortal—"HE ONLY hath immortality."—(1 Tim. vi. 16.) To the righteous recalled from death, God will give the same (Romans i. 7-9), for their "corruptible will put on incorruptibility, and their mortal put on immortality," (1 Cor. xv. 53,) "that mortality might be swallowed up of life."—(2 Cor. v. 4.)

With the "reasoners" who "admit that the soul does live on for ages, after the body has perished," and who "hold that death is simply the separation of body and soul," this argument has nothing in common; and, therefore, the shafts levelled by Dr. Angus at them, fly harmlessly overhead.

The "analogy of the seed which lives in death" is next put under tribute. Dr. Angus says this analogy is used by Jesus and Paul. That they use a sown seed in illustration of the dead and their resurrection, is true, but it is not true that they contemplate it as "living in death." Paul distinctly says "that which thou sowest is not quickened *except it die*," (1 Cor. xv. 36), and Jesus lays still greater emphasis on the fact of death occurring: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground *and die*, it abideth alone; but *if it die*, it bringeth forth much fruit."—(John xii. 24.) Hence, the very basis of Dr. Angus's analogy—viz., the assumption that the seed *lives in death*—is a fallacy. That a seed carries with it to the ground a germinal vitality is, of course, true, but it yields up that vitality to the new form developed, and as the individual seed that was sown, it perishes or dies, and never re-appears. Used as Jesus and Paul use these facts, the illustration is cogent, but as Dr. Angus uses them, it is the opposite; for if it is made to teach that "death only dissolves our bodies into their elements, leaving untouched the living germ," it would require that the living germ should go with the body into the grave, instead of leaving the body and mounting to the skies, as Dr. Angus's theory teaches.

### THIRD LETTER.

The last of the three letters written by Dr. Angus to prove eternal torments may be dismissed with very few remarks. It is devoted to "alleviations" which he finds it necessary to exhibit by way of off-set to the "dark shadow" which he admits eternal torments constitute in the picture of God's dealings. This "dark shadow" being but a shadow and no reality, we have no need to follow the thoughts by which it is sought to soften down the horrible nature of the doctrines advocated.

The ways of the Almighty, when seen apart from the distortions of Pagan imagination, are too pure and righteous to require "alleviations" to enable us to endure them. His very judgments justify Him to our face. The destruction of the antediluvians by the flood, the perdition of Sodom, the desolations of Israel are but so many illustrations of the great fact that the wages of sin is death; and how blessed a fact is this! While punishing, it cures. While judicially dealing with

evil, it extinguishes it. While vindicating the dishonoured majesty of the heavens and repaying the malice of wicked men, it allays the suffering caused to God and man by human perversity, and brings the blessed guarantee that at the last, good will prevail, and the earth be filled with glory and everlasting joy, when the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and there shall be no more curse and no more death.—(Rev. xxi. 4; xxii. 3.)

The task proposed is now completed. Dr. Angus's arguments in support of the popular doctrine of eternal torments have been put to the test, and the result has been to manifest the slimness and unreality of the foundation on which the terrible fabric rests, and further, to bring into view another and an opposite doctrine, which Paul has taught, but which Christendom has lost, that "sin hath reigned unto death."—(Rom. v. 21; vi. 23.) This other view, doubtless, lessens the dignity and importance of human nature. Men appear in a more interesting light when considered as native immortals, than as a race of earth-borns perishing under sentence of death; but a question of truth is not to be decided by sentiment. On the other hand, if our sentiments are disagreeably affected by the view set forth, there is the compensating advantage of that view being in harmony with our experience, and settling a few difficulties which are ever troubling thoughtful minds in the orthodox school. Experience of men is not accordant with the notion that they are of celestial origin and nature. Persons exclusively moving in cultivated society, or surveying the world from the "country-seat" point of view—young ladies living in refinement, and knowing nothing of the world but what they learn from morocco-bound editions of the poets,—may dream themselves into harmony with the notion that man is an immortal "creature of the sky;" but very different feelings are engendered by contact with the great, coarse, selfish, unprincipled work-a-day world, or still better, with savage man in the dark places of the earth. By such contact we are made to feel instinctively how degraded a creature he is, when left to the resources of his own nature, and how much he is "of the earth, earthy;" and how true are the unsentimental descriptions of the Bible

which tell us that "all flesh is as grass;" that "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" (Eccles. iii. 19); that all nations are less than nothing, and vanity.—(Isaiah xl. 17.) In this state of things, we find no difficulty when we consider that mankind are the descendants of the condemned man of Eden, having been suffered to walk in their own way (Acts xiv. 16); and providentially employed in subduing the earth, and fitting it for a habitation of righteousness in a better day to come. We can even discover wisdom where orthodox belief presents mystery of the most staggering and bewildering kind. Death among the sinning millions, upon all of whom it has passed with the nature they have inherited from Adam, is a benign dispensation of justice. Hell as their destiny would be the arrangement of a fiend. And what if the heathen die to rise no more (Isaiah xxvi. 14, Psalm xlix. 19-20; and infancy passes away as though it had not been (Job iii. 16; x. 19), this is but a momentary offence to sympathy, and has none of the anomalies brought with the orthodox view. The dead are unconscious of deprivation. They know not anything.—(Eccle. ix. 5) Therefore, we need not sorrow on their account. The law of God is that death having passed upon all, life can only be entered by belief and obedience of the faith that is in Christ.—(Heb. v. 9; Acts xx. 32; xxvi. 18.) Heathen and children being circumstantially beyond the operation of this law, are unredeemed. Consequently, they remain under the dominion of death. Their salvation, as taught by orthodox religion, upsets the revealed principle that ignorance alienates from the life of God (Eph. iv. 18) and that without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb. xi. 6), and that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation.—(Rom. i. 16.) Their damnation, in the sense of consignment to the orthodox hell, would be a frustration of all our endeavours to recognize justice or beauty in the divine arrangement. The middle ground afforded by the doctrine of man's mortality evades all difficulty, and establishes harmony between the conclusions of experience and the teachings of the Bible. Truth always agrees with itself. May it prevail, to the discomfiture of error and the emancipation of the groaning millions.

*Note for page 6.*—This is an inadvertent misquotation, which on account of the typography being stereotyped before it was discovered, could not be altered. Dr. Angus's words were, "What good men trust to as just." The misquotation is due to the fact that the words were copied from a phonographic copy instead of the printed original, "as" being mistaken for "is," and the "to" not being sufficiently indicated to arrest attention. The mistake fortunately matters little. The comment on the misquoted words is to show it was "eternal torments" Dr. Angus meant when he spoke of future punishment. As it is beyond doubt this is his meaning, the argument to show it can be dispensed with.—R.R.