

## CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS.

To be had through the Doorkeeper wherever Christadelphian Lectures are delivered: or by Post of C. C. WALKER, 21, Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham.

### WORKS OF DR. THOMAS.

ELPIS ISRAEL, 478 pp., 7s. 5d. post free: in the United States, 2 dol. 65 cents.

EUREKA, in 3 vols.: an Exposition of the Apocalypse, 2,114 pp., 31s. 2d. post free; in the United States, 10 dol. 45 cents.

### OTHER WORKS.

J. THOMAS'S LIFE AND WORK, by R. ROBERTS, 4s. 6d.; or post free, 4s. 10d.; in the United States, 1 dol. 70 cents.

CHRISTENDOM ASTRAY: over 400 pp., by R. ROBERTS, cloth, 3s. 4d. post free; in the United States, 1 dol. 20 cents.

SEASONS OF COMFORT: 52 Sunday Morning Addresses by R. ROBERTS, 4s. Post free, 4s. 4d.; in the United States, 1 dol. 80 cents.

THE WAYS OF PROVIDENCE (27 chapters): by R. ROBERTS, 3s. By post, 3s. 4d.; in the United States, 1 dol. 10 cents.

THE TRIAL: Did Christ Rise from the Dead? by R. ROBERTS, price 3s. 10d. post free; in the United States, 1 dol. 25 cents.

THE VISIBLE HAND OF GOD: or the place of miracles in the history of the world, 30 chapters, by R. ROBERTS, 3s. 6d.; post free, 3s. 10d.; in the United States, 1 dol. 35 cents.

GUIDE TO THE FORMATION and conduct of Christadelphian Ecclesias, by R. ROBERTS, price 6d.; 7d. post free; in the United States, 20 cents.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN, a monthly Periodical, edited by C. C. WALKER, 8s. 0d. per annum; in the United States, 2½ dols.

ENGLAND AND EGYPT: Prophecy Fulfilled and Fulfilling, by R. ROBERTS, 7d. post free; in the United States, 20 cents.

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT NOT ETERNAL TORMENTS: being a Reply to the "Rev." Dr. Angus's argument in favour of the popular view of the unrighteous; by R. ROBERTS, 6d. By Post 7d.; in the United States, 20 cents.

THE DECLARATION: the Truth defined in a series of Propositions, with Proof Texts in full, 52 pp.; 3d. post free; in the United States, 7 cents.

RETURN OF CHRIST TO THE EARTH: Four Lectures (Town Hall) by R. ROBERTS, 6d.; by Post, 7d.; in the United States, 19 cents.

THE EVIL ONE: a Lecture by R. ROBERTS, 3d.; by Post, 3½d.; in the United States, 10 cents.

THE LAW OF MOSES as a Rule of National and Individual Life, and Enigmatical Enunciation of Divine Principles and Purposes. By R. ROBERTS, 4s.; by post, 4s. 4d.; in the United States, 1 dol. 10 cents.

THE BIBLE COMPANION: being Tables for the Daily Reading of the Holy Scriptures; post free 1½d.; in the United States, 5 cents.

Also a variety of small works and leaflets for distribution.—Catalogues post free on application.

FRANK JUCKES, Printer, 160, Aston Street, Corporation Street, Birmingham.

330

IS THE BIBLE AGAINST

THE

Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul?

A TWO NIGHTS' DISCUSSION,

IN THE

TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM,

ON TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10TH AND 11TH, 1866,

BETWEEN

R. ROBERTS,

Late Editor of the "Christadelphian,"

AND

R. C. NIGHTINGALE,

(At that time Minister of the Free Church, Severn St., Birmingham)

BIRMINGHAM:

C. C. WALKER, 21, HENDON ROAD, SPARKHILL.

FOURTH EDITION.

1904.

IS THE BIBLE AGAINST

THE

Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul?

A TWO NIGHTS' DISCUSSION,

IN THE

TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM,

ON TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10TH AND 11TH, 1866,

BETWEEN

R. ROBERTS,

*Late Editor of the "Christadelphian,"*

AND

R. C. NIGHTINGALE,

*(At that time Minister of the Free Church, Severn St., Birmingham).*

BIRMINGHAM :

C. C. WALKER, 21, HENDON ROAD, SPARKHILL.

FOURTH EDITION.

1904.

## PREFACE.

---

The following discussion took place in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, on the 10th and 11th April, 1866. The Rev. Charles Britain, Chaplain of the Birmingham Workhouse, presided.

The discussion arose through Mr. Nightingale having read Mr. Roberts' "Twelve Lectures on the True Teaching of the Bible," for the last twenty years and more better known under its new title of "Christendom Astray." Dissenting strongly from the views therein advocated, he proposed to Mr. Roberts a public discussion, which was duly arranged as here reported.

Mr. Nightingale's speeches are reported from shorthand notes taken by Mr. Roberts and revised in transcript by Mr. Nightingale. Mr. Roberts' speeches are reproduced from memory by himself. The Chairman having read the first sixteen pages said:—"As far as my memory serves me the report is very accurate."

The Time occupied each evening was two hours; each speaker having one half hour, and two quarter hour speeches, each night.

## DISCUSSION

---

*"IS THE BIBLE AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE  
IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL?"*

---

THE CHAIRMAN (Rev. C. Brittain) : Ladies and Gentlemen, I owe my position to-night to the kindness of the two Committees supporting the gentleman engaged in this discussion. They did me the honour to invite me by unanimous request to occupy the chair to-night and to-morrow evening; and, in thanking them, I can only promise you that I will do all that in me lies to act fairly and impartially between the two gentlemen who will appear before you as disputants to-night. The subject of debate is one of great importance; but, of course, it is one of which a person in my position, as a clergyman of the Church of England, is presumed to have made up his mind. As Chairman of this discussion, I deemed it my duty to give Mr. Roberts's book a careful reading: and I must say I could discover in it no approach to flippancy or irreverence. The various subjects treated of are argued out in a calm and careful and becoming spirit, and I have no doubt that his convictions are sincere. I think it right on his part to say—indeed he has requested me to say it—that he has no connection with any of the unbelieving associations of the time, but comes forward entirely on his own responsibility. I shall not occupy any more of your time, but simply express the hope that we may spend a pleasant and profitable couple of evenings together. Indeed, from what I have seen of the disputants, I have no doubt this will be the case. I shall now call upon Mr. Roberts to open the debate.

Mr. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen,—In opening this discussion, I am anxious, in the first place, to make perfectly clear a little point to which the Chairman has adverted, but which he has not brought out in the prominent light that was desirable, though I don't suppose this defect arises from any want of proper intention on his part. He has told you that I don't appear as the representative of any unbelieving, Bible-denying community, but come forward on my own responsibility. This is true: but it leaves it open to the inference, that though not connected with unbelievers, I am myself an unbeliever. Now, this is the impression I am, most of all, anxious to prevent. I am as much a believer in the Bible as Mr. Nightingale, and it is because I believe the Bible, that I am prepared to maintain against him that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is a delusion—the mere induction of ancient philosophy, as illogical and unfounded as nearly all the theories of ancient philosophy have proved to be. This subject of the immortality of the soul, as the Chairman has said, is one of great importance. It is impossible to

overrate its importance in a religious point of view. All the great systems of religion that overspread the world, are based upon the doctrine that man has within him a separable, immaterial, thinking entity, styled the immortal soul. All religious theories hinge upon the supposition that this entity outlives the body, and is destined, as a human individuality, to exist for ever in a state of happiness or misery. This belief is the mainspring of all religious operations, the pivot of all religious systems, the very foundation of all religious creed. Should it, therefore, turn out that this belief is untrue—opposed both to the teaching of the Bible and the evidence of sense—the results are necessarily revolutionary in the religious mind surrendering to this conviction. Some may be disposed to doubt the importance of the question one way or other. They may think it a mere matter of theory, the holding or non-holding of which will not, in any way, affect eternal destiny. But those who would take this loose view of the matter (and they are many in these rationalistic days), are not students of the Bible.

They can scarcely, in the intelligent sense, be considered believers of the Bible; for it is the doctrine of the Bible that salvation depends, in the first instance, upon a reception of the doctrines of Christ. The gospel, it is said, is the power of God unto salvation; and the way in which that power was applied in the days of the apostles was by the preaching and belief of it. Now, it could neither be preached nor believed without consisting of definite subject-matter—that is, specific points of belief, or creed, if you will, cognizable to the mind and demonstrable to the judgment. Now, if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is true, it must be part and parcel of the gospel, since the gospel, in that case, must be presumed to be founded on the fact that the soul is immortal, and requires rescue from hell. Hence, to deny the immortality of the soul would be to deny the gospel, and, therefore, to be beyond the pale of the salvation predicated on a belief of the gospel. On the other hand, if the doctrine be untrue, and if the gospel be something which involves the exclusion of it, then it follows that the believer in the immortality of the soul cannot be a believer of the gospel, and is equally excluded from salvation, as on the other supposition. Hence, the question in dispute is one of the most vital that can possibly be debated in any assembly of professed believers in the Word of God. But it is, perhaps, unnecessary to occupy time with any argument of this kind. Mr. Nightingale, I presume, agrees with me that the question at issue involves what would be called 'essentials.' He, doubtless, believes me to be out of the pale of salvation in disbelieving in the immortality of the soul, as I as confidently believe him to be in holding it. There is, therefore, a broad and important issue to which we may, at once, address ourselves. My proposition, then, is that the Bible is against this doctrine, and entirely on the other side. In the first place, the Bible makes no mention of it. Nowhere, from Genesis to Revelation, do you find it affirmed that human beings are immortal. Nowhere do you find it affirmed that human souls are immortal. Not once do you come across the phrases in such constant use among religious people of the

nineteenth century—"immortal souls," "immortality of the soul," "never-dying soul," "precious, immortal soul," and so on. Is not this a very remarkable fact? Can you deny it to be a fact? Which of you, who are readers of the New Testament, can put your finger on a single passage containing a phrase like those currently employed to designate and express the great religious belief of the age? You cannot. No such passage is in existence. The Bible is as silent with regard to the immortality of the soul as if no such doctrine had ever been conceived. Now, how is this to be accounted for? How are you to explain the fact that the Bible makes no mention of that which must be its first and most vital doctrine, if true? It will not do to say that silence means consent; because, once to admit such a principle of interpretation, would open the gates for every form of error. The Bible says nothing of transmigration of souls. Are we, therefore, to infer it teaches it? The Bible says nothing about Brahma or Mahomet. How would it do to suggest that these objects of superstitious faith are to be taken for granted? Mr. Nightingale would not be so unwise. I, therefore, claim that the doctrine of the immortality be treated in the same way. I submit, as my first argument, that the Bible is against the immortality of the soul, because it is totally silent about it. I maintain that the doctrine is but an induction of ancient philosophy, incorporated with the resurrection doctrines of Christianity in the early centuries, and by degrees established as the root and mainspring of orthodox faith. My next argument is this, that the Bible is against the immortality of the soul, because it propounds a theory of immortality which precludes the other doctrine altogether. It tells us that Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.—(1 Tim. i. 10.) What is the meaning of this? To bring to light is to search out or fish up something previously concealed in darkness, to expose to gaze or knowledge something that before was hidden or unknown. Now, Paul's testimony is that Jesus did this for immortality, in relation to man. And whatever sense you choose to attach to the statement, it is fatal to the Platonic doctrine of natural immortality. If it means that he made it known, it follows it must have been something different from the immortality of the soul now believed in, because that was made known 400 years before Christ, by Socrates and Plato, and was believed by the Egyptians even before their time. How could Jesus "bring to light" that which was no longer in darkness? If it means that he made known the way to attain to immortality, then it proves that we are not naturally possessed of immortality, for we cannot conceive of Jesus shewing us the way to get that which we already had in our possession. If we take the New Testament version of the matter, the statement seems plain. That version is that "By man came death, by man also (that is by Jesus) came the resurrection of the dead."—(1 Cor. xv. 13.) "By one man," we are told, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin." A comprehension of this Bible statement will qualify us to understand the other statement that Jesus brought immortality to light.

You will perceive it takes us away back to the garden of Eden. It refers to the event historically recorded in Gen. iii. and as that event is both the historical and doctrinal antecedent to Christ's mission, we must give it a moment's consideration, before concerning ourselves further with New Testament testimony. You are too well acquainted with the narrative of Adam's transgression to make it necessary to read it in detail, but you may not have noticed the consequence of that transgression very particularly. I, therefore, call your special attention to the language in which that consequence is announced to Adam: "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, I ask, if this is not the death referred to by Paul, when he says "By man came DEATH?" Of course it is. This being so, we get a distinct notion of what the "LIFE" is that was brought to light by Jesus. The death to which Adam became liable was not what is properly styled "eternal death." There is no mention of "hell" in the sentence; no hint of *post-mortem* penalty of any kind. The sentence is simply a decree of dissolution of being: "*Dust thou ART, and unto dust shalt thou return.*" In this we are inevitably involved, as the descendants of Adam; because whatever physical conditions appertained to him, would necessarily be transmitted to posterity; for posterity is neither more nor less than a transmission of his own being. In scriptural language, "The clean cannot come out of the unclean;" in the language of experimental philosophy, "Like produces like." Hence, of necessity, the death decreed upon Adam, "passed upon all men," because 'all men' are but the propagations of Adam. In this, there is nothing incomprehensible or unjust; but if the death incurred by Adam's transgression is "eternal banishment from the presence of God, and endless misery in the torments of hell," then it is both incomprehensible and unjust that we should be involved in such a terrible doom, by an act in which we had no participation. But my contention is that the death which resulted from Adam's transgression is bodily dissolution, or an extinction of being; and if the argument be admitted, beauty and mercy will be seen in the law which constitutes death the wages of sin. Under the operation of this law, made doubly binding through Adamic descent and individual delinquency, we were hopelessly mortal. Immortality was truly hid from our eyes, both as a theory and a practical attainment; but Christ brought it to light. How? By representatively suffering the penalty which was destroying us, and escaping its dominion through his sinlessness permitting of his resurrection by God, and surviving as a name, by connection with which men may acquire a title to resurrection unto life. "By man also came the RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD," (not the escaping of immortal souls from hell, and then translation to heaven). Said Jesus, "I am the RESURRECTION and the life"—not the going to heaven. "He that believeth in me, *THOUGH HE WERE DEAD, yet shall he live.*"—(John xi. 25.) "I give my sheep eternal life," he says, "and they shall never perish."—(John x. 28.) "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it

more abundantly."—(John x. 10.) "This is the will of Him that sent me, that he that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."—(John vi. 40.) "Of all that the Father hath given me, I shall lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day."—(John vi. 39.) "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but might have *everlasting life.*"—(John iii. 16.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through his name."—(John xx. 31.) "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK for glory, honour, and *immortality, (God will reward) eternal life.*"—(Rom. ii. 7.)

I submit these testimonies in proof that the immortality which Christ brought to light is a thing to be conditionally bestowed;—that it is not an inherent attribute of human nature, but a thing to be "sought for" and received at the hands of Christ by resurrection. Another plain New Testament fact with which the burial service has made the majority of people familiar, is that the immortality brought to light by Christ has relation to our bodies, and not to a presumed immaterial essence dwelling within us. "THIS MORTAL must put on *immortality*, Paul says in 1. Cor. xv. 53. Again, "Not that we would be unclothed but clothed upon with our house (body), which is from heaven, that MORTALITY might be swallowed up of life."—(2 Cor. v. 4.) Again, "He shall change our VILE BODY that it may be fashioned like unto *his glorious body.*"—(Philip. iii. 21.) If Bible immortality is conditional and has reference to the bodies of men, it is quite evident it must be very different from the immortality of popular belief, which is natural, inherent, indestructible, and the quality not of the body, but of an immaterial essence which is only presumed to exist. Therefore, I contend, on this second argument, that the Bible is against the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

But there is a third argument which more forcibly than the others, it may be, strengthens the proposition I am seeking to establish. I refer to what the Bible teaches of the constitution of man and the state of the dead. On this subject, I would call attention to what is said about the creation of Adam. The words are: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man became a living soul.*" Now, there is nothing here to sanction the popular view of the human constitution. It is not said that God imparted to the clay-formed man an immortal soul, but simply that the clay-organism became a living soul on transfusion with the breath of life. If we want to know the force of the phrase, "living soul," as here employed, we have only to turn to the account of the creation of the lower orders of existence. You will find them styled living souls as well.—(Gen. i. 20, 21, 24.) True, the English version renders the phrase "living creature," but if you will look at the margin, you will find "living soul" substituted. The words in the original are the same. If the application of the phrase "living soul" to Adam, then, proves his immortality, it proves the same thing for the beasts, and therefore,

for Mr. Nightingale, it would prove too much. A living soul is simply a living creature—a creature that lives by breathing the breath of life. In this respect, man and animals stand in the same position. There is no difference between them as to the mode of their existence. This is Solomon's explicit testimony in Eccles. iii. 18: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and they might see that *they themselves are beasts*. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, *they have all one breath*; so THAT A MAN HATH NO PRE-EMINENCE ABOVE A BEAST; for all is vanity." With this agrees the general tenour of Scripture allusion to human nature. Abraham styles himself "dust and ashes" (Gen. xviii. 27), and Job affirms of mankind in general that their foundation is in *the dust*."—(Job iv. 19.) David says: "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that *we are dust*. As for man, *his days are as grass*; as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth, for the wind passeth over it and it is gone, and the place thereof shall know it no more."—(Psalm ciii. 14-16.) Now, all this is at entire variance with the theory which represents human nature in its essence as an immortal thing, destined to outlive the decay of "the body," and differing in kind and mode of existence from every kindred form of animal life around us; and it is in singular contrast with the high-flown words in which preachers dilate on the value of human life. This discrepancy, I submit, can only be accounted for by the fact which I maintain, that the Bible doctrine of the human constitution is opposed to the Platonic; that the Bible teaches man to be mortal instead of immortal, and material instead of immaterial; and consequently adopts a style of language expressive of the one idea and destructive of the other. This fact comes out more strikingly in connection with Bible allusion to the death state. In Psalm lxxxviii. 12, the grave is called the land of FORGETFULNESS; and in Job x. 21, "*the land of darkness* and the shadow of death; a *land of darkness, as darkness itself*." This is no doubt, a little metaphorical, but we must remember that metaphor has its foundation in the literal. It is but the poetical expression of the literal, and figuratively expresses a literal fact. Now, what literal fact is it that justifies David in styling the grave "the land of forgetfulness?" Popular theology supplies none, for in the death state it is taught that memory survives, and even acts with greater vigour than in life; but if we take Bible declaration on the subject we shall see great force in the Bible metaphor. The Bible declaration is, "*In death, THERE IS NO REMEMBRANCE OF THEE*; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?"—(Psalm vi. 5.) "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."—(Eccles. ix. 5, 6.) "Put not your trust in princes; nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help: his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day HIS THOUGHTS PERISH*."—(Psalm cxlvi. 3, 4.) ("Time" called.)

MR. NIGHTINGALE: Gentlemen, all I have to say is, if that is

all Mr. Roberts has to advance in support of his theory, I am not much afraid. If his first say is his best, his last won't be worth much. He made one grand mistake in beginning. He made a great many other mistakes as well; but the grand mistake of all was, proving it impossible we could have immortality before he proved that we were mortal. He ought to have proved we were mortal first, and then gone on to prove that we could not have immortality. His reasonings were something like his texts, very little to the point, and not at all to the purpose. I am very thankful that Mr. Roberts has given us quite clearly to understand what he means to bring forward. He has shown us his child, and we are quite enabled to see what a poor rickety thing it is. It is not so much the fault of the child as the system which has hatched and produced it. I give Mr. Roberts credit for all honesty. I believe he is a thoroughly honest man, in love with the truth, and seeking after the truth for its own sake. Still, I think he has arrived at wrong views, and drawn false conclusions; so that I don't mean to speak softly on the subject. My friend was quite correct in stating that I thought him very much in error. I do think so. I hold it to be a most deadly error that he professes; and in what I have to say, I shall not be at all gentle in dealing with this error. If I use any expression which may savour of harshness, I wish it to be understood that it is not toward Mr. Roberts himself, but toward Mr. Roberts's opinions. I can promise Mr. Roberts this, that, God giving me strength, if he says anything that I think wrong, I shall try to come down upon it smash, whether he likes it or not. If I had been in Mr. Robert's place, I would have begun with a little more sound reasoning. He must pardon me for taking upon me to tell him that. The first word always creates an impression that cannot easily be wiped out. However, I don't think it will take much to wipe off the impression Mr. Roberts has made even upon the minds of his most ardent admirers. If what he has said is what he has to bring forward in support of the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, then I must say the mortality of the soul is a very weak doctrine indeed, and that those who believe in it must be weaker still. He began by saying that it was entirely a deduction drawn from Pagan philosophy—that it had no place in the old historians of the Bible—that till the time of Plato, and comparatively modern times, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was entirely and altogether unknown. I think Mr. Roberts, before he assumed that, might, at least, have taken the trouble to prove it. He contented himself with stating this as a mere fact, and then expected you to believe it. I must say I could have wished he had followed another line of argument. I did not want to bring anything of that kind into this discussion, which was intended chiefly for working men and women. I don't mean to say that they don't understand Plato; still I had much rather he had brought something more adapted to their capacity. I meet the statement with a flat denial at once. I say that the doctrine existed in very ancient times indeed. All I can say is if the apostles had only a vague notion on the subject, certainly their immediate descendants had a very strong belief in the immortality of the soul. It cannot be denied

that their belief was very strong, and that it led them to the martyr's stake, in hundreds of cases. It must have been a strong belief indeed that led men to suffer themselves to be burnt for it. I look upon the persecutions of the early Christians as one of the most convincing evidences of the immortality of the soul. Mr. Roberts says they got the doctrine from Plato, but I say that instead of their getting it from Plato, Plato got it from Moses and his writings. So plain and patent to every Jew was this doctrine of the immortality of the soul, that we don't find it expressly stated in the Bible. I tell Mr. Roberts that men now-a-days, when they write, don't tell us that the sun shines, that the night is dark, that men laugh and children cry, because everybody knows it. The immortality of the soul was a fact patent to these old Jews. It was a fact that they thoroughly understood this immortality of the soul. Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, had no need to state it. Mr. Roberts then advanced from that. [Interruption.] If you don't think that is exactly argument, I should be sorry to go against anybody's opinion, but I have a lingering belief that that is a very strong argument. I will go to what Mr. Roberts said next. I won't quote Greek and Hebrew. I want to keep everything foreign out of this discussion. I think the English Bible, as it is translated, is quite enough. It will answer my purpose, at any rate. I won't quote Greek and Hebrew here to-night, unless Mr. Roberts forces me. I will take you to the 1st chapter of Genesis. In the 20th verse of that chapter you read: "And God said let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth, in the open firmament of heaven." In connection with this, Mr. Roberts gave you that pretty little argument on "living souls." Well then, turn to the 2nd chapter: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." Now, I say that without anything else, this at once proves the immortality of man. It proves that man was different to the beast. There is nothing about beasts having the breath of life breathed into them. If there is no difference between them and man, why didn't He breathe into them the breath of life, just in the same way that He breathed the breath of life into man? Because man was to be the image of his Creator: so He created him. How could a mortal man be the image of an immortal God? I say that only just follow out Mr. Roberts' own line of argument, and he stands convicted out of his own mouth. He referred to a passage in Solomon, if I recollect right, Eccles. iii, 19. He puts a literal interpretation on every word in the Bible. He would explain the passage literally as it stands, without making any allowance for the common belief among the people. They thoroughly understood and believed the immortality of the soul, so that these remarks about death are only to be understood in the same way as in our own church. Amongst ourselves—the much-derided immortal-soul believers—we speak about men dying just as Solomon did, but we don't mean that the spirit dies, but only just the body. Solomon says "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." If I take that literally, as Mr. Roberts wants me to, I must disbelieve my eyes, my ears, and every evidence of sense. If a man literally "hath no pre-eminence above a

beast," then I am bound to say a beast cannot think; therefore, man, who hath no pre-eminence above a beast, cannot think; a beast cannot write, therefore man, who hath no pre-eminence above a beast, cannot write. A beast cannot argue, therefore, a man cannot argue. A beast cannot build houses, therefore, man cannot build houses. If we are to take that text as Mr. Roberts would have us take it; if we are to explain it literally, every dot of an 'i,' and every stroke of a 't,' as he would have us explain it, then we must disbelieve our senses. But we are not to take it that way. Solomon simply meant when he said it, that man had no pre-eminence, in that he died what men call death; so do beasts. [Interruption.] If I am to take it in Mr. Roberts's way of reading it, then I am justified in following out the line of argument I have just entered upon. I say if we are to take it that man hath no pre-eminence above a beast at all, then I mean to say that if in death he has no pre-eminence (according to Mr. Roberts's argument), so, in life, he has no pre-eminence. Is that fair reasoning, or is it not? It is not my reasoning at all. It is simply following out Mr. Roberts's argument. It is simply explaining the text according to his own interpretation. So much for that part of the subject. Let us look now for a few minutes at the general aspect of the question. Mr. Roberts has not at all overrated its importance. It lies at the very root, the very bottom of the Christian faith and the Christian religion. Mr. Roberts holds that Christ came simply to give to his people a conditional gift. I hold, and those who agree with me, that he "came to open up the way to life and immortality, and bring to pass," not through the dreary routine of the Jewish law, but through the "simple faith of the gospel of Jesus Christ." Mr. Roberts holds that when Jesus died, he died simply to give me something which I had not before. I say that instead of coming to change my bodily attributes, instead of coming to work a new law in nature, Christ came expressly to do a spiritual work, to beat down the prejudices of Hebrewism, and make the way to immortality plain and clear. Life is the emblem of happiness, joy, rest, and peace among men; so death is used for the very opposite. Therefore, when Christ speaks of giving me eternal life, it is another way of promising to give me eternal happiness and eternal joy. Mr. Roberts says that Christ's death—that his marvellous sacrifice was accomplished—simply to buy for me what God, with equally strict justice, could have given me without any such sacrifice at all. If immortality simply belonged to the body, God could have worked a miracle, and easily brought that about. But if God's justice must be appeased—if eternal damnation must be escaped [interruption]—ay, eternal damnation! terrible word. I use it, of course, in its theological sense—if deliverance from eternal damnation must be effected, then there was something for God's eternal Son to come to free me from. The idea that God has reduced men and women to the level of the beasts, and that they can work out their own purposes without regard to any evil consequence of any kind, strikes at the root of the common belief of the Christian faith. We join issue at the start directly. Then there are two general inferences which may be brought to bear upon this question. I say—and I assert it most strenuously, quite as strenuously and as

uncompromisingly as I assert that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is found in the Bible—I say that evidence of the immortality of the soul is found in my own heart, in its feelings and aspirations. I want to know why, if I am not immortal, have I these longings and these desires? Why all these pantings and aspirations, if I have no immortality? Do you mean to tell me that a father would set something before his son, and deny him the possession of it? Do you mean to tell me that the great Father, a loving God, would suffer me all my life to pant, and yearn, and long for something beyond the grave, and yet that it was all a lie? There is not a man's heart but will revolt at such a conclusion. Mr. Roberts said in one of his books, not many months ago, "There is nothing like the education of the truth for developing all parts of our nature into harmony, and putting us into a true relation to the hand of God in nature." Now, if this is the case, Mr. Roberts's teaching cannot be true, because it creates the opposite of harmony. I am yearning after immortality, and Mr. Roberts says there is no such thing. It is the province of the truth, gentlemen, according to Mr. Roberts, to educate all my nature into harmony: then his theory cannot be the truth, for most certainly it does not produce harmony. There cannot be harmony in my longing after something which does not exist. So that according to Mr. Roberts's own principle, his theory cannot be true, because he says it is the province of the truth to educate all my nature into harmony. Is that a fair argument—a just line of reasoning? In his theory there certainly is not harmony: it is most inharmonious. I have another source of belief in the doctrine which Mr. Roberts denies—another ground for faith in this doctrine of the immortality of the soul. I don't see what purpose man serves if he is mortal. God has created everything for a purpose, from the smallest blade of grass to the mightiest mountain. But what purpose does the existence of man serve if he goes to the ground, and sees no more of life? He is an empty blot on God's creation all his lifetime. He exists to defeat the purpose of God, and then (according to Mr. Roberts) dies out and disappears. But if I hold the immortality of the soul, then I have no more striking proof of the great purpose of God, than when I see a sinful man warring against God. My God is a wrathful God, a just God, as well as a loving God, and a fatherly God. If an immortal sinner lives in the world without fulfilling any purpose, he does not answer a single end of being. He is no use to himself, no good to his neighbour, no glory to God. Is his history to end there? No; God will punish that immortal soul, and whatever that punishment may be, it declares the power of God and the supremacy of God. Mr. Roberts may say that such a God is not the God of his belief. I cannot help his not believing in my God; my God is the God of the Bible, the God of immortal souls, not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. ("Time" called.)

Mr. Roberts:—Mr. Nightingale has made several admissions of great value to the cause he is opposing, and which are proportionately damaging to the doctrine he seeks to maintain. He admits that the apostles, if they believed

in the immortality of the soul, had only a vague notion on the subject. Why, what an extraordinary fact is this, considered from Mr. Nightingale's point of view, that the apostles, the founders of Christianity, had only a vague notion of the principal doctrine of the system they preached! Mr. Nightingale is obliged to make this admission, because nothing of the immortality of the soul is to be found in their writings. All their sayings on the subject of immortality, as I have already shewn, relate to the body and the resurrection, and the righteous. They employ no form of speech that betrays the slightest affinity with the Greek theory of human immortality. But Mr. Nightingale takes refuge in the faith of "the successors of the apostles." "It cannot be denied," says he, "that the immediate descendants of the apostles had a very strong belief in the immortality of the soul." Well, whatever the faith of large numbers of the early professing Christians may have been, let us see first, from a New Testament point of view, what their authority in such a matter is worth. Paul predicted a departure from the pure faith of Christ. He said to the elders of Ephesus, on one occasion, when he sent for them to Miletus, to see them, "I know that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, *speaking perverse things*, to draw away disciples after them."—(Acts xx. 29, 30.) That these "perverse things" had reference to doctrine appears from 2 Tim. iv. 3. "The time will come when *they will not endure sound doctrine*, \* \* \* *but shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.*" Paul lived to see his prediction partially fulfilled. He said to the Thessalonians "The mystery of iniquity *doth* ALREADY *work*" (2 Thes. ii. 7); and he wrote to Timothy, "all they who are in Asia be turned away from me" (2 Tim. i. 15); and again, "Shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase unto more ungodliness, and *their word will eat as doth a canker*, of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus, who, *concerning the truth, have erred*, saying that the resurrection is past already, and *overthrow the faith of some.*"—(2 Tim. ii. 16-18.) Now, in view of these predictions and these facts, actually contemporary with the Apostles, with what reliance can we accept the faith of professors of the second, third, and fourth centuries as a guide? Doubtless, many in these centuries believed the immortality of the soul, but there is historical testimony to the fact that many did not believe it. Justin Martyr is a specimen of the latter class. The one fact is of as much inductive value as the other, and therefore neither proves anything. There is great peril in accepting any doctrine at second-hand, especially in times when, on apostolic testimony, heresy was rife among those professing the truth. Oh, but, says Mr. Nightingale, the believers of the immortality of the soul went to the stake, and it requires a strong belief to do that. No doubt it does; but the question is not the strength or weakness with which they held their belief, but whether their belief, strongly or weakly held, was true. The strength of a man's conviction does not prove its truth. If it does, we are in this fix to night: the immortality of the soul is true, because

Mr. Nightingale strongly believes in it, and the immortality of the soul is not true, because I strongly disbelieve it. That hundreds of believers in the immortality of the soul suffered themselves to be burned at the stake, rather than renounce their opinions, proves that they were sincere, but it no more proves that those opinions were sound, than does the voluntary immolation of the sincere Hindoo devotee prove that Juggernaut is the true God. The immortality of the soul must stand upon better ground than this, if it is to be entitled to any consideration from reflecting and intelligent minds. Mr. Nightingale does not like the doctrine fathered upon Plato, because he, no doubt, sees the awkwardness of having to acknowledge receiving the first doctrine of Christianity from a heathen philosopher. He, therefore, says Plato received it from Moses and his writings. This is an extraordinary statement, which I never heard made by anyone before. If it is true, then Mr. Nightingale can shew us the immortality of the soul in the writings of Moses; and I call upon him to do so, for I cannot find it. But he has already, with singular inconsistency but entire truthfulness, acknowledged that it is not to be found there. His words are, "Moses, the prophets, and the apostles had no need to state it" (the doctrine). If so, how could Plato get it from Moses? How could Plato get from the writings of Moses that which Moses, according to Mr. N.'s showing, said nothing about, having, as he says, no need to do so? I deny that Plato obtained the slightest assistance from the Jewish writings in constructing his metaphysical theories; for those writings are profoundly silent on the question, except that they speak strongly in the negative by implication. Plato borrowed his ideas on the subject from the Egyptians, who, ages before Plato, believed in the immateriality and transmigration of souls. I have mentioned Plato's name in connection with the doctrine, not because he invented it, but because he was the first to systematize it, and strip it of many of the gross absurdities with which it was associated previous to his day, and give it to the world in a coherent and acceptable shape. Mr. Nightingale says Moses had no reason to speak about it, because the doctrine was as self-evident as the shining of the sun, the laughing of men, the crying of children, and so on. Well, this is Mr. Nightingale's opinion, but what is it worth as a matter of argument? It is a begging of the question. I am just as much at liberty to say that the reason of Moses' silence on the subject is because the doctrine did not come within the system of divine truth. But is the doctrine self-evident? If so, why am I here to-night to dispute it? No man denies that which is self-evident. Self-evidence is an end to all controversy. But supposing I were to admit, for the sake of argument, that it was self-evident, would this account for the entire absence of allusion to the doctrine in the Bible? By no means. Self-evident facts stamp their impress on the speech and records of men. Take the instances Mr. Nightingale has given us. The shining of the sun. Do we not read in the Bible about the fact that there is a sun, that it gives light to the world, that it rises and sets, and so on? Do we not gather the same fact from almost every book and newspaper we can take up? So with men laughing and children crying. The Bible incidentally

reflects both these self-evident facts. Therefore, on the strength of the very illustrations given by Mr. Nightingale, I contend we ought to have clear and abundant traces in the Bible of the immortality of the soul, if it was a self-evident truth. Mr. Nightingale finds proof of the immortality of the soul in the statement that God breathed into Adam's nostrils "the breath of life." He says there is nothing about God having breathed the breath of life into the beasts. True, but there is something much more important. There is evidence that beasts possess the breath of life; and surely if there is any essence of immortality about the breath of life, it must arise to the creature from the possession of the breath of life, and not from the particular form or ceremony which might attend the infusion of it. I refer to Solomon's statement: "*They* (men and animals) *have all ONE BREATH*" (Eccles. iii. 19); and that this "one breath" is "the breath of life," is evident from the statement of Moses in reference to the flood: "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth—both of fowl, and of cattle, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and *every man*; ALL IN WHOSE NOSTRILS WAS THE BREATH OF LIFE, *died*."—(Gen. vii. 21, 22.) So that fowl, and cattle, and beasts, and so on, have the breath of life as well as man. This is Scripture, and it is reason too; for what difference can we perceive between man and the lower animals as to the mode of existence? Do they not live and die under precisely the same conditions? Do animals not live by breathing the air of heaven, and can man live without it? Let a man and a dog be placed in the vacuum of an air pump, does the man live any longer than the dog? You know that death is equal master of both; because both depend equally upon the breath of life in their nostrils for the sustenance of existence. But if man's life was a different life from that of the animal—if it arose from an immaterial, indestructible, immortal principle—he ought to be unaffected by the influences which destroy animal life, and continue to exist in full possession of life and faculty, even under the air pump. But it is not so; and the reason is that the Bible is true in declaring man to be on a level with the beast, and that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the unenlightened conceit of Paganism, is a fiction. ("Time" called.)

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I should almost have thought I was listening to Plato, if I had not known I was listening to Mr. Roberts. That was a speech more worthy of a heathen than a man professing to be a Christian. [Interruption.] He denied in the first place that the noble army of martyrs were animated by anything beyond a sincere conviction of the truth. That is what I refer to when I say it was a speech worthy of a heathen. It was not a Christian speech. He denied that there was anything of God's good Spirit in these good men. He would have us believe that God was not in these men; he put aside the ruling power of God in men's hearts altogether. He denied that which every professedly Christian man believes. He denied that Supreme Power which nerved the martyr. Then he set up a foe which I didn't set up, and in the most graceful and expeditious way knocked him.

down again. I said nothing about Moses especially declaring the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. I only said that the people to whom he wrote thoroughly believed it. I said nothing about Moses alone declaring the immortality of the soul. I said that all the Scripture writers alike believed in it, and took it for granted. Then he quarrelled with me and tried to argue with me about the breath of life. I simply said it was quite evident there was some distinction between man and the animals in the matter. We find that God breathed into the one the breath of life, while we simply read that the others had it. Mr. Roberts fell into a very common mistake. We don't say that this living breath, or breath of life, is the soul. I didn't say that the breath of life was the immortal soul. We don't profess to say anything of the kind. We say that the immortal soul is something that comes direct from God—something which moves our will, which controls our thought, which directs our action, which lifts us above the level of the beast. I have never heard the preacher, I have never read the book, I have never met the theologian, who said that the living breath was the soul, or that the soul was the living breath. We only say this, that God breathed into man the breath of life, and that with that breath of life, he put in something which is not in animals. We don't profess to tell what that was. God's ways are higher than our ways, and His thoughts higher than our thoughts. Mr. Roberts has, of course, said a good deal about this breath of life, but he ought to have proved first that I said it was the soul. I never said anything of the kind. I only drew the distinction between man and the beast that Moses himself has drawn. What is this immortal soul? In what does it consist? [Interruption.] We are perfectly at liberty to enter into any argument which at all bears on the subject. Mr. Roberts will bring forward certain physical arguments to prove that an immortal soul does not exist. Now, I say we don't say there is any physical power in it at all. We simply say that the soul is the soul, and that this soul, wherever and whatever it is, is something beyond the reach of the human eye. You may tell me there is mystery in all this; there are mysteries about us on every side. I might if I wished, enter into the discussion of the question as to whether the Christian man is immortal. I think if he is immortal, then the worldly man must be immortal also, because the natural law never goes against a spiritual one. We don't say what this soul is. We simply say it is there, like a bird shut up in its cage, and longing to be free. Mr. Roberts tries to bring forward Scripture to prove that this does not exist, but he cannot succeed. He said that I said the apostles had a very vague idea of the immortality of the soul. I never said anything of the sort. What I said was in irony. We say this immortal soul is a spiritual thing altogether. The Materialists argue wrongly from the very first. They take those passages which apply to body—flesh and bone—and interpret them as the spirit. They say we are to understand them as something quite different from what they talk about. They not only go against every sound principle of criticism, but against every sound principle of the most common thing—common sense. I want to know what 'spirit,' and 'soul,' and 'mind' mean in the Bible? I want

to know how Mr. Roberts explains them. I want to know how Mr. Roberts makes the destruction of the body prove the destruction of the spirit. The body is not the spirit, and the spirit is not the body. Does he mean to tell me that the tears which bedew my eyes when I have sinned, and the joyful hope that swells my bosom when I have the assurance of forgiveness, are nothing but flesh and blood? Grief and joy are not flesh and blood. Anybody but a Materialist would see the difference at once. I want to know if Mr. Roberts would dare to come forward and say that God would destroy His own handiwork. How could God destroy His own image? God save me from the Materialist who asserts that God will destroy that which His own hand has made. God has made His own image in us, and sin has polluted it; He has made flesh, and death destroys it. The Materialist says death destroys us altogether, but we believe that death closes the door on one side, and opens it on the other; that it lays the body low, but liberates the spirit. Mr. Roberts does not believe anything of the sort. He says this is all poetry and fancy. But I will deal in argument. I ask Mr. Roberts to meet this argument about the spirit. He must remember that the spirit and soul are not the body and flesh. We are not arguing to-night about the thing which has feelings, which has flesh and blood, but about the thing which thinks and hopes, and sorrows, and breathes. I admit that the body is destroyed, but if Mr. Roberts could quote us Scripture to shew that God will destroy both body and soul, I will never say another word against it. ("Time" called).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Nightingale has not said much this time that affords scope for answer in the way of argument. He has, however, said one or two things calling for remark. He has occupied his time for the most part with defining what his ideas are. He tells us that he and they who believe with him, believe that the soul is this and that, but he does not attempt to prove his definitions. He has not quoted from the Scriptures in support of his belief in the matter. He finds fault with me for not accepting the martyrs as the infallible guides and standards of truth. He says God's Spirit was in them. I demur to this being assumed. An important point like this must be proved. They had an animating spirit in them, but whether it was the spirit of truth or the spirit of error must be decided by reference to the standard of the truth. John told the early disciples to "Try the spirits whether they are of God."—(John iv. 1.) He gives a test by which this may be done. He says "WE ARE OF GOD; he that is of God heareth us; and he that is not of God heareth not us. *Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*"—(John iv. 6.) I don't suppose even Mr. Nightingale would object to the martyrs being subjected to this rule; so that whether their opinions were right or wrong, the discussion really hinges on what the apostles taught. If their opinions were opposed to apostolic teaching, their martyrdom would not convert those opinions into truth. If their opinions were right, it was because they were in agreement with the teaching of the apostles. Hence we may entirely leave them out of account in discussing

whether or not the immortality of the soul is true. Mr. Nightingale repeats his statement that Moses believed the immortality of the soul, but modifies his previous declaration on the subject. He adds that not Moses especially, but all the Old Testament writers believed it. This only makes the case worse for Mr. Nightingale, because he has to account for the silence of twenty writers on a subject presumed to be uppermost in their hearts, instead of the silence of one. If they all "alike believed in the immortality of the soul," why does none of them mention it, and why do they employ a style of speech which indicates a contrary conviction? Why, for instance, did Zechariah say, "Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets, *do they live for ever?*"—(Zech. i. 5.) Why did Isaiah say "Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance. \* \* \* *All nations before him are as nothing, and they are counted to him as LESS THAN NOTHING, and vanity.*"—(Isaiah xl. 15-17.) Why did Job say "They shall lie down alike in the dust, and the worms shall cover them?"—(Job xxi. 26.) Why did David say, "What profit is there in my blood when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee? Shall it declare thy truth?"—(Psalm xxx. 9.) And again, "*Like sheep, they (the wicked) are laid in the grave, DEATH SHALL FEED ON THEM, and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning. Their beauty shall consume IN THE GRAVE from their dwelling.*"—(Psalm xlix. 14.) Mr. Nightingale argues in favour of the immortality of the soul, from the distinction observed between the creation of man and animals; but the logic of this argument will not bear a touch. That distinction only indicates the greater dignity and importance of man. It does not disprove what Scripture elsewhere affirms, that as regards the nature of life, there is no difference—that they have all one breath, and that man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.—(Eccles. iii. 18.) Mr. Nightingale has conclusively shown (what I never disputed) that this equality of man and animals does not relate to the living state. Looked at and compared as living beings, man is infinitely above the lower forms of animate existence. In life there is every pre-eminence, that is, as to capacity and endowment. Man is a noble creature: his faculties are God-like—his aspirations are exalted—his capabilities of enjoyment are unbounded. But does this superiority in life disprove his equality in death, which the Scriptures expressly declare, and experience daily proves? Mr. Nightingale believes he is immortal because he has a craving after immortality. Why, what a curious argument this is. A poor man hankers after other people's money, therefore he is rich! This would just be as sensible a conclusion. I argue the other way, and convert Mr. Nightingale's facts to my use. I experience the longings that Mr. Nightingale has described, but I construe those longings into a proof that I am not immortal. As against the infidel, I argue this much from them that they point to a possible relation of existence not now realised in human experience, but as against Mr. Nightingale's theory, it is equally forcible. The doctrine of the Bible I hold to be the only true solution of the matter, and that takes a middle ground. It affirms that though constituted with a view to a possible

immortality, we failed in the moral probation which divinely precedes it; and in our progenitor Adam, were doomed to return to our original nothingness. To this it adds, the glorious doctrine that Christ has been raised up to open a way whereby, in accordance with all the moral requirements of the case, we may ultimately escape the operation of the law of death, and be rescued from oblivion by a resurrection to incorruptible existence. Mr. Nightingale believes he is immortal because he can think, feel contrition, love, sorrow, and so on; but it is difficult to conceive on what principle he deduces immortality from these premisses. I share these qualities with him, but to me they prove nothing on the subject one way or other. They are the positive characteristics of human nature while it exists; but they indicate nothing as to the immortality or perishability of human nature. If difference of mental constitution proves difference of essential nature, we are bound to apply the argument among the lower animals, and to say that because a dog or an elephant has a power of observation, memory, and a docility of disposition which are not evinced, say by the mouse or rat, therefore the dog or elephant has a principle in its nature unpossessed by the others. But Mr. Nightingale won't lend himself to this argument. How, then, does he account for the mental differences among the animals? I suppose he would say they are but different manifestations of the same Creative Power. This answer would be good; and why not extend it higher, and take Bible ground, and say that man and animals have ALL one breath, are ALL but diverse manifestations of the same Great Power? Some admit this argument, only they apply it on the other side of the theory. They say that all animals have immortal souls like man, and will, in the disembodied state, grow to a higher sphere of existence. No less a man than John Wesley lent his name and influence to this theory. The theory will no doubt be scouted by Mr. Nightingale, but it is in reality more consistent than his own. He insists that man has an immortal thinking entity, because man exhibits powers of reason and conscience. He assumes that reason and conscience cannot be possessed or exercised, except by an immaterial principle, which cannot be seen, or felt, or cognised in any way by the senses. But let him logically demonstrate the grounds of this assumption. Why invent an incomprehensible and entirely gratuitous explanation, to account for phenomena which are seen to be referrible to a distinct cause, but which Mr. Nightingale's philosophy refuses to recognise, from a fear of its own destruction? Has the brain nothing to do with the powers we manifest? Dares Mr. Nightingale say Nay? Does not injury of the brain interfere with the action of the mind? Is it not the fact that mental diversity prevails among men in the exact ratio of cranial organization? Do not large and finely-formed heads invariably go with vigorous and well-balanced minds? What of those poor unfortunates who are to be found in the lunatic wards of our workhouses, many of whom are entirely destitute of reason, and some of whom are devoid of even the physical susceptibilities—mere breathing bundles of flesh and blood, without sensation or voluntary motion? If I understand Mr. Nightingale aright,

he will not deny that these poor creatures have souls. If so, how is it that they are lacking in the qualities which Mr. Nightingale attributes to the immortal soul? The soul thinks, says Mr. Nightingale; why do they not think? The soul reasons, says Mr. Nightingale; why do they not reason? The soul loves, gives a sense of conscience and contrition, and perception of right and wrong, says Mr. Nightingale; why are these unfortunates, having souls, incapable of moral volition? It is impossible to answer these questions in harmony with Mr. Nightingale's theory, but it is easy to answer them in harmony with the truth. Idiots lack the cerebral organization that gives cerebral power; therefore they lack the mental results. They are degenerated physically from the image of the *Elohim*. Therefore they lack moral resemblance to the *Elohim*. This reminds me of Mr. Nightingale's arguments on the subject of Adam being made in the image of God. He contended that this proved human immortality, asking "how could there be a mortal image of an immortal God?" What is immortality? Deathlessness. Can you make an image of a relative quality? If an image were transmuted into the very vital counterpart of a man, would it not cease to be an image? If man were *exactly the same* as his Creator, he would not be an image, but "very God." The *Elohistie* likeness of man does not relate to the durability or constitution of his nature, but to his moral and intellectual capacity, which is after the type or pattern of the angels—"a little lower than the angels." ("Time" called).

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I won't enter into the subject of the martyrs again. Mr. Roberts quite put aside all spiritual and personal interference of God. I don't think a lie in any sense would have the Spirit of God to support it. Mr. Roberts said that I had produced no text. I beg to inform Mr. Roberts that it is not my place to produce texts. He affirms that the Bible is against the immortality of the soul, and it is for him to bring forward texts to prove his doctrines. I have to bring mine to disprove them afterwards. Mr. Roberts made a great mistake in reproaching me for not bringing forward texts. I think I have transgressed the proper bounds of debate; I have already exceeded my proper limits. I have brought texts forth, and it is his fault if he has not brought forward sufficient to prove his side of the question. Then Mr. Roberts proceeds to the brain. We have at length the physical aspect of the question. I think I understand him to say that it is the brain that thinks. Then Mr. Roberts proceeds to argue that if there was inferior brain, there were inferior mental powers, and that if the brain was injured, these powers ceased. That does not prove there is no soul. We say the brain is the instrument, not the power; the steam engine, not the fire. If I break the piston or connecting rod of any engine, the machine cannot work, but the power is there just the same. If I take the fire away, there may be piston, wheel, crank, rod, but the machine won't work. The fire is the power. The wheels, cranks, piston, rods and all the rest of it, which you understand better than I do: they are the instrument. The brain is the instrument: that is the right teaching of theology. The

brain is the instrument, and the soul is the power. The brain may be injured or destroyed, but the soul remains the same. The power is not destroyed. God works on one principle always, and in one way. It does not follow that because part of the instrument is taken away, the power is in any way diminished. I feel with my finger. If you cut my finger off, I don't feel with my finger, but the power of feeling is just the same. I see by the eye. If you destroy my eye, I see no longer, but the power of sight is there. The instrument is merely disordered or destroyed. I was in conversation with an eminent doctor in this town to-day, and I am going to use his own words in speaking of this subject. He said that a short time since, he trepanned a boy at Dudley, and took away nearly a cupful of brain from him, and yet the boy is just as intelligent as ever, and just as lively as ever. Now, if the brain is the power, why was the boy's mind not injured? He then told me that many a man of great intellect and power of mind, had what we call a deficient brain formation. All men of mental force have not high foreheads, and without high foreheads, there cannot be great brain. Now if the brain is the power, why, when the brain is deficient, is there not deficient result? If the cause is weak, why is not the effect weak? We say the brain is the instrument. Behind the brain, there is this great immortal soul of ours. There are animals which have larger brains than ours—animals of more extended brain formation, in proportion, and yet they don't come up to man in the power of intellect and power of thought. They don't approach man's wonderful adaptability to all the powers of life. Therefore, the brain argument must fall to the ground entirely. All animals have more or less brain, but there is not an animal that is possessed of reason. They have instinct, but reason is very different from instinct. Reason teaches me to control my passions, instinct tells me to gratify them. Why is it that these animals with their brains do not put some restraint on their passions the same as man? Who ever saw beasts refuse to eat when they were hungry? Do not animals pursue their own inclinations and follow out their own desires whenever an opportunity of gratifying them presents itself? Who ever saw man gratifying his passions like a beast? Some men may go to strange lengths in following out their inclinations. Sometimes men will run wild in riot. Still, reason overtoppled always holds her place, and puts the reins on man's affections, desires, and longings. I want to know how this is, if man has no pre-eminence above a beast, if he has no soul? Nature and revelation must always agree. I am making nature and revelation agree now, because nature tells me that I have something that controls my passions that beasts have not, and I get it from revelation that man is above the beast, because he has a soul. The beast is inferior to him. Mr. Roberts alluded to the somewhat exploded theory of the immortality of the souls of beasts. That has some arguments and some great names to rest upon, but I don't pretend to believe it for an instant. I think it at once derogatory to God and disgraceful to man to hold such a doctrine as that. I say that God has made man in His own image—that he planted something within him—a living and immortal principle. I defy Mr. Roberts at least to

deny this, that man, in many instances, is superior to the beasts. I want to know in what this superiority consists, if not in an immortal soul? Then I think Mr. Roberts referred to various passages of the Scripture, about death and dust, and so on. That was very old. Nobody now adheres to the literal rendering of these words in the Bible. No scholar does who at all pretends to any conversance with sacred writ. It was just simply adapting the word to the common apprehensions of the people on the subject of dying and death. Mr. Roberts spoke of the different meanings of the word "soul." I quite agree with him that the word has different meanings, and we must gather those meanings from the texts. The same word often means very different things. A light day and a light weight are very different things. A dull day and a dull sermon are both very distasteful and unlovely things, but still very different; so when we find the words "spirit" and "soul" used in Scripture, we must gather the meaning from the context with which they stand connected. If I turn to the 22nd chapter of Matthew, and the 37th verse, I find the words: "And Jesus said to him, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy *soul*, and with all thy mind." Now, here there is a clear distinction made between the different parts of man's nature. As I read these words, it is quite plain that man has a heart with which he loves, a soul with which he aspires, and an understanding with which he thinks. But supposing I read the word "soul" as Mr. Roberts would have us read it—"life," how would it read: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and all thy *life*, &c." "Life" would neither be sense nor grammar. We must understand it in the context in which it stands. Nothing of the sort, says Mr. Roberts; you must understand it everywhere just alike. That is neither fair interpretation nor sound criticism. ("Time" called.)

---

## SECOND NIGHT.

---

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In appearing before you to-night, as Chairman of the Discussion commenced last evening by Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. NIGHTINGALE, I have to remind you of the question in debate, viz., "Is the Bible against the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul?" The time to be occupied by the speakers will be subject to the same regulations as were observed last night. I beg to remark that I have been much impressed during the discussion by the deep interest manifested by the assembled audience. Nor am I surprised at the depth of feeling exhibited, for the subject under consideration is one of vast importance, and, consequently, should be approached with sobriety of mind, and an earnest desire to arrive at the truth. I am well aware, ladies and gentlemen,

that the momentous question before us is one calculated to excite powerful emotions in the mind. I have, therefore, as your Chairman, to request that all outbursts of feeling, whether expressing approval of the sentiments of the speakers or otherwise, may as far as possible be avoided, as their indulgence must of necessity interfere with the calmness of mind which is indispensable in the proper discussion of so important and weighty a subject as the one under consideration. It would be improper in me as Chairman, to express an opinion as to the talent displayed, or the relative merits of the gentlemen who have to address you. Before calling upon the gentleman who is to open the discussion to-night, I may remark that I feel assured that my request will commend itself to the judgment of this large and intelligent audience, when I ask you to give to each speaker a courteous and patient hearing. I have now the pleasure to call upon Mr. Roberts to resume the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Ladies and Gentlemen, In his concluding speech last night, Mr. Nightingale took a position which practically amounted to an evasion of the duty he has taken upon himself, in challenging me to this discussion. In response to my call for Bible testimony in favour of the immortality of the soul, he said it was not his duty to quote passages in support of his side of the question. He said his position was that of a simple denial of what I had to say, and that he had gone beyond his province in quoting so many passages as he had done. I am a little astonished that he should attempt in this way to cover the defect of his advocacy, under the technicalities of debate. But he is wrong altogether, even in the construction of those technicalities. It is true that my duty is to say "Yes" to the proposition of the evening, namely, that the Bible is against the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and that it is Mr. Nightingale's duty to say "No;" but I am not to content myself with a simple "yes." It would be no profit for me simply to assert my belief on the matter. I must prove my "yes." I must show by testimony and argument, that the Bible is against the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and Mr. Nightingale must, in the same way, prove his "no," by showing that the Bible is in favour of the immortality of the soul. The man who stands upon technicalities in such an important matter, is conscious of the weakness of his position. A man who felt the Bible to be largely and expressly on his side, would not hesitate even to exceed the strict boundaries of his duty, and quote every testimony that would at all tend to establish what he believed to be the truth. Mr. Nightingale's neglect to do this, and his excuse on the score of technical duty, leaves it open for me to suggest that the reason why he has neglected to quote the Bible in favour of his doctrine is, because he feels there is little or nothing in the Bible to support it. I again call upon Mr. Nightingale, when he rises to reply, to quote a single passage (and more if he can get them) from the Bible, that proves the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Leaving Mr. Nightingale on the search for testimony, I will proceed to notice the arguments he laid before you last

night. The soul is the will, said he, which controls our thoughts and directs our actions. In answer to this, I ask if the power of will in man is an immortal, immaterial soul, what is it in animals? It is impossible to deny that animals possess the power of will. Look at the horse standing in the street. Its owner or director comes to it, and utters a sound which the horse understands as a command to move on, and the horse instantly sets its legs in motion. Who stops the horse's legs when he comes to a stand still? The horse. Who moves the horse's legs when he starts again? The horse, just as much as we move ours. The horse, and every other animal, has a power that directs its actions just as much as we. If, therefore, our power of will is to be referred to the possession of an immortal and immaterial principle, we are justified in attributing it to the same cause in a horse. On the other hand if a horse can possess and exert the power of will without an immortal and immaterial soul, is it not possible for human beings as well? If you ask what the will is, it is no more possible to tell than to say what the faculties of sight, hearing, feeling (which are possessed equally by men and animals) are. All we can say is, speaking experimentally, that will is a power peculiar to the organization of which we, as living creatures, consist. Some men have more will-power than others, just in proportion as the organization is fitted to evolve and manifest it. This leads us back to the subject of the brain. Mr. Nightingale says the brain is the instrument of the soul. This, says he, is the right teaching of theology. Well, we knew that much. Conventional theology is no authority whatever. We are here to discuss what the doctrine of current theology is worth from a Bible point of view. It, therefore, doesn't help the argument at all to tell what the dictum of theology is. On what ground does Mr. Nightingale hold the brain to be the instrument of the mind? What does he mean by "instrument of the mind?" An instrument is an agency employed by intelligence to effect some design. To affirm then that the brain is an instrument of the mind, is to say that the mind is something behind and distinct from it, employing it for its own purposes. Yes, says Mr. Nightingale, that is just what I say it is. Very good, that is Mr. Nightingale's say: but what is the value of it? One assertion is as good as another. I am just as much at liberty to affirm the opposite. Mr. Nightingale's theory is ingenious, but that is all that can be said for it. It is entirely gratuitous. It begs the whole question at issue. The very point in dispute is, whether there is such a thing as a separate, distinct, intelligent, immaterial, and immortal entity to use the brain as a vehicle of thought. Mr. Nightingale's theory of brain instrumentality at once assumes the point, and is, therefore, worth no more than the imagination in which it originates. It would be as logical to argue that muscle is the instrument of strength, that flame is the instrument of heat, or that the rose is the instrument of its perfume. But supposing we were to grant Mr. Nightingale's theory for a moment, for the sake of argument, we shall find that really it defeats the doctrine it is brought forward to support. The doctrine is that the soul of its own power and action thinks, loves, fears, hates, &c., while the theory is that the soul requires a brain as

an instrument to do these things with. When we show the instrumental theorists an idiot who cannot reason, Oh, say they, the instrument is defective, that is why the powers of the mind are deficient. If we show them a man insane from injury of the brain, Oh, say they, the instrument is out of order; that is why the manifestations are deranged. When we show them a person in a state of unconsciousness from a blow on the head, they rejoice with a similar explanation, that the instrument for the time is out of working order. It, therefore, comes to this, that the abstract soul cannot be conscious, reason, love, distinguish between right and wrong, &c., without a material brain in good condition to enable it to perform these functions. If this is the case—if the soul is checked in its functions by interference with its material instrument, what is its value without the instrument? If it cannot think, reason, &c., with a defective brain, what is likely to be its power when death destroys the brain altogether? Mr. Nightingale's theory overturns Mr. Nightingale's doctrine, and favours the conclusion that I have endeavoured to reason out. Mr. Nightingale's illustration of the steam engine is no better. He says it cannot work without the steam; and, on the other hand, that if a single part of the mechanism is out of its place, it can make no use of the steam, but, says he, the steam is there all the same. Very good; the illustration is excellent when properly applied. We are the engines; our lives the steam. The working of the engine has its parallel in the mental phenomena evolved by the action of the life on our vital machinery. But where is the soul? Oh, says Mr. Nightingale, it is the steam. Is it so? Then the soul cannot evolve mental operations without the body. This is the logical conclusion. This illustration is excellent, but it defeats the purpose for which he used it. It goes to establish the very thing I contend for. I contend for the Bible representation of the matter, that all living forms—whether men or animals—are but embodiments of the life-energy that fills the universe, having Supreme Intelligence for its centre and source. They have "all one breath."—(Eccles. iii. 18.) "In all their nostrils (beast, cattle, creeping thing, and every man is the breath of life."—(Gen. vii. 22.) "In Him we live, and move, and have our being."—(Acts xvii. 28.) "With Thee is the fountain of life."—(Psalm xxxvi. 9.) "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind."—(Job xii. 10.) "If God set His heart upon man—if he gather unto Himself His spirit and His breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."—(Job. xxxiv. 14.) The teaching of these testimonies is in harmony with Mr. Nightingale's illustration. The life-steam is the universal vital propulsion in all animated forms. God is the steam. It is the invention of Pagan philosophy to say that it is a separable soul. When the machinery wears out, the operations stop, and the steam vanishes to its source. "The dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it."—(Eccles. xii. 7.) In view of this, we can understand why the dead are unconscious. Consciousness is the condition developed in the living. When the living die, they cease to be everything that a living being is. I deny that, says Mr. Nightingale. Well, I will give him testimony, and

invite his particular attention to the testimony, and specially request him to deal with it. "Oh, spare me that I may recover strength before I go hence and be no more."—(Ps. xxxix. 13.) "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."—(Eccles. ix. 5.) "There is no work, nor device, nor KNOWLEDGE, nor WISDOM in the grave whither thou goest."—(verse 10.) "In death, THERE IS NO REMEMBRANCE OF THEE; in the grave, who shall give thee thanks?"—(Psalm vi. 5.) "Wilt Thou shew Thy wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise Thee? Shall Thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or Thy faithfulness in DESTRUCTION. Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?"—(Psalm lxxxviii. 10-12.) "The dead praise NOT the Lord, neither ANY that go down into silence."—(Psalm cxv. 17.) "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts PERISH."—(Psalm cxlvi. 3-4.) "The grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down into the pit CANNOT hope for Thy truth. The LIVING, the LIVING, he shall praise Thee as I do this day."—(Isaiah xxxviii. 18.) "DAVID IS NOT ASCENDED INTO THE HEAVENS."—(Acts ii. 34.) Now, I ask Mr. Nightingale to deal with these statements of Scripture, and try to harmonize them with a theory which maintains the very reverse of what they say. Let him no longer content himself with defining his ideas. Let him remember that it will not carry conviction either to me or to the audience, if he simply tells us what he or anybody else believes. Let him set to work and fairly meet my arguments and quote testimony from the Bible, where plenty must be found, if the immortality of the soul is a Bible doctrine. He quoted one passage last night which he seemed to regard as a triumph for his view of the question—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, strength, and mind." He asked if soul meant life, what would be the sense of exhorting us to love God with all our life? I reply by asking him if there is anything more appropriate in asking us to love God with our 'strength?' How can a man literally love God with his muscular strength? No more inappropriate is it to ask us to love Him with our life. The words of the passage only invite the consecration of every power in our nature to the love and service of God, and what more appropriate than to ask us to love Him with that which covers all? Mr. Nightingale defies me to deny that man is superior to the beast. I don't deny that man is superior to the beast, in the particulars enumerated by Mr. Nightingale. We both agree that as a living being, man is infinitely above the brute creation; but the question does not relate to life but to death. Solomon says, "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." There must be a sense in which this is true. The question is, in what sense? I ask Mr. Nightingale to answer this question. My answer to it is, that it is in death that man hath no pre-eminence. Solomon is talking of the subject of death, when he makes the statement in question. His words are "As the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath, SO THAT A MAN HATH NO PRE-EMINENCE ABOVE A BEAST."—

(Eccles. iii. 18.) But Mr. Nightingale's theory contains no place for Solomon's statement at all. He has proved that it is not true as regards life, and yet he denies that it applies in death, for it is just in death that man has pre-eminence over the beast, according to his theory. Death destroys a beast, but liberates a man for another sphere of existence. I particularly ask Mr. Nightingale's attention to this point, and request him to show us in what sense it is that "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." He has conceded the argument as regards the breath of life. He has admitted, as he was bound to admit in view of the fact, that the beast possesses the breath of life—that the breath of life is not the soul, which he at first suggested it was. He says the soul was something that went into Adam along with the breath of life. Well, so he says; but what is the value of an assertion like this? I must leave you to judge. We are now trying a theory on evidences, and not on assertions. He says he believes he has an immortal soul within him, because he feels it in his bosom, like a bird in a cage. This is another of those arguments which are entirely destitute of logic. What is the value of a feeling? Go to the lunatic asylum, and you have "feeling" exemplified in a great diversity. One man "feels" he is the King of England; is he, therefore, King of England? Another feels he is a rich nobleman with a retinue of servants; is he, therefore, not a poor inmate of a lunatic asylum. If the immortal soul makes its presence felt in the breast, ought not I to feel it as well as Mr. Nightingale? I suppose he won't deny that I have an immortal soul if he has one. How then does he explain the fact that I don't "feel" it, but feel the contrary; that I am a frail mortal, hastening with him to "the end of all living?" It is clear that Mr. Nightingale misinterprets his feelings. He feels something, but his theology—his educational bias—prevents his perceiving that his "feelings" are nothing more than the activities, moral and intellectual, of that wonderful brain organization which he estimates so lightly, but which is the real source of any superiority we may possess over the animal. He says the immortal soul governs, checks and restrains the passions. If this is the case, there must be many men and women who have no immortal souls, for there are more people in the world whose passions are unchecked and ungoverned, than there are people whose passions are controlled. He seemed instantly to see this difficulty, and admitted that some men behaved strangely; but he made the matter worse by saying "still reason overtoppled, *always holds her place*, and puts the reins on a man's affections, desires, and longings." This is exactly contrary to the truth in thousands of instances, especially in unenlightened countries, and therefore the argument entirely fails. There is one argument against Mr. Nightingale's theory, to which I would call his attention, before I sit down. I refer to the death of Christ; and lest I should be misunderstood, let me, in the first place, explicitly avow my belief in the mission of Christ, as declared in the New Testament, as "the Lamb of God, to take away the sins of the world." I will, of course, differ from Mr. Nightingale's view of the subject, but still I believe in the sacrificial mission of Jesus. He came to take away sin. According to

Mr. Nightingale's theory, sin pertains to the immortal soul—of course, not to the body—and the consequence of the immortal soul's sin, according to the same theory, is that it is liable to be consigned to the exquisite and unending tortures of "hell." Christ is presumed to have suffered "in the room of" sinners—that is, to have endured the *penalty due to them*. Now in view of this, will Mr. Nightingale explain how it is that to fulfil this mission, Christ was manifested in THE FLESH, and "suffered in THE FLESH?" How was it that he died a *bodily death* for immortals souls' sins? How was it that to prevent us dying "eternal death," he died a "temporal death?" How was it that as a substitute, he endured for "three days," (say) in order that we might escape the sufferings of uncounted millions of ages? Will Mr. Nightingale deal with the difficulties? They are difficulties that arise out of his theory. They are not difficulties that are incident to the New Testament doctrine. The New Testament knows nothing of immortal souls or endless torments. It has to do with death in the sense of extinction of being, as the consequence of a state of disobedience. It is based on the Edenic decree, which consigned Adam, and, of course, ourselves as the mere propagation of his being, to dissolution in the ground. ("Time" called.)

MR. NIGHTINGALE: The first thing that I would take up your time with to-night would be to explain one or two rather strong things I said last night. Before I pass on to notice anything else, I should like to be quite clear about this. I feel, perhaps, rather vexed that in the heat and warmth of discussion in my opening speech, I should have said anything which sounded like personality. It was quite unwillingly and quite unintentionally. From what I have seen of Mr. Roberts, I have no reason to be personal, but I was very much pained at what he had said. Of course when we read these things in books, it hurts us very much, but when they come warm from the lips of an earnest man, they strike us as being still more offensive, and I might say, heart-wounding. I don't think when I read the faces of some of you around me that I was alone in that feeling. It was simply painful to hear our "theory"—our very favourite and very dear "theory"—of the immortality of the soul attacked in any kind of way. I wish to make that explanation. I think it is due to Mr. Roberts. Now, as to what Mr. Roberts has said about my proving the immortality of the soul, he would almost reverse our position, and make it my place to affirm. Mr. Roberts complains about my not having gone to the Scriptures to prove the immortality of the soul; but I would remind Mr. Roberts that if there was any want of that last night, it was Mr. Roberts's fault. He went into the physical aspect of the question first, and spoke about the brain, and all those things. If he had kept entirely to the Bible, I should have done so. It is Mr. Roberts's place to lead, and mine to follow. Again, I deny that Mr. Roberts has a right to dictate to me what line of argument I should follow. If I adopt a weak one, so much the better for him. If the course I adopted

was a weak one, why did his friends make so much noise? Mr. Roberts proceeded to say that I challenged him to this discussion. I deny that I challenged him. He had issued a general challenge, undertaking to discuss the question with anybody, and I simply took up the challenge. If I am wrong, the fault lies at the door of a mutual friend, who misinformed me. I have told Mr. Roberts that I am not the challenger; I don't consider myself in that position at all. He then goes on to say that I didn't prove what I asserted. I say again that I didn't undertake to prove that the Bible was in favour of immortality. I only undertook to prove that it was not against it. There is a great distinction between these two things. Then he proceeded in the next place (but I cannot follow Mr. Roberts so well as he can follow me, not being able, like him, to take shorthand notes), I think he proceeded to notice my similitude about the engine. There he quite misstated the matter altogether. I did not say steam was the power. No one supposes that steam is the power, except people that are unaccustomed to it. We all know that fire is the power, and not the steam. Let that pass for what it is worth. Then he goes to the Bible. He alluded to the death of Christ; but I won't enter into that question at all. We cannot, my dear friends, make that a point of discussion. I cannot bring my Saviour and my Saviour's cross forward to be discussed in any way, at a meeting of this kind. If we cannot prove or disprove the immortality of the soul, without bringing that in, I will let it alone. Mr. Roberts says I have begged and assumed the question. I say I didn't assume or beg it at all. If I did, it ought almost to be compared to the old story, "you hit me, and I hit you back again;" for he certainly begged the question more than once. He then alluded very slightly (and I am very glad he did), to the physical aspect of the question. I mean if I can, to-night, to adhere strictly to Scripture, so that I won't reply to Mr. Roberts's remarks, though I may perhaps say this, that at some future time, if Mr. Roberts is willing to discuss the physical aspect of the question, I don't think I shall be unwilling to meet him. We will now look at some of the passages he has quoted. Psalm xxxix. last verse: "O spare me, that I may recover strength before I go hence, and be no more." Now I must here beg of you to remember that which I stated last night, that with the men who wrote these sacred books, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was a settled fact. If Mr. Roberts would read history, he would find this doctrine of the immortality of the soul long before Plato. If the doctrine is to be fathered on anybody, it is upon the worshippers of idols of wood and stone, and not on Plato. When David used this expression, of "departing hence and being no more," he simply accommodated himself to the common ideas of the times. This is not an uncommon thing. For instance, in the *Daily Post*, a few days ago, I saw a report of a man having committed suicide, and the language used was, that he had "destroyed himself." Now, we may fairly presume that the writer of that notice was a believer in the immortality of the soul; yet, he writes the man "destroyed himself." He didn't mean that he had

destroyed himself in the sense Mr. Roberts contends for; but that he had thrown himself into a pool, by doing which his body became deprived of life, but his spirit still retained its vital power. Nobody but one of Mr. Roberts's belief, would understand it in any other sense. What would any of my friends here, those clergymen, and ministers, and others, who are on this side of the platform, what would they understand by the statement? They would not understand that the man's body, soul, and spirit were alike lost. They would only understand that his body had perished in the waters, but that his spirit was alive for evermore. Now if we can use such language, and yet believe in the immortality of the soul, why not David? David was like any other writer in adapting himself to the language of the time. We often forget this. These men did not accommodate themselves forward to our days, but the days in which they wrote. When David spoke about "departing hence and being no more," he simply accommodated himself to the common feelings and sentiments of the time. He meant that his body would be no more. Mr. Roberts alluded last night to the fact that we find none of these common statements in the Bible, which are now in use to express the immortality of the soul. I say that this is because it is taken for granted. This is a most important argument. The sun shines, the winds blow, and it is just as plain and apparent that the soul lives for ever. I refer Mr. Roberts to Psalm xix. 7: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the *soul*." It is certain that David does not speak of converting the body. As I said last night, we are not met here to discuss what the soul is, but simply whether there is such a thing to be found in our own experience and Holy Writ. Then Mr. Roberts quoted another, Psalm vi. 5: "In death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" There is nothing in this against the immortality of the soul. We know that there is no remembrance of God nor giving of thanks to Him after death. What do we hear from day to day, coming from the lips of pious men and women? They ask to live—they ask that God may spare their lives—they ask that God would keep them from dying, that they may be able to give God thanks; and when they do that, they don't refer to giving thanks in heaven, but to the thanks of the lips on earth. They desire to sing His praise in the great congregation. Yet these pious men and women, though they speak thus, believe that they will remember God and give Him thanks when their spirits depart. So with David as regards the praise of the lips and the memory we have of God in the body. We could say "In death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" But in the xxiii Psalm we find David expressing his real sentiments, when he says, exclaiming in joyful aspiration, "*I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.*" And in another place, he speaks of having "length of days for ever and ever." Does he mean there that when he goes down into the grave he will forget God in the sense which Mr. Roberts would have us understand? Take one passage by itself, and it has scarcely any meaning at all, but taking them together, they make one harmonious whole, beautiful, clear, and

simple, that he who runs may read and understand. Then Mr. Roberts quotes Eccles. ix. 4; but if Mr. Roberts will allow me to give him a little lesson in rhetoric, I think I can explain that to him. Solomon had been speaking of the different estates and conditions of the children of men. He had said "For to him that is joined to the living there is hope, for better is a living dog than a dead lion." Now it is perfectly clear that Solomon wanted to bring together the most perfect contrast he could find. If man had no pre-eminence above a beast—as he wanted to impress very clearly upon the minds of the people the superiority of the living over the dead—he would not have said a living dog is better than a dead lion, if he and those whom he addressed had not believed in the immortality of the soul. Why does he say "lion" instead of "man"? Because the distinction was quite plain and clear, so that Solomon's rhetoric, which Mr. Roberts cannot understand, really tells against what Mr. Roberts quoted it to prove. If Solomon had thought that man had no pre-eminence above a beast, then, according to the rules of composition (this argument will apply more particularly to those who understand the rules of rhetoric) he would have said "a living dog is better than a dead man." Mr. Roberts quoted many other texts, but I will now try to give him some passages, so that he may not have to accuse me of standing here without giving him anything to do. I refer you to 2 Kings xxiii. 25: "Like unto him was there no king before him that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with *all his soul*, and with all his might. What does Mr. Roberts make of heart, soul, and might here? Is it the body? Again in Psalm lxxxviii. 14: "Lord, why castest Thou off my soul? Why hidest Thou Thy face from me?" What is the meaning of this? Soul, mind, spirit, or whatever it was, David here pictures in a state of grief and agony, from the hiding of the divine countenance, and he came to his Father and wanted to know why He did it? Again, Isaiah xlvi. 22: "There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked." How are we to read this text, if annihilation comes to the wicked? Surely when the wicked man is annihilated, he will be at peace; but thus saith the Lord, "there is no peace to the wicked." You cannot find a more explicit definition than that. No peace, no peace; there is no eternal annihilation to the wicked here. You will see that the words "There is" are not in the original. The verse simply reads "no peace to the wicked;" no peace in this world, no peace in the world to come. This is taking the literal meaning of Scriptural words, of which Mr. Roberts is fond. Again, in Isaiah lvii. 20, 21, we read: "The wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace saith my God to the wicked." I won't quote more passages this time; but just before I conclude, I should like to refer to what Mr. Roberts has said. He said feelings were no proof of the truth of a doctrine, because I referred to mine. I did not say they were. I said, if I recollect right, that according to Mr. Roberts's own words, he was convicted of an inconsistency in denying the immortality of the soul. He said "there is nothing like the education of the truth for developing all parts of our nature into harmony." He says "this aspiration after immortality is a

true aspiration," yet his truth does not teach him to bring our nature into harmony with it. He admits the aspiration, but denies the immortality, so that in his system, at least, there is no harmony. ("Time" called.)

MR. ROBERTS: As a good deal turns upon the meaning of the original word translated "soul," it will not be wasted time if I read a few passages in which it is used. The book before me, from which I purpose to read, is one that is accessible to any English reader. It is called *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance*. It classifies the words of the Bible after the style of a common Concordance; only it does so with reference to the original instead of the translated words. It gives you, under one heading, all the passages where a particular Hebrew word occurs, whether translated uniformly in the English version or not. Turning to the word "soul" in the Index, the reader is referred to page 829, on turning to which, he finds the word *nepshesh* given as the Hebrew equivalent. Under this word the reader finds no fewer than 800 passages in which it occurs, and on looking down the list, we discover a few things not apparent in the English version. We find, for instance, that animals have souls. In Gen. i. 20, we read of "the moving creatures that hath life (*nepshesh*)." According to this, the fish of the sea have "soul," and if that soul is immortal, then the fish have immortal souls. In Gen. ix. 4, we find that Noah is commanded not to eat "flesh with the life (*nepshesh*) thereof," so that when beef and mutton is in a living state, they have souls in them, and if soul is immortal, they have immortal souls. Farther down, we read (Lev. xvii. 14) that blood is "the life (*nepshesh*) of all flesh," so that blood is soul, or, as it appears from the 11th verse, "soul is in blood;—the life (*nepshesh*) of the flesh is in the blood." Every animal having blood has soul. Ergo, if the soul is immortal, all animals have immortal souls. This is legitimate reasoning; but I suppose Mr. Nightingale will seek to evade it by saying that soul in these instances simply means life—transient, evaporative life, such as belongs to every form of animate existence. He cannot do anything else, because the fact that beasts have soul is incontrovertibly thrust upon him; but if it mean this as applied to animals, it will be for him to show that it means an immortal principle as applied to man. When I sit down, I will hand him the book, and ask him to point to a single instance out of the 800, in which it has that significance. I can promise him beforehand that he will not find a single instance where it means immortal soul. It has a variety of meanings, or rather uses, but never expresses the Platonic idea of a separable, conscious, intelligent entity, capable of disembodied existence. It is used in the sense of creature or person, in many places, and in this sense it is applied to both man and beast. The following are examples of the latter. "Every living creature (*nepshesh*) that moveth."—(Gen. i. 21.) "Let the earth bring forth the living creature (*nepshesh*)"—verse 24. "Every living creature of ALL FLESH."—(Gen. ix. 16,

16.) This was in allusion to animals. Again, he that killeth a beast (literally, the *nepshesh*, life, or the soul of a beast) shall make it good; beast for beast, or as it stands in the margin—"life for life," *nepshesh* for *nepshesh*—soul for soul.—(Lev. xxiv. 18.) The word, as applied to man, is used in the sense of creature or person in the following passages: "Man became a living soul."—(Gen. ii. 7.) This is often quoted in proof of the immateriality and immortality of man's nature; but it will be observed that the same form of speech is applied in the plural form to animals. Whatever, therefore, it proves for man, it proves for animals. But, in truth, it proves immortality for neither of them. The phrase simply expresses the idea of life by breathing, without any reference to its duration. The animals had life by breathing, and man had life by breathing, and, therefore, they were both living souls, or living creatures. "Soul" is used as "person" in the following: "All the persons (margin, "souls") of his house."—(Gen. xxxvi. 6.) "All the souls that came with Jacob."—(Gen. xlvi. 26.) "According to the number of the souls."—(Exodus xii. 4.) "If a soul sin through ignorance."—(Lev. iv. 2.) "Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood."—(Lev. vii. 27.) "Whatsoever soul doeth any manner of work on that same day," &c.—(Lev. xxiii. 30.) The word is also used to denote the mind and affections of a person. "If it be your mind (*nepshesh*) that I should bury."—(Gen. xxiii. 8.) "His soul clave unto Dinah."—(Gen. xxxiv. 3.) "O my soul, come thou not unto their secret."—(Gen. xlix. 6.) "If your soul abhor my judgments."—(Lev. xxvi. 15.) "Whatsoever thy soul lusteth after."—(Deut. xiv. 26.) "The soul of all the people was grieved."—(1 Sam. xxx. 6.) "My soul thirsteth for God."—(Psalm xlii. 2.) In one or two instances, *nepshesh* is applied to dead bodies: "Shall come at no dead *nepshesh* (translated body)"—(Numb. vi. 6.) "Defiled by the dead body (*nepshesh*) of a man."—(Numb. ix. 6, 7.) From these examples, it is quite evident that the word "soul" of itself not only does not sanction the common theory on the subject, but absolutely destroys it by the diversity of its meaning, and by applications which, even from an orthodox point of view, exclude immortality from its significance. Its employment to signify the mind and affections proves nothing for the Platonic theory; but no doubt it is this employment of it that has created the impression that the Bible is in favour of that theory. The mind is presumed to be immortal, and the word used in the Scriptures to designate the mind, is therefore accepted as the synonym of immortality; but this is a logical blunder. The mortality or immortality of mind must first be settled from independent sources, because the word expresses nothing on the subject. It comes from a verb signifying to breathe, and is, therefore, appropriately applied to all that results from the act of breathing—to the air breathed, to the life thereby developed, to the mental faculties evolved from the life, and finally to the whole person whose existence springs from, and is sustained by—the vital act of breathing. In all this, there is nothing of native immortality. In fact, native immortality is entirely excluded by the whole teaching of the Word of God. It is a pagan invention—the mere induction of ancient an-

bedarkened philosophy, opposed to and subversive of, though incorporated with, the resurrection doctrines of Christianity. But it may be suggested that what is lacking in the word "soul" is supplied by the word "spirit"—that though soul may not mean the immortal principle, "spirit" does. This suggestion is at once and for ever excluded by the statement of Solomon: "They (men and beasts) all have one *ruach*," (the word translated *spirit* and *breath*).—(Eccles. iii. 18.) If *ruach*, or spirit, is an immortal principle, it follows from this statement that beasts are immortal as well as men. Solomon is not alone. Moses, in words already quoted, says that ALL (men and animals) have the breath—*ruach*, spirit—of life in their nostrils—(Gen. vii. 22.) Practically, *ruach* is interchangeable with *nephesh*. They are of an identical etymological derivation: for *ruach*, like *nephesh*, comes from a verb signifying to breathe. *Ruach*, like *nephesh*, is used throughout the Scriptures for life, mind, the affections, &c., and like *ruach*, never approaches the Platonic doctrine of natural disembodied immortality. I now hand the book to Mr. Nightingale, and ask him to find, in the hundreds of instances in which "soul" and "spirit" are used, a single case in which either of those words means an immortal principle capable of conscious disembodiment and endless existence. Mr. Nightingale does not like the argument on the death of Christ. He refuses to deal with it, and that too, on the plea that it is too sacred for discussion. I can only say that he is unlike the apostles in the matter: for of Paul it is testified, that in the open and hostile synagogues of the Jews, he reasoned with them, and alleged that Christ *must needs have suffered*.—(Acts xvii. 2, 3.) He preached the gospel with *much contention* (1 Thess. ii. 2); and the apostle John says they were to try the spirits on the very subject of Christ's death, and that if anybody brought not with them the true doctrine, they were not to receive them—(1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John 10.) Mr. Nightingale has evidently not caught the right spirit, or else he would not be so tender on one of the most important doctrines of Christianity; and a doctrine which has a direct bearing on the subject under discussion. ("Time" called.)

MR. NIGHTINGALE: AS to the book which Mr. Roberts has handed to me, it is impossible for me, at such short notice, to go through it, so as to find out what Mr. Roberts has asked for. All I can say is, Mr. Roberts seems to have changed his tone wonderfully. If there was any doubt before as to the meaning of the word soul, it is entirely set at rest now. It means various things. There would be no need for this discussion if that was not the case. It is just because of its various meanings that Mr. Roberts and I come to different conclusions. If one word meant blood, and another flesh, and another spirit, and another mind and soul, then, to use a very common expression, it would be as clear as a pikestaff. It is just because there is this difference in the definition of the word that there is such difference of theory. It is just because we don't understand another word in the Greek—*baptizo*—that we differ in our constructions of it. If the word were not capable of more than one meaning,

there would be no dispute about baptism—no quarrelling about sprinkling, dipping, or immersing. The parallel runs complete. I don't know whether it was the story in the *Daily Post* or not, but Mr. Roberts has put a halter round his own neck. He has not noticed the passages I gave him, so I will give him one or two more. In the 9th chapter of Luke, 30th verse, I read that Moses and Elias appeared on the Mount of Transfiguration, and talked with Jesus of the decease he should accomplish at Jerusalem. Now these men had died in the body hundreds of years before; and we know that it is said that God is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. Then I take Job. x. 1: "I will speak in the bitterness of my soul." Mr. Roberts, I suppose, would make this "the bitterness of my life." Now, as I said last night, we must take the meaning of the word from the context in which it stands, just as we take the words "light" and "heavy." I could give you hundreds of words in the English which mean very different things. In one sentence it means one thing, and in another, another. I don't mean to say what Job meant by "soul" in this passage. I think the word there means spirit—bitterness of his spirit. It certainly did not mean his body. He did not say the bitterness of my body: that would be out of the way altogether. I next go to 2 Sam. iv. 9. David had been in great adversity, and in this place he says: "As the Lord liveth, who hath redeemed my soul from all adversity," shewing you that as regards the word translated "soul," we have just as much right to apply it one way as the other. "God hath redeemed my soul," that is, my spirit, my mind, out of all its troubles. Well now, we will pass on to another class of texts, another division of the subject. I will now take one or two inferential texts—texts which show there is something existing within man. Mr. Roberts won't deny the doctrine of union with Christ. Now, when Christ left his people, he left them a promise that he would be with them to the end of the world, or as it reads in the original Greek "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the *aiōnos*—duration." If Mr. Roberts would limit that to the time of the duration of the Jewish power, then his argument is utterly fallacious, because Christ could not be with them in the spirit if the soul was mortal and not immortal, because many of these men died before the end of that time. If I take it to apply to the end of this world, in the ordinary sense, then I want to know how—according to Mr. Roberts's teaching—Christ could be with them while their bodies were sleeping in the dust. "I am with you *always*." Let Mr. Roberts explain "always." Then Jesus, in teaching his people, gave them the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Lazarus died and was carried into Abraham's bosom.—(Luke xvi.) How does Mr. Roberts explain that? "The rich man died, and in hell"—or the unseen place—"in the unseen place he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." If there was no other place than this, this would be sufficient to prove the immortality of the soul to me. Why did Christ use this parable if the dead go to their graves, and be there unconscious? Just another passage. In heaven, "there angels do always to hold the face of my Father which is in heaven."—(Matt. xviii. 10.)

When this is read in the original, it teaches the existence of disembodied spirits far more strongly than it seems at first. "Angelos," it is well known, can be translated "spirits." "There spirits in the heavens evermore behold the face of my Father who is in the heavens," implying that when a little child dies, its spirit beholds the face of the common Father in heaven. That teaches the immortality of the soul to me. ("Time" called.)

MR. ROBERTS: It is impossible in the space of a quarter of an hour, to notice the many little points which Mr. Nightingale has raised in his last two speeches. I must, therefore, content myself, in this my last speech, with presenting a summary of the arguments, on the strength of which, I ask you to believe that the Bible is against the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. I have called attention to the fact that the Bible is entirely devoid of the phrases by which the doctrine is moderately expressed; that though our religious teachers are every day talking of "immortal souls," "never-dying souls," "immortality of the soul," and so on, none of these expressions are to be found in the Word of God. Mr. Nightingale has vainly endeavoured to make light of this circumstance, by contending that the most important truth of religion, if it be a truth, is taken for granted in the very book from which all religion is derived. He has asked us to believe this, but he surely cannot on reflection urge his plea. Is it possible that a doctrine so truly momentous, if true, should never once, in the whole and varied course of Holy Writ, come to the surface in some unqualified and unmistakable expression? Is it possible that the writers of the Bible should, over a course of 3,000 years, be silent on the most vital and palpable doctrine of the whole system of divine truth? The suggestion is utterly untenable. It is even absurd. The practice of theologians is a direct negative to it. Do they take it for granted? Are they not continually reiterating the fact that we have immortal souls? Do they not, one and all, yield to the fearful pressure of the doctrine, and warn us of the unspeakable and eternal peril to which human beings on that account are exposed? The Methodists are a fair example of the doctrine reduced to its logical results. They illustrate the effects of surrendering the heart and judgment to the awful conclusion that we are liable and in imminent danger of sinking to a condition of indescribable and everlasting misery. They are more consistent than the smooth-tongued, and, perhaps, more respectable, priests of the Church of England, who treat the subject with a tenderness little in keeping with the terrible import of the doctrine they profess to believe. The Methodist is in earnest, and spares no words and no fervour to convince you that you are on the brink of a yawning abyss of woe, into which the devil of their creed is anxious to pitch you, and from which they tell you Christ came to deliver you! Is it possible that the earnest and faithful Prophets and Apostles of old would have been less explicit and less direct in their statements, than the consistent Methodists, if they, like them, believed that the soul was immortal, and eternal torture was the destiny of all not saved? Is it conceivable that these doctrines can

be true, and not mentioned in the Bible? It is simply absurd to suggest such a thing. It is much more natural to conclude that the entire silence of the Bible on the subject means entire discountenance. To this conclusion we are shut up by the other considerations to which I have called your attention. The Bible reveals immortality as a condition only to be attained through Christ, by those who are obedient to him, and expressly declares destruction and obliteration to be the end of all sin and sinners. This excludes the doctrine of inherent immortality and eternal life to the wicked in torment. The doctrine of natural immortality sets aside the mission of Christ, who brought immortality to light, and who proclaims himself the Resurrection and the Life, in relation to all who believe in him. Finally, we find the Bible expressly affirming the unconsciousness and extinction of those who are in the death-state. Mr. Nightingale has attempted to get over these testimonies by affirming that they relate to the body. Are you satisfied with such a mode of explanation? Can Mr. Nightingale himself be satisfied with it on calm reflection? "*In death there is no remembrance of Thee.*" Who can believe that David wrote these words with the reservation which he imputes to him? Who can seriously suppose that David would give prominence to the unimportant and self-evident fact that a lifeless body was incapable of thinking of God, and to keep back the momentous truth (if true) that "the immortal spirit" retained and expanded its memories in the disembodied state? "He returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish.*" Who can suppose that David would seriously say such a thing as that in reference to what nobody would call in question—the incapability of a corpse—and omit, and colourably conceal the uncognizable and terrible fact (if true) that a man at death goes straight to God with a memory charged with the distinct and palpable recollections of a lifetime? The suggestion is dishonouring to the Word of God. It amounts to an imputation of the *suppressio veri*. It is saying that the Bible fails to plainly declare the truth, and colourably teaches error. It is impossible to receive Mr. Nightingale's suggestions for a moment. They are the mere makeshifts of a theory in terrible straits. His allusion to the phraseology of newspaper obituaries, and the common talk of people on the subject of death, does not soften the difficulty one iota. To argue from people believing in immortal-soulism, to those whose belief is disputed, is entirely precluded. It is true that modern immortal-soulists speak of death as if it were a destruction of the person; but it is open for me to affirm that this, instead of proving that the Bible writers, writing in the same way, still held the immortality of the soul, only shows that good sense, as a matter of language, triumphs, even in modern times, over a theological fiction. There can be no parallel between the two, because modern religionists, while adopting a natural language on the subject of death, expressly avow their belief in the immortality of the soul, and the consciousness of the dead; which Bible writers do not. But how comes it, it will be asked, that the immortality of the soul is universally received as a Christian doctrine? This question must be answered historically. We go back to the times of the apostles, and we find their teaching free of it; but we find them predicting a time when fables

would prevail against the truth; and we find contemporary with them the germs of those fables in the doctrines of the Grecian schools. We behold these schools in great influence and activity. We see Christianity spread through the power of its miraculous evidences. We see the Apostles disappear from the scene in martyrdom, and we then see a gradual coalition between "the wisdom of this world" and "the foolishness of preaching"—an amalgamation of Platonic philosophy with the simple doctrines of Christ; an unholy alliance between the mere speculations of heathen thinkers and the divine dogmas of Nazareth. The mixture developed a system which grew to a gigantic and tyrannous system of superstition, that overshadowed the world with darkness for many centuries. A little relief came at the Reformation, but left the system substantially unchanged, and the result is, that in this boasted nineteenth century of enlightenment, we live under a system of religion staggering to the understanding, and revolting to every worthy sentiment of our nature—a system which sends us at death to our reward in heaven or to our doom in hell, and yet brings us back at a future judgment day, to have it decided whether we ought to have gone there; a system which says the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and yet asserts the salvation of children, idiots, and heathens without the gospel—which sends missionaries to the heathen, and yet teaches they can be saved without them—a system which tells us God is love, and yet, that with omnipotence at His command, He allows an immortal and supernatural devil to infest creation, destroy His works, and damn His creatures; which tells us that God is mercy, benignity, order, and peace, and yet that with foreknowledge and omnipotence at His disposal, nine-tenths of the human race are to be consigned to a state of inconceivable agony and torture, which shall last to all eternity; a system which tells us that God is just, and yet that He is to punish countless millions of immortal souls, for the sin of one man in which they had no participation, and of which they had no knowledge; that God is gracious and merciful, and yet that the poor, helpless wretches, in the slums of great towns like Birmingham, who are born in squalor and filth, and surrounded by all the degrading influences of brutality, ignorance, and vice, are to be sent to writhe in eternal agony for what they could not help being—to pay an eternal penalty in objectless torture for the misfortunes of a brief span of life, over which they had no control; a system which, while compelled to use the Bible descriptions of Deity, presents to us a monster outstripping in blundering selfishness and malignity all the fabled gods of Greece and Rome; a system which with one hand holds out the Bible as the word of God, and with the other steals every spark of divinity from its pages, and enshrouds it in a darkness and confusion which stagger the sensible mind in its honest endeavours to receive it. These may seem heated and extravagant remarks, but they are within the strict line of the truth. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is the great stumbling block in the way of popular faith. It necessitates a theology which is repulsive to every logical and moral instinct, a theology which the cool and dispassionate mind cannot receive, except by a despairing, bewildered, and fatuitous act of faith. The results are rapidly

multiplying throughout English society. The chasm between intellect and the Bible is growing wider and wider, and threatens the entire alienation of the Book of God from the confidence and regard of the reflecting of the community. This is all because the Bible is held responsible for absurd doctrines which it does not teach, and is set before the people as the source and standard of an impossible system of theology, with which it has absolutely nothing to do, and of which it is entirely subversive. Remove the immortality of the soul, and you destroy the lurid pictures of damnation by which the people are seared into religion, and you banish the source of all the discord which vibrates in every doctrinal fibre of the system. Accept the plain statements of the Bible and the evidence of sense, that man is a corruptible and decaying organism of life, after an exalted pattern, but degenerated from primitive type—under condemnation of death, but offered a possible immortality of perfect existence on the basis of faith in God's promises, and obedience to God's commandments, and you have a doctrine of future life which harmonises with the character of the Deity as declared in His Word, and revealed in the works of nature. Reject then, the cause of all theological disorder, the Pagan fiction of the soul's immortality, which the Bible is against, negatively, constructively, and expressly, and receive the harmonious doctrine of conditional immortality, by resurrection through him who has declared himself to be "the Resurrection and the Life."

MR. NIGHTINGALE: I felt a little reproved last night, for a somewhat violent ebullition of feeling in the course of the discussion. I put it down, of course, to my being a mere novice. It was the first time I had ever taken upon me to discuss a question of this kind, and it was quite new for me to stand before an audience like this; and greatly against my own intentions, I let slip a few hasty expressions, but I think that now we are equal. If I lost my temper, Mr. Roberts has certainly lost his, so that we are square. One thing struck me. It may appear trifling, but while Mr. Roberts was speaking, I have been very much reminded of something I saw in a stationer's window, as I came to the meeting to-night. I refer to our wonderful *Punch*. The number for this week has just come out, and in it there is a picture of a page standing before his mistress, and the mistress is dismissing the boy for carelessness. The boy on hearing that he is dismissed, becomes saucy, and says, "I suppose it is because I am so ugly." Mr. Roberts dismisses our doctrines because they are so ugly. Well, we cannot help that. According to his own statements, we must take the doctrine wherever, however, and in whatever position it is to be found. If it does not commend itself to his feelings, that is not the fault of the doctrine. Mr. Roberts boasted somewhat loudly of my not quoting Scripture. I have been quoting Scripture all night, but he has never thought fit to touch any of it. Once or twice his speeches have reminded me of Dr. Johnson's words, "A definition of things in general." He treated us in his last speech to things in general, but certainly nothing in particular. Mr. Roberts seems rather fond of Solomon, so I will give him something from Proverbs, 12th

chap., 28th verse. "In the way of righteousness is life, and in the pathway thereof, there is no death." *No death*, mark that; man, you see, has some pre-eminence above a beast. It is for Mr. Roberts to say how annihilation and no death can shake hands together. I think I must believe that Solomon believed that man had some pre-eminence over the beast, because "in the way of righteousness is no death." I will then go to the 10th chapter of Matthew, 28th verse. Christ says, "Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul." Why didn't Mr. Roberts quote that? It goes on to say, "but rather fear him that can destroy"—destroy, here, it is well known, means not to annihilate, but to afflict torments—"both body and soul in hell." Again I read, in 1 Corinthians xii. 7. the following statement. "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. Would Mr. Roberts have me believe that the members of Christ shall see corruption for a time? That He who liveth for evermore would let one of His members perish in that sense? I am not certain whether Mr. Roberts believes in the doctrine of union with Christ or not, but he believes that Christ ever lives in heaven. Mr. Roberts proceeded, in a very general and vague way, to combat this subject, on the whole. I won't say whether it was for shortness of time or shortness of argument. Probably both things went hand-in-hand; but I must say, I could not help being pained by the tone which Mr. Roberts adopted, in the last part of his speech, toward ministers of religion. The experience he has had of them in this discussion, has not been such as to warrant his applying such words to them. I think if Mr. Roberts had continued to debate, and not grown angry—and continued the good lesson which he taught me last night, we should all of us have been as much instructed; for I must confess I have been instructed by some of his speeches. I think, sir, instead of heaping opprobrious epithets upon a class of men who at least are doing as much for poor derided and neglected human nature as Mr. Roberts, it would have been better to have left those words unsaid. If he had not used those expressions, which I cannot think he believes in, in reality, he would have produced a more lasting impression on your minds, and upon those who agree and believe with me. I must say, however much it pains me to say it, that while Mr. Roberts was speaking, I thought instead of listening to one who believed the Bible, I was listening to one who disbelieves it altogether. I thank God I never attended an infidel lecture; but if I may understand anything from reports, I should say that nothing was ever uttered at one of these lectures, more calculated to bring disgrace and dishonour upon the Bible, than those things which have been said by Mr. Roberts. I would only say in conclusion, we have at last had a digest of Mr. Roberts's system to-night, and especially last night you have also heard mine. I ask you which is in most accordance with the general teaching of the Bible—the system which I believe or that which he teaches? Which is most likely to harmonise the truth in all its relations—the system which teaches immortality or that which denies it? He says somewhere in his lectures, "God has given to man alone the misery of unsatisfied desires."

Mr. ROBERTS asked Mr. Nightingale to quote the words he referred to. Mr. NIGHTINGALE did not at the moment find them, but afterwards privately referred Mr. Roberts to the following passage:—

"That man, having strong instinctive desires for immortality and perfection, should yet be subject to sin and death, and surrounded with imperfection, disorder, and misery, requires explanation. This explanation 'nature' refuses to furnish. If we look upon the condition of man as a natural accident, we have an impenetrable mystery to deal with. We have to account on natural principles for the fact that while nature establishes the strictest correspondence between instinct and condition, in the case of every other species throughout her wide domain, she refuses this beautiful happiness-producing adaptation in the case of her noblest production—man, leaving him to the wretchedness of disappointed, noble aspiration. This it is simply impossible to do. Unaided by Revelation, human condition and destiny must for ever remain an insoluble enigma."—*Twelve Lectures, &c.*, 3rd edition, page 70.

He continued—Which is most worthy of your belief, the faith which teaches me that my hope and God's ways are one, or the one that says my thoughts and God's thoughts are different? Which is likely to be in accordance with the faith of the Bible—that which tells me that the Bible stands by itself, or that which tells me that the Bible and the infidel can shake hands—that mortality and immortality can walk side by side—which teaches that infidelity and Christianity can embrace each other lovingly? I don't mean to say that Mr. Roberts does this. I think he would repudiate infidelity entirely, as much as I should. I say his teaching leads to it. We are told by the Apostles that in the last days false teachers shall rise, and draw away people after them: I quite agree with that. I think they have arisen, and are living now, and that we have been listening to some of their teaching to-night.