

SECOND PROPOSITION—FOURTH SESSION.

REMARKS BY MR. HENRY OVERBY, CHAIRMAN.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The hour has come now to take up the second subject in this discussion. I will read the proposition now to be debated :

The Scriptures teach that all that constitutes man will be utterly unconscious from the time of death till the resurrection.

Mr. Williams affirms,

Mr. Hall denies.

(*Mr. Williams' First Speech of One Hour*)

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I will say now in regard to the proposition we are to discuss, that the form in which it is presented is the form that my friend wrote up at the time arrangements were made. It is not exactly as I would like it; it is not just as I wanted it; my form would be “That *man* in the state between death and resurrection is totally unconscious.” My friend preferred to have it that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious between death and resurrection. There may be a possibility of getting out of this an apparently technical advantage; if so, it will be only technical. What I affirm is this: Man between death and resurrection is totally unconscious. Therefore if there is any advantage taken of that, whether parts that constitute man is conscious before what constitutes him becomes unconscious, or the spirit is unconscious or not, we will deal with that when the question comes up.

What is it we affirm? What is it we ask you to believe? In starting out in the investigation of this subject, we ask you to believe that a man when he is dead is dead. That is what we ask you to believe, that man when he dies is not alive. Is it unreasonable to ask you to believe that a dead man is dead? Will any man say that a dead man is not dead, but that he is alive? If he is alive he is not dead. If he is conscious he is alive, and if he is alive he is not dead. Our affirmation, therefore, is that a man who is dead is dead and that he is not alive when he is dead. Now I do not think that I am asking you to accept anything that is unreasonable in that. Let us therefore proceed to quote a number of scriptures bearing upon this subject. I will, first of all, read a number of texts that I expect to use throughout this discussion and give my friend the whole time at his disposal during the discussion of this subject for their consideration. I have them quoted in this little book, “The Great Salvation,” and as they are here together I shall read them from this.

I. Cor. xv: 47, “The first man is of the earth, earthy.” I quote that to prove that man is out of the earth; he did not come from heaven. Gen ii: 7—And the Lord God *formed* man of the dust of the ground. Gen. iii: 19—For out of it (dust) wast thou taken; for *dust thou art* and unto dust shalt thou return. Job xxxiii: 6—I also am *formed out of clay*. Gen. iii: 23—Therefore the Lord God sent him (Adam) forth from the garden of Eden, to till the *ground from whence he*

was taken. Gen. xviii:27—And Abraham answered and said: Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord *which am but dust and ashes.* Job iv: 17—Shall *mortal man* be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his maker? Job x: 9—Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast *made me as the clay;* and wilt thou *bring me into dust again?* Psa. ciii: 14—For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that *we are dust.* Psa. lxxxix: 48—What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? *Shall he deliver his soul (himself) from the hand of the grave?* Eccl. iii: 19, 20—For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even *one thing befalleth them—as the one dieth so dieth the other . . .* all go to one place; *all are of the dust and all turn to dust again.* Isa. xl: 5—All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the Spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it; surely the people is grass. Eccl. ix: 10—Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is *no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom* in the grave whither thou goest. Psa. vi: 5—In death *there is no remembrance of thee,* in the grave who shall give thee thanks? Eccl. ix 5—For the living know that they shall die; but the dead *know not anything.*—Psa. cxlvi: 3, 4—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. Isa. xxxviii: 18, 19—The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee, *they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.*

Now here are a few testimonies I will leave for my friend to consider. I wish to use these as I go along in presenting the subject. I shall therefore go back to the beginning and see what man is; and then we shall see what takes place when he dies, inasmuch as death undoes what formation and life did; then we shall see what death really results in. It is said in Gen. i that the Lord God formed man. It does not say that the Lord God formed the body of man and put the man into that body; that is not it at all; it is that the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and whatever man is, he is formed out of the dust of the ground. Where did man come from? Out of the dust of the ground. Now let my friend consider in his first speech who said this: God said so. What did God say man came out of? The dust of the ground? Immortality does not come out of the dust of the ground, does it? If man, then, the real man, is an immortal being, that man did not come out of the dust of the ground, for immortal beings do not come out of the ground. Yet we have it here that the Lord God formed man—whatever he is—out of the dust of the ground.

Then what is the next thing in the process? He breathed into his nostrils—breathed into what? Into his nostrils. What did he breathe into his nostrils? Breath. Do not talk about breathing an immortal soul into a man's nostrils. How could you breathe an intelligent entity into a man's nostrils? What did God breathe into man's nostrils? The breath of life, or, if you prefer it, the spirit of life, as we shall see after a while they are the same. He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man—the man formed out of the dust of the ground—became a living soul—not an immortal soul, but a living soul. And here, let me say, you ask my friend from the beginning of this discussion to the end to give a text anywhere from Genesis to Revelation where you have the phrase "immortal soul," and see if he can do it. Everybody, I suppose, in the Baptist church has used the term "immortal soul" a great many

times, and many others have used it before they learned the truth; where did the phrase come from? It did not come from the Bible, for it is nowhere found in the Bible. If it is found in the Bible my friend will be able to produce it. So it is God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Now he is a living soul, and living soul does not mean immortal soul, for the phrase "living soul" is applied to the beasts of the field more often in the Scriptures than it is applied to man. Therefore living soul cannot mean immortal soul, for if it did, then you would prove the immortality of the soul for the beasts of the field with a greater number of testimonies than you could prove that of man. Living soul, therefore, means simply living creature; or, as Dr. Kitto renders this verse, "Man became a living animal." He belongs to the animal kingdom and not the vegetable kingdom. Do not be shocked because we say he belongs to the animal kingdom, or because Dr. Kitto renders the verse "living animal" because he was the highest of all other creatures, and given dominion over them. There are now many men lower than the animals. Of course you could not entertain the idea that they are immortal souls, for why should immortal souls descend below the level of the brute?

In the text I have quoted in I. Cor. xv. it is said, that the first man is of the earth, earthy. Where did man come from? From the earth. What is he then? Earthy. That means the body of man, not the man, my friend will say; but it positively says that the *first man* is of the earth and we believe what it says. We cannot permit people to volunteer their opinions and add to the testimony and read between the lines. It is said that he is formed from the dust of the ground; that he is out of the dust, that he is of the earth earthy. In speaking of this earthy man formed out of the dust of the ground and given dominion over all things on the earth, God said that he with everything was very good. What is man now? What kind of a man do we have? God in his power and wisdom has organized and formed a creature out of the dust of the ground, and to bring that creature to life and cause him to stand up a living creature, he starts the process of respiration. What is that? He causes the man to breathe and he begins to breathe the spirit of life in which we all dwell, and it is in this sense we all live and move and have our being in God. The spirit of God surrounds us; it is everywhere. We cannot get away from His spirit. If we ascend to heaven, He is there. If we make our bed in the grave He is there. By His spirit He is everywhere, upholding, sustaining all things, whether vegetable or animal. We are therefore living in the halo of that spirit, appropriating it to our use by breathing in and breathing out the breath of life, and as long as we do that we are living men and women. First he formed the whole structure, inanimate, of the human being, and then started up the machinery. The very same thing took place with every creature. They all have the breath of life. They "went in two and two into the ark of all flesh wherein is the breath of life" (Gen. vii: 13), the very same words—so that man has the breath of life and the beasts of the field have the breath of life. Man is formed, created, the beasts of the field were formed. Here they are inanimate, then made alive by the appropriation of that life God has placed them in. The moment they begin to do that they are alive; and when they cease to breathe they are dead.

Now we come along a little further in the line of the testimony we have quoted. We come down to the time man transgressed the law of God. You remember the sentence, "In the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die"

(Margin). I will ask you now, Who was it that was to die in case of breaking the commandment God gave? You will say that it was *man* who was to die. I will ask you, Was that man a conscious being before he was made alive? No, you will say, he was unconscious. Was he a conscious being after he was made alive? Yes, you will say. Now, therefore, when life is taken away from him he is again a lifeless being as he was before he was made alive; and since he was unconscious then, is he not unconscious now? But this you will say is reasoning on the question: true, but the Spirit of inspiration says, "Come, let us reason together."

Now I will follow along: The man did transgress the law; what was the result? The result was, the penalty threatened was pronounced upon him. What was the penalty? "Death shall be thy portion." And was this penalty pronounced upon *man* after he had transgressed the law of Jehovah? "Because *thou*—the same man; what had this man done? He had put forth his hand and taken of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. What kind of a man was it? A man that had a hand and he could put forth the same hand and take of the tree of life. Was it an immaterial, spiritual man, or a real, substantial, literal man, formed out of dust and animated by the breath of life? That was the kind of man that put forth his hand and took of the forbidden fruit. "Because *thou*"—this kind of a man, there is no other kind of a man there—"hast done this, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt *thou* eat of it all the days of *thy* life . . . in the sweat of *thy* face shalt thou eat bread until *thou* return unto the ground"—this was still the material man, was it not? "Return"—go back again to the dust from whence thou wast taken, "for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Now certainly we have man dead, gone back to dust, and therefore unconscious. That is what my proposition says.

Now we will follow this matter a little further along. Man had been placed in the garden of Eden. After he had transgressed the law of Jehovah it was said, "Now, therefore, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever"—what? Lest he do what? "Lest he eat of the tree of life and *live forever*." What is he driven forth from the garden for? To prevent this man from living forever, so that he might die under the sentence. Do not let him put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and live forever, because he is a sinner. Drive him out of the garden lest he do this. So that God has arranged and prepared that sinners shall not live forever; he has not prepared to *preserve* them forever throughout the countless ages of eternity in hell fire—nothing of the kind. That is a pagan myth as we shall show before we get through. If he had been an immortal soul before he ate of the tree of life he must necessarily live forever anyhow. He would be a "never-dying soul," a soul that never could die. But this soul that the Bible is talking about is one that could pass under death. He must not be allowed to put forth his hand and take of the tree of life lest he live forever. Therefore God drove him out of the garden. Now I ask you, Did Adam live forever? Is Adam alive today? Is he ever going to stop living? If not, then he lives forever anyhow, notwithstanding God drove him out of the garden to prevent it. If he is an immortal soul, then he lives forever and God failed to prevent it. Did God drive him out of the garden to prevent him living forever? If Adam is still alive in heaven or hell or anywhere else then God did not succeed; if Adam is dead, then God did succeed. I say he is dead and therefore God did succeed; and if he is dead, then he never can come to life without a resurrection.

We now come to the book of Job xiv: 1—"Man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not . . . There is hope of a tree if it be cut down that it will sprout again . . . but man dieth and wasteth away; yea man giveth up the ghost and where is he?" What becomes of him? Why he says, "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up; so *man lieth down* and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." What has become of him? He is dead. Show him to me if you can. My friend is going to show to us a living, conscious man after this takes place. Job asks, "If a man die shall he *live again*?" All the days of my appointed time will *I wait* till my change come." He returns to dust from whence he was taken. "For dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," are the words and they cannot be changed.

Going along a little further we come to the words of the wise man, Solomon, in whose heart it is said God put wisdom, and you have the wisdom of Solomon as a proverb: Eccles. iii: 17—"I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them and that they might see that they themselves are beasts." Then he proceeds to explain that he is talking about death, for this same wise man says that a "living dog is better than a dead lion." and here he is talking about man in death; "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them." What is the one thing that befalleth them, Solomon? that befalleth man and beast alike? What is it? We are taught to believe that when they die it is a very different thing with man and beast. We are taught to believe that when a man dies he does not die; that when a man dies he knows more than he did before—when he was alive; for we hear the preachers saying from the pulpits, "Wait a little while, and what you do not know now, you will know all about when you die." So a man has to die to increase his knowledge according to that. Let us come to the words of Solomon: "As the one dieth so dieth the other." Is the beast conscious after death? No, my friend will say. Then man is not conscious after death. How do you know? Solomon says, "As the one dieth so dieth the other," and here he adds, "For they all have one breath." It is the same breath, the same spirit that man lives by the beasts live by. Then he adds, "All go to one place?" What place is that? If it is in heaven, then the beasts go there too; if it is a burning hell, then the beasts go there too. "All are of the dust and all turn to dust again." That is what happens, then, when death takes place. So far as death itself is concerned it is the same with man as with the beast, so that he says that man hath no preëminence over the beast. My friend, of course, in negating my proposition says that man in the death state is conscious; then he certainly has a preëminence above the beasts, but Solomon says that in the death state man has no preëminence above the beasts. Now he challenges my friend; he challenges every man that would dare to say what Plato said—for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is called the Platonic doctrine, and the Platonic doctrine was in its original state a doctrine of the transmigration of souls, that the souls of the beasts went down and the souls of man went up—so after Solomon tells us clearly that man and beasts die alike, that all are of the dust and all return to dust again; then he challenges the world by asking them, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, or the spirit of the beast that goeth downward?" He is challenging the very thing that I am challenging here today,

where is the man that ever knew of such a thing as that? That was taught in Egypt where Plato received a part of his education, in Alexandria. Therefore Solomon contests this Egyptian and Platonic doctrine and challenges such a thing. I tell, you, he says, that man and beast are alike in death; they all return to dust at death.

Then we come to the Psalmist who speaks in language that cannot be misunderstood. Psa. cxlvi: 3: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth." What goeth forth? His breath. What does that mean? He breathes out his last breath; he expires, as we say, and what then? He dies; everybody knows that. No, you say, he is more alive than he ever was. Let us see what the Psalmist says about that? "His breath goeth forth." Now, David, will you tell us what has become of the man? Why, he says, he—the man—he returns—what does? The man "goes again." What did we find the first man was formed of? Out of dust. Now when death takes place, what? He *returns*, goes back, again, to dust. What about his consciousness, for I am here to affirm that when a man breathes out his last breath and returns to dust he is absolutely unconscious; my friend is here to deny that and we want the Psalmist to settle it for us; what does he say? "*In that very day his thoughts perish.*"

Let the wise man come in again. Eccles. ix: 5—"For the living know that they must die; but the dead"—The living do know something; what do they know? They know that they must die. What about the dead? Do they know anything? I am here to say no. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know NOT ANYTHING." Is that plain enough? Does that sustain my position? What is it that is dead? O, my friend here will say, it is only the body. but it is *he*—the man—that comes from the dust, therefore the entire man is certainly in an unconscious state when dead; and that is the reason why Solomon adds, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, no knowledge, no wisdom nor device in the grave." Well, what of that? if we do not go to the grave? Your words do not mean anything. No, they do not fit the theory my friend is here to support. But what does Solomon say? "There is no wisdom nor knowledge nor device in the grave WHITHER THOU GOEST." He tells us that the time to work is now, that the time to have knowledge is now, because after death when you go to the grave there is neither work, nor wisdom, nor knowledge nor device. Therefore man in death is absolutely unconscious, if God's word be true, and who will dare to challenge the truth of God's word?

Now you will say, that is a very dark picture. If I were to leave it right there it would be; but let us see. In Job xiv; after he tells us that man dieth and wasteth away, yea man giveth up the ghost and where is he? Then he goes on to say, "If a man die, shall he live again? "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands."

This is the question. If a man die, shall he live *again*. He was alive once, he is dead now; shall he live again? But if he lives all the way along and never dies, and only shuffles off his body and goes on living above or below, in heaven or hell, what is the use of the question, "Shall he live again?" If he dies and is dead, unconscious and not alive, then the question comes in appropriately, shall he live again? Then Job goes on to say, "O, that thou wouldst hide me in the

grave, that thou wouldst keep me secret until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time and remember me." Then when that set time comes, what was Job's hope? "Thou shalt call and I will answer thee. Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." When is this time that you are referring to, Job? We have his answer in the nineteenth chapter: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand AT THE LATTER DAY upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body"—though I die and go into the grave—the question is, shall he live again? "Yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." So then his hope was in the resurrection of the dead; but if man does not die and become unconscious what in the world do we want of a resurrection? If good men go to heaven and are basking in bliss there, what do they want of the resurrection? Are you going to disturb them in bliss and bring them back and compel them to go into mortal bodies and judge them? Are you going to bring those writhing in hell and put them back into their bodies and judge them again? But if the dead are dead and awaiting a resurrection, then God will judge them first and reward them afterwards or punish them according to their deserts.

Now we will follow along a little further and we come to a case recorded by the prophet Isaiah, a portion of which I have quoted, from the thirty-eighth chapter. Here you have the case of King Hezekiah. It says in the first verse, "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death," and the prophet came to him and told him to set his house in order, for he should *die and not live*. That is plain enough, is it not? Therefore, when he was dead he would not be alive, would he? Now let us see how he viewed the matter. When the message of death came to him he turned his face to the wall and wept sorely and prayed for life. In answer to his prayer did God add to his days of life or not? If he had died would he have been dead, or would he have been alive for the fifteen years? What did God do? In listening to his prayer, he gave him the thing he asked for, and what was that? Life; fifteen years of living. If he had died he would not have been alive those fifteen years, would he? Oh, yes, we are told, he was a good man and he would have lived in heaven. Would it not have been better, then, to have let him die if death would have sent him to heaven? I ask you are you willing to believe that Hezekiah prayed to be kept out of heaven fifteen years? If he had died he would have gone to heaven and enjoyed the bliss of heaven, you say. Now let Hezekiah tell us what he knew about the matter. Tenth verse: "I said in the cutting off of my days I shall go to the gates of the grave." Then he would not have gone to heaven, would he? He would not have gone where he would see the Lord in the land of the living? "I shall go to the gates of the grave; I am deprived of the residue of my years. I said, *I shall not see the Lord*, even the Lord in the land of the living." Then he would not have gone to heaven, would he? He would not have gone where he would have seen the Lord in the land of the living. "I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world." Why? Because he would be dead and could not behold anything. He could not see the Lord nor man. Verse seventeen; "Behold for peace I had great bitterness," that is when he contemplated death. "But thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption." Where would your soul have gone, Hezekiah, if you had died? It would have gone to the pit of corruption. What has God done in adding fifteen years? He has saved my soul from the pit of corruption, or, in other word ,

he has saved *me* from going to the pit, to the pit of corruption. What is that pit of corruption, Hezekiah? "For," he says, "*the grave* (that is the pit of corruption) cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day."

Now we will come to the New Testament. We have here the case of a dead and buried man. Word had come to the disciples and to the Lord himself that Lazarus was dead. In speaking of this the Lord said, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth and I go that I may awake him." They thought that he was sleeping an ordinary sleep, and he said unto them plainly, "Lazarus is dead." What does he mean by that? And they followed him to the home of Martha and Mary; and Martha said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." Why, what is the matter, Martha, Mary? Why are you weeping? Even "Jesus wept." Lazarus was a good man; why are you weeping if he has gone to bliss in heaven, as Baptists believe, as I can show you from their books I have here? But she said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." He is dead; we are left without him. But the Saviour said, "Thy brother—" shall what? Thy brother is still living, still conscious? If he had said that, then my friend here would have had an excuse for negating my proposition, for I have affirmed that man in the death state is absolutely unconscious. What about this man, Lazarus? "Thy brother shall *rise again*." I know he is dead and buried, but he shall rise again. Where is he? In the tomb. Who is in the tomb? Lazarus. Why is he there? Because his breath went forth and his thoughts perished. Now, "Where have you laid him?" They took him to the place and he said, "Lazarus, come forth." Where did Jesus bring Lazarus from? He brought him from wherever he was. Where was he? Was he in heaven? Was he in a burning hell? Did Christ call him to come out of the flames of hell? Where was he? As you know, ye was in the tomb and nowhere else, and in the tomb there is no wisdom, nor knowledge, nor device. Then, he that was alive in heaven came forth? He that was alive in hell came forth? No; he that was *dead* came forth, and Jesus said, "Loose him and let him go." There we have the resurrection of a *dead* man.

I am now going to refer to a portion of scripture that will settle this matter in your minds, every one of you, if you will just give me your careful attention. The apostle in I. Cor. xv. was dealing with a heresy that had crept into the church at Corinth, which heresy was a denial of the resurrection of the dead. He says, "For I delivered unto you first of all—among the chief things of the gospel—how that Christ died." Did you tell the Corinthians that Christ died, Paul? What! the second person of the "blessed trinity" died? The second person of the triune, God died? He who is God, very God, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, the second person of the trinity! Can God die? If Christ is co-equal and co-eternal, the second person of the trinity, he could not die. My gospel is that Christ died and the same Christ was buried! My gospel is this, said Paul, that if there is no resurrection of the dead, Christ is still dead and in the tomb, and you have no Christ, and therefore you may as well eat and drink for tomorrow you die. So you see in the case of Christ death was a reality, and "God raised Jesus of Nazareth from death." If you ask what happened to his soul, he "poured out his soul unto death," but his soul was not "left in hades." which is another way of saying that *he* was not left there,

Now following along this argument, Paul comes to men in general who die in Christ. If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not raised, and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Now this is the matter I want you to rivet your attention on. If there is no resurrection of the dead, what then? "They that have fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED." The apostle says that they are dead and in the grave, and if there is no resurrection for them they are perished forever, and our answer to Job's question would be, No. What does this teach you? It teaches that the future life absolutely depends upon a resurrection out of death. Therefore it teaches you that there is no consciousness in death. If there is no resurrection they never live again. That is what the apostle says. Are you willing to believe that men when dead are dead, and that when they are buried they return to dust?

Now in regard to the word "soul" and the word "spirit." I know what my friend will do; that he will bring up the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and the thief on the cross, and the apostle's desire to depart and to be with Christ, and that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord, etc. I have given you text after text of plain, literal statements, not parables, that say that the dead know not anything, that if there is no resurrection they that sleep in the dust of the earth are perished, that the first man is out of the earth, that when we are dead, we are dead. I have shown you this. If there are a few parables that seem to contradict this, let me tell you it is an easy matter to harmonize the Bible. The first thing is to get the general tenor of the Scriptures. A few obscure passages here and there do not give the general tenor of the Scriptures. In regard to the words "soul" and "spirit" I will give a definition of them so it may be before you, and so my friend may have the advantage of it. I am not going to give you my own definition, but what will be acknowledged as authoritative. The primary meaning of the word soul is breathing creature; it is employed to express a variety of aspects in which living creatures are spoken of. Hence the word is applied to the beasts. From the original the word is rendered "life," "living," "a living man," "person," "self," "breath," "heart," "mind," "body," "creature," "beast," "man," but it is never found in the Bible with the prefix "immortal." The beasts are called souls. Job says, "My soul chooses strangling and death." We are told in Revelation that every living soul died in the sea. So "soul" does not mean "immortal soul."

Now in regard to the word spirit. The primary meaning of the words—there are different words in the original, and of course different in the Old and New Testaments. You have in one case the word *fantasma* and the word *pneuma* in the Greek and in the Hebrew *neshama* and *ruach*; the primary meaning being wind, breath. As used in the Bible the words represent different things, sometimes disposition, mind, taste, feeling. Spirit is applied to God, to angels, to men, to beasts. Therefore, the meaning must always be determined by the context. If it is the mind we shall see from the context. Immortal beings are called spirits. If the reference is to angels the context will decide, but the word must be understood by the connection, then we shall have no difficulty in understanding it. But the plain simple teachings from the facts before us are these: Man is created out of dust; in death he is dead, absolutely unconscious, absolutely lifeless, absolutely dependent upon a resurrection from the dead before ever he can live again. Now it is very strange that these things should be denied. Suppose it is true, as the orthodox world believes, as the Baptist church believes—

I do not think my friend here will deny it; their representative men teach that when you die, if you are good you go to heaven and bask in bliss; if you are bad you go to hell and writhe in torment. If this be true, then, from the time of Cain and Abel good men have been going to heaven and bad men have been going to hell, and therefore for nearly six thousand years Cain has been writhing in torment and Abel has been basking in bliss. Ask Abel if he wants a resurrection, to be forced back into his body that was a "mortal coil" to him. Will anybody ask him if he wants to come back here and be judged in the day of judgment? His answer would be, "What in the world do you expect me to be judged for when I have been happy six thousand years?" [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—FOURTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Speech of One Hour.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We are entering upon the discussion of a subject that is fraught with profound interest to everybody present. I suppose probably no subject could claim your attention or arouse your interest so much as does the condition of the dead. The thought that comes nearest our hearts and provokes our falling tears is the recollection of our departed friends and the anxious inquiry springs to our lips. What is the present condition of the dead? What shall be our condition when it will be said of us, that we are dead?

We appreciate the very patient attention that has been given to our brother while he proceeded to outline before you his position on the subject; I bespeak for the entire discussion of the question that same degree of interest, and as fearful as is the thought that we may stand by the open sepulchre, and look in on the pale face of the ones we love, with the expectation that they have fallen into utter unconsciousness, and must sleep without consciousness until the resurrection from the dead, terrible, I say, as such a truth may be, yet if it be the truth of God's word, we ought to accept it, and I now assert my readiness to accept the position that has been taken by this brother, if the passages he has quoted, when placed in their right connection with what they themselves say, teach any such doctrine. I will be willing to believe it if God teaches it. But I am not going to accept it because of some sort of an interpretation my brother may make. I shall follow my brother as he did not follow me, and will not set up an opposing line of argument until I have noticed his.

I shall first call attention to the fact that he does not like the proposition, and yet he volunteered to put his name to it; he accepted it, and that makes it all right so far as he is concerned. The proposition states just what he tried to prove. I do not know why he objects to it. He has been trying to impress us with the thought that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from the time of death until the resurrection. If he didn't try to prove that, what did he try to prove? He wanted the proposition to read that man is unconscious from death to the resurrection. Well, my brother, "all that constitutes man" should be understood in that term "man." If there is an advantage that is sought to be taken in the use of the word man, then you see why the brother wanted the

wording changed. But the doctrine of the Christadelphians is that all that constitutes man, and everything belonging to man, from the time of death to the resurrection, is unconscious. That is their doctrine. The proposition states it, and I like it, and the brother will be obliged to stand by it. I admit that he will have trouble to defend it. It says a good deal but it will be hardly possible to prove it. It means, when you come to consider the question, that you have got to find out what man is. The brother's proposition required him to do this. He forgot it; he overlooked it; for some reason he did not do it. Do you know what constitutes man from anything he said? He undertook to prove that man is made of dust, that at least a part of the earth is in his constitution. That part is accepted; he proved it, we admit it. He quoted a number of scriptures, I. Cor. xv: 45, "The first man is of the earth, earthy." We believe that he had earth in him. Gen. ii: 7, "The Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground." That proposition is admitted. He was formed of the dust. But there is another word, "formed," in that connection the brother did not happen to notice. We will see it directly. Gen. iii: 19, "Out of the dust wast thou taken." Correct. Job xxxiii: 6, "Formed out of clay." That is right. Gen. iii: 23, All right. Gen. xviii: 27, "Abraham but dust and ashes." That is right. Abraham was dust and ashes; so are we, but is that "all that constitutes man?" The proposition says that all that constitutes man is unconscious. Dust constitutes man in part, the brother proves it, and we admit it, but is that *all*? Suppose we take a little time to inquire into that? Let us see what it does take to constitute a man. We admit dust is a part of it. Turn to II. Cor. iv: 1, "For though our *outward man* perish, yet our *inward man* is renewed day by day." There is man, an "outward man," and that man perishes; the brother proved it. What man is that? The man taken out of the ground, made out of clay, of the earth, earthy, who goes back to dust and ashes: that is the outward man and that man perishes. Is that all that constitutes man? Let Paul answer, "But our *inward man* is renewed day by day." There is *another* man, brother, that pertains to the constitution of man. and belongs to the proposition. Here are *two men*, if you please; one man of the dust who perishes, and the other man rises out of his death that does not perish, and Paul declares that both are of the same man.

Eph. iii: 16, "To be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man." "The inner man." What man is that? Is that the one that came out of the dust? Is that the one that dies day by day when the body is perishing day by day? Here are *two men*, and they constitute but one man, and the brother says that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from death to the resurrection. That is true of the dust man, but there is another man. Is it true of him? Did he prove that the dust man dies? Does anybody deny it? No sir. He says that all he wants to prove to this audience is that when a man is dead he is dead. We all believe that, brother. The question is *which* man is it that is dead? We ask this because the Word says there are two of them, one on the outside and the other on the inside. You prove that the outside man is dead and we accept it, but there happens to be a passage you have lost sight of that speaks of another man, the inner man.

Rom. vii: 22, "For I delight in the law of God after the inner man. * * * So then with the mind (the inner man) I myself serve the law of God, but with flesh (the outer man) the law of sin." There are two parts to man, one an outer man the other an inner man.

I. Pet. iii: 1-4, listen, "Likewise, ye wives * * * whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and wearing of gold and putting on of apparel." That is done on the outer man, the body. Do not give your special attention to that. Peter says, "But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit" Let it be what? The *adorning of the inner man*. What is that? A meek and quiet spirit. Have you got a spirit? These wives had. Is that their inner man? Yes, Peter says that is the inner man, and they are adorning that which is not corruptible. What is it that is not corruptible. This meek and quiet spirit is not corruptible. That word "not corruptible" is the word which, in Rom. ii: 7, is translated "immortal," "incorruptible"—the very identical word is original Greek that is translated "immortal" is there translated incorruptible and is applied to the *spirit* of the godly women. Didn't you say something about finding a place which said something about an "immortal soul" or an "immortal spirit?" Here it is. Look after it a little if you please.

All that constitutes man is totally unconscious after the resurrection. What constitutes man? An outer man and an inner man; a dust body and a spirit; one a dying, perishing body, and the other being renewed day by day at the same time. These are declarations of God's word. It says this is what constitutes a man.

Let us turn and examine the scriptures given by the brother. He went over a long list of scriptures in a hurry. I took them down as fast as he read, I. Cor. xv: 45, "The first man is of the earth, earthy." Correct. Did God form man from the dust of the earth?—He did. What part of the man?—His body. What of the spirit? Did he form the spirit out of dust? If he did not, where did the spirit come from?

Job iv: 17, "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" There it is, "mortal." The *body* is mortal. Is the spirit mortal? I challenge the brother to say so. The brother challenged me to find a solitary passage where it said "immortal soul." You find a passage containing the words "mortal soul," and I will find right next to it the passage containing "immortal soul."

Psa. ciii: 14—"He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust." What is it that is dust? Our mortal body. It goes back to dust. But is our spirit dust?

Job xxx: 25—"For I know that thou wilt bring me to death and to the house appointed to all the living." Correct. This is spoken of the body, not of the spirit.

INTERRUPTION BY A SHOWER.

I had just called your attention to the fact that there were two elements necessary to constitute a man; one is the outer man and the other is the inner man; it takes both of these elements to constitute a man. There is no controversy about the body becoming unconscious. That fact is admitted. Let us see if the various scriptures referred to do not speak of the body.

Eccle. ix: 5 makes the statement that the dead know not anything; neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten." The brother takes the position that this involves the entire man. "The living know that they must die, but the dead know not anything." That is going to be admitted, but the question arises, What is it that is dead? What is it that is

involved in the matter of death? Suppose we read just a little further from that same author. Listen: "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they a portion any more in anything that is done under the sun." You see now he is speaking of death, and the relationship of the dead to things which are under the sun. This serves as a key. What element is it that is being considered as dead? Let us look a little further into that. Does the death include the spirit? The body is dead, that is admitted; and the death mentioned there includes the spirit or it does not. Is there something that survives? Let us ask this same man that used this language in this same book whether the spirit goes down into death or not. Listen: Eccles. xii: 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was." Does the spirit return to dust? "But the spirit goes to God who gave it." What is it then that is dead? The part that pertains to the knowledge that is under the sun. Let us see a little further what is meant by the expression "The dead know not anything." The declaration is, "For he is not the God of the dead; but of the living; for all live unto him." That is the statement of Jesus Christ. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. But didn't all of them die? Yes. Is not all that constitutes a man wholly dead? The brother so affirms. If so, God is no longer their God. But He is their God! He is therefore the God of the dead because they all live unto Him. Then they are not dead. There is an element in them that is not dead. The expression must be taken either in a limited or an unlimited sense—please look at another part of the sentence—"neither have they any more a reward." If the application is of unlimited application to all, then this will deny my brother his reward. He is now alive; he is going to die; the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward. His own passage has cut him off from the resurrection and from the reward. Listen to Job vii: 9, 10: "He that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more. He shall return no more to his house; neither shall his place know him any more." This declaration is to be taken in an unlimited or in a limited sense. The statement is that those that go to the grave shall come up no more. It is a declaration of the total annihilation of the dead and a denial of the resurrection from the dead if taken in an unlimited sense. We must determine the sense of our scriptures. So the passage is to be taken in a limited sense and the reference is to those under the sun who shall have no more knowledge of anything that takes place. But the spirit, which is a part of the essential being as God gave it, still lives. The inner man returns to God who gave it. It follows then that the proposition is untrue so far as that passage is concerned.

But he also called attention to another passage: let me turn and read, Job xiv: 10, "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea man giveth up the ghost and where is he?" Giveth up what? The ghost, "and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up, so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep . . . If a man die shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait." What is it that dies? The body. What is it of which Job is speaking? The body, that which goes down to the grave. The spirit does not go to the grave. Solomon says the spirit returns at death to God who gave it; the body returns to dust. If the phrase body does not include the spirit, the proof is not to be found in this passage for the support of his proposition. That it does not include it in this passage is found in the fact that Solomon says the spirit returns to God who gave it.

It is said that God formed man from the dust of the ground? Did God form man's spirit from the dust of the ground? "God formeth the spirit of man within him"—Zech. xiii:1. Here is the same word "formed" that is used in Gen. ii: 7. That body that the brother says was made out of the dust of the ground, was unconscious until the time that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. That body was nothing but a magnificent corpse until God gave unto it the breath of life. But did God make the breath of life of the dust? Was it just breath, or breath having life in it? Zechariah declares that God "formeth the spirit of man within him." That is made a direct part of the matter of his creation.

The brother referred also to Eccles. iii: 10: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth the 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. All go to one place; all are of the dust and all turn to dust again." The brother presumes to say as a conclusion of this statement that there is no distinction between man and beast. They both go to one place; they all are of dust and all turn to dust again. Now the very next sentence, which the brother neglected to quote, gives us the key to the situation and makes a statement of the true nature of the case: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" It is true that the body of the beast and the body of the man are alike but is it true of their spirits, of their inner man? The very next sentence declares that when you come to their spirits you strike the difference. The spirit of the man goeth upward at death, and the spirit of the beast goeth downward at death. God made the beasts and gave them their breath, but he did not breathe into their nostrils of the breath of life. The beast hath breath and flesh, and it comes from the dust. In these respects man's body is like them, but when man comes to die, the spirit returns to God who gave it and goeth upward. But this is not so of the beast.

Psa. cxlvi: 3—"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sun of man in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." What is the psalmist David talking of in this connection? It is well enough to look at the connection, and by doing it we are able to escape false conclusions we otherwise would fall into. The psalmist is talking about men who put their trust in the princes of this world. He says, "Put not your trust in princes that cannot carry out their purposes." They have no perpetuity of life in this world, when they die their purposes perish. That word is also translated "purposes," "intentions," "designs." They fail; they are unable to carry out their plans; they die. It has no reference whatever to their condition after death. These princes may still live—do live, because God is the God of the living.

Then we have the statement that Hezekiah prayed that God would spare his life yet for fifteen years. The brother says, "Did God spare his life?" Yes. Would he have lived if God had not spared his life? No. Would he have died? Yes. In what sense? Total unconsciousness? That is the very point the brother undertakes to prove. He would have been dead as to his body; would he have been dead as to his inner man? All men have an inner man? When God

breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul, did he give the first man what he expected every other man to have? Did he give what those wives had, a spirit? Did he give what the Corinthians had, a spirit? If he did, did that die? If it did the brother has not yet proved it. The brother says, Suppose he had died and gone to heaven, would it have been just to Hezekiah to let him stay out of heaven fifteen years? Yes. Why? Because God has so constituted life in its natural relations as to make us love life. So long as we look at life from this side of the grave, life is desirable; our relationships here have by nature and association become sweet, so if, like Paul, we could have a glimpse of paradise, we still would have a desire for the things of this world, unless we, like Paul, had been crucified to the world and the world unto us. There is not any inconsistency in this.

But the brother asks what is the need of the resurrection if the dead are now alive. He thinks it would be cruel to bring them back to their earthly bodies. Why bring back the dead from heaven? For instance: Abel has been in heaven ever since the time he passed away. Why call the spirits back and put them in mortal bodies? We do not come back and enter into mortal bodies. In the resurrection from the dead they get immortal bodies; their bodies become immortal like their spirits in that glorious operation.

Then the brother came to the New Testament. He said, "Lazarus is dead" Jesus Christ said it. Was he dead? He was; but in what sense was he dead? Was he dead in the sense of being totally unconscious? Was everything that constituted Lazarus dead? Was his inner man dead? His spirit dead? The declaration is, "The spirit returns to God who gave it." If that was true of anybody in Solomon's time, wasn't it just as true in Lazarus' time? If Solomon's spirit went to God at death, and everybody in his time went to God in spirit at death, so did Lazarus. Then the spirit of Lazarus was not dead. The body died. There is no doubt about that. Where did he come from? If he was dead in spirit he would have come down from heaven; whereas the dead Lazarus came forth from the grave. Was he in the grave? He was. He had died and been buried. Whenever resurrection comes, the spirit comes to the body and the body is obliged to come out of the grave. The dead body is revived and the man lives.

Then the brother came to I. Cor. xv. I will turn and read that statement: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The argument the brother makes is drawn from the expression "They which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished," if the dead rise not. The point in the argument is this: "If there be a conscious condition of the spirit between death and the resurrection, then there could not be any perishing even if their bodies did not rise, since there is an element of their being which is already saved. Paul's entire argument is hypothetical; he bases the argument on a supposition. He says, "Ye are yet in your sins if Christ be not raised from the dead;" yet the Corinthians had already received the forgiveness of sins. He bases the assurance that there was remission of sins on the resurrection from the dead, and yet

whether there was a resurrection from the dead or not, they had had remission of sins. He says, Your faith is vain, yet they had faith. In the very same hypothesis Paul argues that if there be no resurrection of the dead, then you have got no spirit and they that have departed have no existence at all. Resurrection from the dead is based on the idea that man is potentially immortal and resurrection from the dead is based on the idea that man is potentially immortal and resurrection from the dead is a necessity for the development of immortality. If there is no resurrection from the dead, then there is no immortality on the same ground you have no faith, and no remission of sins; yet you did have faith, and remission of sins, resurrection or no resurrection. To show that his argument is purely hypothetical he proceeds to say in the twentieth verse, "Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept." Therefore they that sleep in Christ are not perished; therefore your faith is not vain, our preaching is not vain, your sins are pardoned. Therefore the hypothetical argument Paul makes instead of supporting my brother's position, is directly opposed to it.

His next point was the resurrection of Jesus Christ. He asks whether Christ was dead. There is a sense in which Christ's death involves a separation from God. That is the meaning of the word death, separation. In that dying hour Christ looked up and said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Does God forsake him? Does he die? Yes. Therefore, the Son of God separated from the Father goes down in the grave and he speaks of it as "death." And I wish to call attention to a thought just here. My brother intimates that Christ became as totally unconscious in his death as we are in ours. According to his conception Jesus Christ was wholly without knowledge from the day of his death to the time of his resurrection. His divinity as well as his humanity both alike slept. Listen to what Jesus said in his departing hour. He looks up into the face of the Father and says, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit." Where did his spirit go? Into the hands of God. Unless his solemn declaration in the dying hour was false, his spirit did not go down into the sleep of death. Did he have a spirit? He says he did, and he commended it to God. Spirits do not go into the grave; spirits do not return to dust for they are not taken from the dust.

I believe I have noticed every point taken by the brother except the last one. He says the primary meaning of the word soul is "breathing creature;" it is used very frequently of soul and of spirit in the Bible; it is applied to beasts and various other things; it is also applicable to man and God. We have got to determine by the context what the meaning of the word is. That is granted. Nearly any word you may think of in connection with the scriptures has various applications, and you have to determine its meaning by the context. Therefore there is very little to be drawn from the statement of the original word rendered soul and spirit and sometimes applied to beasts and to man and sometimes to God. If it always meant a mortal being then God is mortal; if it sometimes means an immortal being then it may be so applied to man. I have called your attention to the line of argument drawn by the brother. There is one point further. "The grave cannot praise thee; neither any that go down into silence." Who goes to the grave, to this pit of corruption? The outer or the inner man? The key to the whole situation is found in this simple definition of what constitutes man. If the fleshly body is all there is of him then the fleshly body in death is uncon-

scious. If there is an element in man separate from the dust body which at death goes to God, then it does not go to the grave. All these passages the brother stated of going to the grave, of having no knowledge under the sun, our purposes perishing—all that pertains to the grave. It involves the body and does not involve the spirit. The brother has to prove that the spirit man also goes down to the grave as does the dust man, and when he has established that proposition he will make some start to prove his doctrine.

If I have overlooked a passage that you quoted and you will now call my attention to it, I will look at it before I proceed. Name it and I will now turn and look after it, or name it later on. Then let us proceed to inquire a little into the nature of this subject.

Gen. i: 26, Man was made in the image of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our image and after our likeness." What is God's image or likeness as it is expressed in man? Man was to have dominion over all earthly creation. It may be well to find something further about the construction of man who was made in God's image, and given this dominion over nature. Man's body could not have that ascendancy necessary for this dominion. There are ten thousand things in nature that have decided advantages over our bodies, but there is nothing in nature that has an ascendancy over our spirits. When it comes to his conceptions, his thoughts, his imaginations, his discoveries, his inventions, man rises in the scale of his being until he ascends above everything else that has earthly being. Whatever it is in man that is in God's image it was to have dominion. Flesh cannot do it; therefore flesh is not the part of man made in the image of God. Man's body could not be made in the image of God. Turn to Isa. xl: ii. "To whom will ye liken God? To what image will ye compare him? You can make an image of man; you can make it out of clay, out of brass, out of gold, out of silver, and it is the declaration of Isaiah that nobody can make a likeness of God. That man and God are not in the same image; if they were you could make an image of God as easily as you can make an image of man.

In Acts xviii: 29, "Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold or silver or stone, graven by art of man's device." Any sculptor can make an image of man, but no one can make an image of God, and this shows us that our bodies are not in God's image.

It is dishonoring to God to attempt to make a likeness of him. In Rom. i: 23 "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." That was a disgrace to God to make an attempt at it, but it would not be a disgrace if man's corruptible body was in God's image.

Phil. ii: 6-8, "Who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of man." Here is a change on the part of Christ from the likeness of God to the likeness of man. He took on himself our flesh and was made like we are in body. That shows that our bodies are not like God's image. Who took on the likeness of the flesh? Christ. But have you found that the outer man, or dust man, that constitutes man as to his flesh, and his inner man, are both distinct things, and that this outer man is not in the image of God? It is merely of the earth, and goes back at death to dust. If there is therefore any likeness of God in man, it must be his inner man. He has a dual nature; his dust or material body is not in God's image.

But read again John iv: 24, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must

worship him in spirit and in truth." There is God's character, God's nature. It is spirit. Let us see if we do not find an endowment of that element in man which is called spirit, and that the real man made in the image of God will turn out to be the spirit which does not die. Rom. viii: 16, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." God is spirit, and the relationship between us and God is of a spiritual character.

Can this dust body of man be like a spirit? Luke xxiv: 36-40, "When Jesus stood in their midst they were terrified and affrighted, supposing they had seen a spirit, but Jesus said, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Dust bodies do have flesh and bones, and spirits do not. Spirits cannot therefore be in the form of dust bodies. Now, then, from whence came this spirit that does not have flesh and bones and that was not made of dust? Zech. xii: 1, "He formeth the spirit of man within him." Notice, he is speaking of the creation. Where did the spirit come from? God. How? God formed it in man. When God stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth that is the creation period; what else did he do? He formed the spirit of man within him. What? At the beginning. How? When God made man out of the dust of the ground, he was a corpse; it takes another act, a creative act, for that man to have life. God formed the spirit within him, that is what Zechariah says. Moses says that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. From whence then came the spirit? From God. At death what becomes of the spirit? The body goes back to dust, but the spirit that came from God was formed in man at the time of the creation, that spirit thus formed, at death goes back to God who gave it, and you have the same lifeless corpse you had at the beginning. What is the distinction between man now at death, and Adam at the creation? He is a corpse; he was then, he is now. There was a period in which he lived. Now he is dead. Where is his spirit gone? To God who gave it. As to his spirit, he is not dead; as to the outer man, he is dead.

Acts vii: 59, "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Who said it? Stephen. When? At death, when he was dying he looked up to God and said, I am now going, I am taking my departure; I know where my body is going, down under these stones in death. Is that all that constitutes a man? Listen to his statement, "Lord receive my spirit." When Jesus was on the cross, he cried with a loud voice, saying, "Father, into thy hands, I commit my spirit." Does all that constitutes a man become unconscious at death?

But the question may arise, can spirits have conscious being without material bodies? The declaration is made that God is a spirit; God's body is not made of dust; it does not have material organization; he is nothing but spirit. Jesus Christ was spirit before he became incarnate. Then he had a body and continued in the body until death, and from the time of death until the resurrection he was without a material body; at the resurrection the spirit and body came together. Angels are said to be the spirits sent forth to minister to them that shall be heirs of salvation, and yet they have no material bodies; they are not made of dust. It is therefore possible for the spirit of man to exist separate from his material body and still have conscious being in the presence of God after death.

Now a few words about immortal soul; the brother did not find it, and nobody else finds the expression, "immortal soul," yet I showed you that there is an

incorruptible spirit; the same word translated immortal in other places, a spirit undying, that abides and will continue. The word "mortal" is always applied to the flesh and never applied to the spirit, and there is not any statement that at death the spirit dies. James says that the body without the spirit is dead, but the spirit is not dead. It is that inner man that we claim is still conscious after the death of the body.

I have called attention to the fact that the flesh body is not in the image of God; let us see if the spiritual man is in the image of God. Rom. viii: 29, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son." In the transaction in the garden of Eden there was a twofold nature in man. Who was it stretched forth his hand and took the fruit? Adam. What part of Adam? His hand. What was it ate of the fruit? His mouth; his material body. What was it transgressed the law? His material body, the only man present. Was there no other man present except that? Where was the spirit that Zechariah said God formed within him? Did not that have a part in it? Had man's will, his conscience, his mind no part in the act of disobedience? The man's spirit was involved as well as his body and he lost the image of God in that transaction. The declaration was, "*In the day* that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." In some sense or other man died that day; he did not die as to his body; he died in the sense of a moral death, in the sense of a separation from God. In Col. iii: 10 we read, "And have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. It becomes like a new creation. The man dead in trespasses and sins has been brought to life. What man is that? The inner man. Where does he go at death? To God. Stephen's spirit returned to God; Jesus's spirit returned to God. The thief's spirit went with Christ. What died? The body? No, the spirit, the inner man, that God said should die in the day that he ate of the fruit, not in the sense of being totally extinct, but in the sense of separation from God. The body is the outer man, the mortal; that dies in the sense of becoming unconscious and going back to dust. The word mortal means subject to death; the word immortal means exemption from death. Death as to the body means that state of being in which there is a total and permanent cessation of the vital functions and sensations of life, an extinction of bodily life. That is Webster. What of the soul, Mr. Webster? Spiritual death, a perversion of the soul by sin, loss of the favor of God.

Can man be dead and at the same time be alive? Can the spirit be dead and the body alive? Let us see if it is possible. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she yet liveth." There is life and death both in the same person. Look a little further; Col. ii:13, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him." These people who he here says had been dead were alive all the time and at the very time that he says they were dead. That shows that there is one element in man that can be dead while at the same time there is another element in man that can be alive. Here are two men, an inner and an outer man, and while the inner man is dead in trespasses and sins, the outer man is very much alive. When the outer man is dead and goes into the grave, the other man lives in the spiritual realm just the same. [Time called.]

SECOND PROPOSITION—FIFTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' First Half-Hour Speech*).

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—It is now my duty to review what my friend said yesterday afternoon in reply to my affirmative address. The first thing he complained of was in relation to my referring to the proposition. Now I did not complain of what the proposition was intended to say; I was simply complaining of what seems to me to be an awkward way of saying it. I am satisfied; I did not express any dissatisfaction with the proposition as to what it really meant. It was only a question of the form of it, how it should be.

The next complaint my friend made was that I had not even stated what constituted man. Now if it seemed to him so, then he could not have been paying very strict attention to what I said. I gave, in scriptural words, what constituted man. I thought it would be better for me to read from the scriptures what constituted man than it would be for me to give my own words. Therefore I first called your attention to the fact that we are informed that the first man is of the earth, earthy. Then I referred to the book of Genesis where Moses gives us a full account of the formation of man and of the impartation of life to him. It seemed to me that that was the very best way to find out what constituted man, for surely Moses ought to be taken as an authority on the subject when he is giving a detailed account of his creation. The constitution of man is embraced, therefore, in these words, "The Lord God formed *man*." I emphasized the word "man" because I anticipated that my friend would soon take the liberty of changing the words of Moses and the words of the various writers I quoted from, that he would throw in the word "body" instead of "man," but let it be understood that the scriptures tell us that the Lord God formed man, and hence we must believe that the formation of man is out of the dust of the ground, and there we have what my friend is pleased to call a magnificent corpse. I do not think the word corpse could be applied to a man who never lived and died; you could not call him a dead man; you might call him a lifeless man, but not a corpse until he had been alive and had died, and not a magnificent corpse then. I never saw such a thing in my life. Magnificence is not an attribute of a corpse.

Now then we read the words, the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. There you have what constitutes man. I cannot improve on it; I could not if I attempted it, but my friend seems to be sorry that I did not in my own words give what constitutes man, simply because he did not seem to be satisfied with what Moses gave as to what entered into the composition of or what constituted man.

Now the next thing our attention is called to is the outward man and the inward man. The first argument is to show that there is more than one man, and that one of these men is formed of the dust of the ground, that is the material man, and this material man is made a living man by the breath of life; and there you have a man, a breathing creature. Then, according to my friend, God put another man into that man; and so instead of this transaction having to do with one man it has to do with two men. Now the question arises, are these men, both of them, separate conscious beings? Does the inner man have a consciousness of itself? Is it capable of thinking, acting and reasoning of itself, separate

from the material man? The next question is, does the material man have a separate consciousness of itself? If so then we have two separate, distinct entities, two conscious, intelligent beings here instead of one man. Now isn't it strange that Moses did not say something about the second man, having consciousness, and power to think and reason, in addition to this man that God made out of the dust of the ground?

But what about the text referred to, the inner and the outer man—"though the outer man perish the inner man is renewed day by day?" Let me call attention to Eph. iv: 2, "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the *old man* which is corrupt according to deceitful lust, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Now my friend has called attention to the new man, the inner man that he says is a separate man inside of this material man, and here we find another man, the old man, that we are to put off. If these are all beings, literal men, conscious entities, then we have, first of all, the outer, material man, then the man you put off when you are converted, and still another man that you put on, and over and above all, you have an inward man, or an immaterial soul, which my friend says is inside this outward man, this would be four men. So you see we have too many men, surely, if these are all literal men. We shall have to reduce the number of men or else we shall find that we are truly legion, as the insane man said in relation to himself, and we shall certainly have a conflict between them all.

Let me call attention to what is said here and ask, In what sense do we put off the old man. The old man represents the sin state in which we are when we are born into the world. Disobedience brought sin into the world and sin brought death upon us all, and as long as we are in the old man state we are without hope and without God in the world. When we put off that old man and put on the new man do we have to put off and put on literal men? Of course we know better than that. Man here is used in a figurative sense to represent character and state, the new man to represent the character of Christ and our relation to him. When we put on Christ we put on the name of Christ. It is a matter in relation to our characters which change from the old man state of sin to the new man state of righteousness when we put on Christ.

Now I will invite your attention to a few other testimonies, and you will find out what the inner man is. In Gal. iv: 19 Paul says it is Christ formed in you. Then he says in II. Cor. iv: 10 "that the life also of Christ might be manifested in our body." This portion of scripture is right in connection with what my friend quoted about the inner man. What then is the inner man? It is Christ formed within you the hope of glory. When is Christ formed within us? He is formed within us when we believe the gospel, in our minds, in our hearts, in our characters. But do you expect to find a literal man inside of you as soon as you are converted? The word is a figure to represent a moral change in us, not the introduction of a new entity, a being, capable of living separate from the body.

In regard to this part of the question, I will now challenge my friend to produce a single portion of scripture, anywhere in the Bible, that speaks of an inner man in any unconverted man. He has been seeking to show you that the inner man is the immortal soul, the immaterial spirit, and therefore, according to him, it is in every man whether converted or not. But the apostle Paul is speaking only to those who are converted to the truth and have put on Christ. This inward man is being renewed day by day after the *image of him that hath begotten him*.

When does Christ beget a new man in us? When we are converted to him, when the heart is renewed by the truth and is made to grow in favor with God. We are begotten, says James, by the word of truth. Therefore the inner man is not an immaterial entity, an immortal soul, but a figurative representation of that character that has been begotten in every true follower of Christ only.

Now my friend said in relation to the various portions of scripture I quoted, for instance where it says, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," "we believe it," he says, but he does not believe it; he is simply mistaken about it. I will ask the question, Which is the responsible man in the case, the immortal spirit, or the the dust body, as he calls it, which, if there are two, is the responsible one for putting forth the hand and taking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil? Which was responsible for transgressing the law of God? If the soul is the vital part, the thinking entity, the man that survives the death of the body, then, of course, the soul must be the sinner, the responsible part. Then why did not God pronounce judgment upon the supposed soul of Adam? The sentence was pronounced upon Adam, "Because thou hast done this." How would it do to read, "Because thou, the immortal soul, hast eaten of the tree, in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou, the immortal soul, return to the ground, for out of it wast thou, the immortal soul, taken, for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou, the immortal soul, return. How will that suit you? You do not have "immortal soul" there, nor immortal spirit. The entire sentence, you will see, pertained to that which was to return to the dust from whence it was taken. If there was an immortal spirit entity then there was no punishment pronounced upon that immortal spirit. All the punishment you have in the record was pronounced upon man that came out of the dust and who returned to dust again.

My friend has something to say in relation to things that are under the sun; that belongs to the next question and therefore we will refer to it when we reach it. Just a word in relation to what he said: "Neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." You say Solomon was speaking of everybody, good, bad and indifferent; therefore there is not a single one of these that he is speaking of who will have anything more to do with things that are under the sun; he says that they have no more a portion there. My friend has forgotten himself, because he did tell us in the other proposition that he believed as the Christadelphians believed, that the saints are to take the kingdom under the whole heavens, and that therefore they will have a portion under the sun then. Yes, my friend, you told us that they would reign with Christ on the earth and that the twelve apostles should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. They will surely be under the sun and have their portion there, will they not? Now my friend has come to the conclusion by a wrong use of the words of Solomon, that they will never have any more a portion under the sun. That will never do. The Scriptures cannot certainly contradict themselves.

Now my friend has dealt with the question of a meek and quiet spirit. I want to call attention to that in detail because he made a good deal of it. In I. Pet. iii: 4 we read that the women were to adorn themselves, not outwardly, but in the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit. Now what is this that is not to be corruptible, this something that is to be cultivated by these women which would be regarded as precious in the sight of God? My friend called attention to the fact

that the Greek word *aphthartos* here rendered "not corruptible," is in some places rendered immortal, but he did not remind you that we use this form of words in relation to corrupt character. In Ezek. xx: 44, we have the words, "Not according to their wicked ways and *corrupt doings*. The word incorrupt does not always mean immortal. A man may have a corrupt character; or his character may be incorruptible. Dan. ii: 9—"For ye have prepared lying and *corrupt words* to speak before me." II. Tim. iii: 8—"Corrupt men, reprobate concerning the truth." We have also the word sincere, which comes from the Greek word *aphtharsia* in Eph. vi: 24—"Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in *sincerity*." Again, Titus ii: 7—"In all things showing themselves a pattern of good works; in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, *sincerity*." Now what I have called attention to these texts for is to show that the word which is sometimes rendered immortal is sometimes rendered sincerity. It means the same as when we sometimes speak of our representatives, we say of them that they are incorruptible in character: you cannot bribe them. These are men you can depend upon. So as to these women: they were to adorn themselves with a meek and quiet spirit and a character that could not be corrupted. It does not refer to an entity at all, nor to physical nature.

Now I will come to Eccles. xii:7—"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." But our friend said that the spirit *goes* to God; that is not how it reads; the way it reads is this: "And the spirit shall *return* to God who gave it." Return, return, not simply go, but go *again*. The spirit shall return to God who gave it—not gave *him*, or gave *her*, but gave *it*. It is it, not a being, not a person; it was an it that was given to somebody. To whom was it given? God formed *man* out of the dust of the ground and gave to him this it, the breath or spirit of life. When he dies the spirit returns to God who gave it and *man* goes back to the dust. You have then that undone that was done in the formation and vitalization of man. Again, the spirit shall *return* to God who gave it. Was that spirit a being before God gave it? Was it a conscious entity, a thinking being? Why, no; we had no consciousness before we were born. Had Adam any conscious existence before his formation? No, he was formed first and when God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life he became a living soul. God did not put a conscious, living being into a body, because man had no consciousness before he was created. The very thing God gave to the man to make him alive returns to God who gave it when man dies. It is no more conscious after it has returned than it was before it was given to the man.

My friend has discovered now, however, that the beasts have spirit, too. He comes along to Eccles. iii. where we read, "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that 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." Now this word breath here is *ruach*, the same word that is rendered spirit in the 12th chapter that returns to God who gave it. Solomon used the same word, our translators have given us two different words. Breath is one definition of the word spirit. When God made man alive he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he lived; when man dies he breathes out, expires and he is dead. "They, man and beast, have all one breath," when the one breathes out he is dead and when the other breathes out it is dead. Solo-

mon says that man in death hath no pre-eminence above the beast. Then he asks the question, "Who knoweth, where is the man who knows—who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward?" as the Egyptians and, afterwards, Plato taught. Here my friend yesterday made a mistake. This is what Mr. Hall said; I have it from the notes of the stenographer:

"'All go to one place; all are of the dust and all turn to dust again.' The brother presumes to say as a conclusion of this statement that there is no distinction between man and beast. They both go to one place: they all are of dust and all turn to dust again. Now the very next sentence, *which the brother neglected to quote*, gives the key to the situation and makes a statement of the true nature of the case: 'Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?'"

Now did I neglect to quote this verse? This is what I said yesterday: "My friend, of course, in negating my proposition says that man in the death state is conscious; that he certainly has a pre-eminence above the beasts; but Solomon says that in the death state man has no pre-eminence above the beasts. Now he challenges my friend, he challenges every man who would dare to say what Plato said—and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is called the Platonic doctrine, and the Platonic doctrine was in the original state a doctrine of the transmigration of souls, that the souls of the beasts went down and the souls of men went up. So after Solomon tells us clearly that man and beasts died alike, that all are of the dust and all return to dust again, then he challenges the world by asking them, 'Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward?' He is challenging the very thing that I am challenging here today. Where is the man that ever knew of such a thing as that? That was taught in Egypt, where Plato received a part of his education, in Alexandria. Therefore Solomon contests this Egyptian and Platonic doctrine and challenges such a thing. I tell you, he says, that all are alike in death; they all return to dust at death."

Now after my saying all that, my friend says I neglected to refer to the passage. But now further on this question: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward?" My friend will admit, I am sure he will, that the same word *ruach*, which is here rendered spirit for the man is rendered spirit for the beast. Is this spirit of man an immaterial entity, a conscious entity that survives the death of the body? Then you have the same spirit for the beast; for Solomon says in the same chapter that they have all one spirit, *ruach*; the only difference is one goes down and the other goes up. My friend challenged me to give a text to prove that the spirit of man dies: I will challenge him to prove that the spirit of the beast dies.

My friend says that when God breathed into man's nostrils he breathed into him a breath that had life in it. What kind of breath did the beasts have? He says, You cannot find anywhere that God ever breathed into the nostrils of the beasts. I ask, Can you find that he breathed into the nostrils of the woman? Didn't she have the breath of life? Turn to Gen. vii. 17 and we read, "And behold I, even I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy *all flesh wherein is the breath of life*. So we see the beasts had the breath of life; how did it get into their nostrils? [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—FIFTH SESSION.

(Mr. Hall's First Half-hour Speech.)

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:— We have been kindly favored by an overruling providence, and are permitted to meet together again this morning for the purpose of continuing this investigation. I trust we all have feelings of proper gratitude to God for His continued care over us, and that we appreciate our opportunity of studying this momentous question that so pre-eminently concerns our present and eternal well being.

Our brother begins his speech this morning by admitting that the proposition to which he seemed to raise some serious objections yesterday is all right; he just didn't like the words exactly in which the thought was clothed. We are agreed that the words are all right, because they state precisely the position our brother is trying to defend. I do not know why the brother raised the objection unless it was merely for the sake of putting in some time that had to be filled.

The brother says I found some fault with his definition of the terms in the proposition. I charged that he didn't tell the people what constituted a man, when he declares that he did, and that in the very words of the Holy Spirit; that the first man was of the earth, earthy; and the earth, he declared, was what constituted all of man; and he thinks I found fault with him because he did not take his own words to explain what he thought. In this the brother mistook my objection. My objection is that he didn't let the Holy Spirit say all He wanted to say, and all He has said, about what constitutes man. I do not want a statement of the matter from the brother's standpoint, in his own words, but from the standpoint of the Holy Scriptures, so that we can see all there is of man. In one place we have the statement that God formed man of the dust; another statement that he formeth the spirit of man within him. Here are two formations, both referring to the creation. One is in Gen. ii: 7, and the other is in Zech. xii: 1. There are two formations, one of the body of a man, and the other of an inner man, put into a body made out of the ground. God has a right to state plainly and distinctly His own way of constructing a man. My objection was that the brother did not let the Holy Spirit say what was in man, and what was of man. He said I wanted him to give his own statement of the matter.

He said, Do you have two men? when I turned and found that there was a hidden man of the heart. Are we to understand that we have two men, one man inside of the other man. That would be my understanding of it; would you understand it that way? If Paul came to you this morning and said, Your outer man is perishing day by day, and that the inner man was renewed, what would you understand him to mean by it? I ask the brother to tell the audience in his next speech. If I remember correctly, he overlooked that point. What would you understand Paul to mean by the outward man? Is it not the body? Is it not passing through physical changes day by day that result in physical death? If he says the outward man is perishing day by day, and the inward man is renewed day by day, would not that be the condition man is in? He called it a man. I didn't make this language. God's Spirit said this through the mouth of His servants. This man on the outside that dies, I think is the body that was made out of dust; that is mortal. This man on the inside that lives, and gets better every day that the other man dies, I take to be that spirit that God formed

in man when he made him out of the dust of the ground. God calls it the inner man; therefore it is a man. If it is not a man, then let my brother show how Paul understood the subject.

Then the brother turns over a little and finds another man; this thing is multiplying on us. Yesterday he could find only one, and when I found another he goes beyond me and finds a third, and we get three men. I rather expected when this thing began there would be too many for him, but I did not expect him to admit it this early in the fight. Our brother quotes from the Scriptures as follows:

"Seeing that you have put off the old man (that is one man Paul said they had) with his deeds, and put on the new man (there is another), and be renewed in the spirit of your minds"—the inner man. There is another. And he couldn't find but one yesterday, and proposed to put us down with the beasts, and make us to have no pre-eminence above the beasts, by giving the literal interpretation to Solomon's words. But here we have three men to get rid of after that dust body is out of the way. You have got a big task on your hands, brother. The apostle, in speaking of the "old man," referred to the old habits of life. So he says, We are agreed on this. But what are you going to do with the other two? "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind." Where is he, that fellow that is getting that renewing? Listen. Paul says that "While the outward man perishes the inner man is renewed." What man is that? The inner man. We have got back to the original two by mutual agreement. Still the brother has not been able to get rid of the original inward man.

The brother challenged me to find any mention made of an inner man in an unconverted man. Zech. xii: 12, "God formed the spirit of man within him." That spirit is within every one of us. I prove it by Matt. x: 28, "Fear not him that is able to kill the body, and after that has no more that he can do; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." There are two men, and the application is made to every man, and the reason there is no mention made of the renewing of the inner man, and the adorning of the inner man in an unconverted person, is because such have not been renewed in the spirit of their minds. They have got a spirit, but it has not been renewed. The whole human family was endowed with it.

The brother wants to know which man was responsible for taking the forbidden fruit. I think both men were responsible. I think the spirit in Adam the thinking endowment, the moral entity, entered into that transaction. The first thing to do would be to get the consent of Adam's will, before the reaching forth of Adam's hand to take of the forbidden fruit. You have got to have both the consent of the will and the act of the man to make every sin. They were both guilty, and in further proof of that God has punished both. The brother wanted to know if the inner man was guilty why God did not pronounce sentence on him. He said, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and he drew some smiles while applying these words to the immortal soul. Both were present and to both God said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Some part of the sentence is to be fulfilled that day; some other part is to be fulfilled before the sentence is complete. What died that day? I challenge my brother to say that the body died that day. Something died, what was it? Not his body, for he lived hundreds of years after that in his body, and it finally died. It was that body that

had to dig as a part of its penalty, and to labor in the things of this life. But what of the spirit that from that time onward never had any further communion with God, and God withdrew his face and allowed the man to go into moral ruin and separation from God? Death means separation from God, and God gave it that day to man in withdrawing that spirit from further communion with man's spirit. In spirit he died, and you have got them both there and they are both in the sin, or God's word could not be fulfilled.

The brother says that the reference in Ecclesiastes where they have no more a portion in anything under the sun has to do with the next proposition. You remember that what I said was in reply to the introduction of that very passage which the brother used to prove that the dead know not anything, and I found in the very same chapter a little further along that the writer intended the application of his language to refer to the things under the sun, that those who go down under death shall not have anything more to do with the things of this world, while it remains in its present condition. Then the brother said, "You contradict the position you took in the other proposition, because you said they were going to possess the kingdom under the whole heavens." Yes, but that will be in the resurrection state. Job had the same idea and asked that God would appoint him a set time and remember him in that set time. I shall fall into the grave and have no knowledge of the things under the sun until that time shall come. And that is what Solomon is talking about.

Then we come to I. Pet. iii: 1, 4, the passage that shows that these good wives were not to adorn their bodies, put on worldly apparel, and make themselves pretty and comely in the presence of their husbands—that is all right in its place, and perfectly commendable—but Peter says there is something more acceptable than that, and what is it? To adorn the hidden man of your heart. And what is that? It is the incorruptible, imperishable, immortal, essential entity, that is in their being, to let it develop its inner life. The brother quoted two or three passages to show that this word is used with reference to incorrupt character, incorrupt doings, incorrupt actions; we want incorruptible men, men who cannot be bribed; if you get that kind of men you have got to get men whose hearts are incorruptible. These women were to have a nature that is incorruptible. You are not going to have that sort of men, you are not going to have that sort of women, unless you have those that have been renewed in the spirit of their minds, and you are not going to have that unless they have been born again. What is it to be born again? Let Jesus answer. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the spirit is spirit," and it is this spirit which is to be adorned, this spirit which is incorruptible, and it produces fruit like the tree, and is incorruptible. There you have an incorruptible nature. The very word that is rendered incorruptible in that place is the very identical word that in Romans is rendered immortal and immortality—the very same word in the Greek, and these Christian women had inner men in their hearts which were immortal, deathless, which had been renewed by the power of God's spirit in the spirit of their minds, in their natures, so that sin and the characteristics of sin could find no place in their lives, and that life comes as the fruit of the inner principle which is incorruptible.

The next reference was in Eccles. xii: 7. The statement in that passage was, "Then shall the dust return unto the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The brother says I quoted it yesterday, "go to God," not

"return to God." If it returned to God didn't it go to God? But return is the proper word and I accept it.

He says, Now notice that God's word don't say, "him" nor "her" nor "he" nor "she" in referring to the spirit; the matter of personality is not considered, but man's spirit is referred to as "it"—returns to God who gave "it." All right. It don't make a partical of difference to me. I ask you is the spirit an entity? Does the word "it" ever represent an entity? You have got the word "it" referring to the Holy Spirit in Rom. viii. The spirit of man does not take on outward personality among men because the spirit is not manifested among men. God's word does not need to indicate the personality of the spirit by a pronoun. The apostle refers to it as the inner man, the hidden man of the heart. There is a man, call it "him" or "it" if you will, but the declaration of God's word is that it is *man*.

His last reference was Eccles. iii: 19. The brother says I misrepresented on this point, and he reads from yesterday's debate to show that he really did quote that expression. Very well; I didn't catch it, probably being busy making notes. I stand corrected on it. I am quite sure that when he read the passage straight along that he didn't quote it at that time, though he made remarks afterwards that included it. I observed the stopping of it just at the very beginning of these words. All right, however, the passage has been quoted, and Solomon says there is no pre-eminence of man over the beast. Do you mean there is no pre-eminence in any man? Is man no better than the beasts? Are these people no better than the horses that pulled them here? Are they no better than the pigs that eat the slop from their tables? Did Solomon mean that there was no element of their being that had pre-eminence over the beasts? No, Solomon didn't mean that; my brother don't believe it. The language is figurative; the result of the nausea he felt at his mortal stomach at the general vanity of human life. In the exercise of poetic license he used the language of the text. Is there no difference? The beast has a spirit? Yes. Man has a spirit? Yes. Both these go out; both come from the same word, but there is a difference between the spirit of a man and the spirit of a beast. God formed the spirit of man within him. The beast has a spirit but it does not come from God, and as it did not come from God it goes down when the beast dies, because it is of the earth. The reason that a man's spirit goes up is because it came from God and returns to him. Solomon says this is the distinction, though he declares no man knows that spirit. I agree to that. I do not know it; you do not know it, yet he knew that it went up.

I suppose the brother's idea is the same that Brother Cargile had; he said that the spirit was the breath and as a man generally lay on his back when he died, his breath went up, and as a beast died with its face to the earth, its breath went down. I judge that is about the size of his argument on the subject.

I have noticed everything the brother said, and I desire now to call attention a little in advance of the brother. Away back in the Old Testament he is finding all his proof in the use of hypothetical expressions. I am going back to the Old Testament. In Isa. xiv: 4, 9 you will read what the prophet said of Babylon; "How hath the oppressor ceased! * * * hell from beneath is moved to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee." That word hell is translated from the Hebrew word *sheol* which represents both the grave and the state of the dead in the grave. He told us yesterday that everybody in *sheol* had quit thinking, quit acting, quit speaking. Listen: "It stirreth up the dead for thee,"

What! I thought if they were clean dead it could not stir them up. God's word says they are there in sheol, even all the chief ones of the earth, and all stirred up. Let us look a little further. Ezek. xxxi: 15, 17, "In the day when he went down to the grave I caused a mourning. * * * I made the nation to shake at the sound of his fall when I cast him down to hell with them that descend into the pit. * * * This is Pharaoh and all his multitude." They are dead, and in the grave, and in hell. Now compare these words on the same subject: "The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of sheol"—dead, buried, in hell, in sheol and yet talking! That is from the Old Testament, the very place where he goes to prove that everything dead is silent, right out of those same scriptures we read that in hell they speak.

I want to quote another passage, a declaration of the Old Testament. The scriptures talk about being gathered to the fathers. Listen: Gen. xxv: 8. "And Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man and feeble of years, and was gathered to his people." You cannot have a gathering to people without considering the idea of a multitude. Abraham's body was never buried with his people; it was buried by the side of his wife in the cave of Machpelah; yet God's word declares before he was buried that he died and was gathered to his people. The idea of being gathered to people carried the idea of a multitude. You have got to have a multitude in existence to which Abraham went after his death. From the New Testament, before this debate closes, we are going to find this man Abraham alive with his people.

I want to notice another thought; I want to tell you that the ordinance of Baptism is a contradiction of this man's doctrine. Rom. vi: 3, "As many as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In this we have a picture of the burial of a dead body. Speak to the administrator and say: What are you doing? Burying the old man. What are you doing? Raising up the new man. Here is a representation of the death and burial of the body and the resurrection of the body. What is the condition of the man between the burial and the resurrection? Is he dead? You do not bury a man until he is dead. Were you clean good dead when you were put under the water? Is there a conscious or an unconscious condition represented by the figure between the burial and the resurrection? I come to tell you this morning that the doctrine the brother undertakes to impress upon us degrades man to the level of the brute; it is a gospel of dirt. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—FIFTH SESSION.

Mr. Williams' second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.)

MR. WILLIAMS QUESTIONS MR. HALL.

Mr. Williams: Question—I will begin now with the passage in Eccles. xii: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was." This refers to the body?

Mr. Hall: Answer—Yes sir.

And the spirit shall return to God who gave it; was that spirit a conscious entity before it came from God?—It was a specific gift from God; it was conscious in its connection with God, not separate from God. It had existence with God just like the creation of the body; the dust had existence.

Did the spirit as an entity have an existence before creation?—Not as a separate entity.

And when it returns to God is it a separate entity then?—Yes sir.

Where is the proof?—We will find proof in the argument.

You said yesterday that Jesus Christ was a spirit before he became incarnate; do you understand that Christ had an existence in heaven as a personality before he came to earth?—Yes sir.

What was his nature?—Spiritual.

Immortal?—Yes sir.

If Christ came down here as the second person of the Trinity what was it grew in wisdom and stature, the human or the divine nature?—Both the human and the divine natures. The divine nature had for the time being voluntarily assumed the conditions of humanity.

Did Christ come down from heaven as Christ?—Yes sir.

Then if he came from heaven as Christ, how could he grow in wisdom if, as God, there was nothing he did not know?—There was a voluntary submission on the part of Christ to the conditions of humanity.

Did Christ voluntarily agree to an arrangement to become a know nothing?—There was a measure of that involved in it.

Then Christ, the second person of the Trinity, put himself into such a position that he did not know anything?—No, not exactly.

Then how did he grow in wisdom?—That is a characteristic of humanity and Christ became human.

Now I will ask you another question: Did Christ, the immortal Christ that came down from heaven, die?—He did in a sense.

In what sense?—In the sense of separation from the Father.

When was the separation from the Father?—In the dying hour.

Was he dead then?—He was in the dying hour.

Was he dead when he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—No, not when he cried out.

But the Father had forsaken him. He who died on the cross, and was buried, was that Christ immortal?—Yes.

When he was dead, he was not alive, was he?—Yes, I will explain that.

You must explain it in your speech; in this method you must only answer questions?—That is the reason I answer so briefly. I will take time to make that perfectly clear.

Now, Mr. Hall, I will ask you, when Adam partook of the forbidden fruit, which of the two men you have in your theory ate of it?—The body

The soul had nothing to do with that?—Not with the eating.

Does the soul eat fruit?—Not literally.

Does the soul ever die?—Not in the sense of ceasing to be.

Can the soul be strangled?—I think not.

Job says, "My soul chooseth strangling and death," do you believe that?—In the figurative sense in which Job spoke.

Now, going back to Adam, I will ask you which is the thinking, responsible

man?—I think both are capable of thinking.

Then the body can think independently of the soul?—I think there is a measure of intelligence in both.

Answer my question; do you think the body can think independently of the soul?—I do believe it can.

How many sinners had we when Adam partook of the forbidden fruit?—That one man had two natures; people frequently speak of man's dual nature.

Then Paul should have said, "By two men sin entered the world." It is said, "Because *thou* hast done this, cursed is the ground for *thy* sake." To which of the men is he speaking?—He speaks to the dual nature of the one man. They are both involved.

Then he is speaking to both?—Probably.

Then speaking to both he says, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Then the soul returns to dust, too?—I have explained that.

If he is speaking to both, why do they not both return to dust?—Because each has a part of the sentence appropriate to its nature.

Does Moses say anything about each having a part of the sentence appropriate to its nature?—The word of God does; Moses does not tell the whole story.

"Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return"—what was involved in that?—The death of the body.

So the body was the responsible being in the case and not the soul?—It was one of them.

Will you be kind enough to find a sentence pronounced after man had sinned upon the soul?—The soul that sinneth it shall die.

When Moses says the Lord formed man out of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a *living soul*, was not that the soul that sinned?—Yes,

And wasn't that the soul that died?—I think so, in the sense of being separated from the source of life.

Exactly. Now you have said that God never breathed into the nostrils of the beasts the breath of life; will you tell me where the spirit of the beast came from?—God gave the spirit of the beast.

Now I will ask you, if the spirit of the beast came from God and the spirit of the man came from God, and Solomon says "they have all one spirit," why do you not believe it?—I do.

Are they not then the same?—I think not.

Solomon says, "they have all *one* spirit"?—That is correct; you are asking a question Solomon does not ask; Solomon does not say that they have the same spirit.

Could it be *one* spirit without being the same?—I think it could; the spirit takes shape according to the body it is in.

You challenged me to show that the spirit of life was breathed into the beasts?—Of God, yes.

When you say spirit "of God" or spirit of life breathed into the beast, do you not mean that which produced life in the beast?—The question I proposed to challenge you on was that God breathed into the nostrils of the beasts as he breathed into the nostrils of the man the breath of life.

Look at this text: "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh *wherein is the breath of life*" (Gen. vi: 15), the same words that are

applied to man. Now then, if the breath of life was in their nostrils, who could have breathed it there?—They did.

Who breathed it there in the start?—God gave them the ability to breathe.

Didn't he give the same to man?—He gave man the start in breathing.

Didn't he give the same to the beasts? Will you give me a text to show that God did not put the breath of life into the beasts, and since the breath of life is in the beasts, could it come from anywhere else except from God?—Of course God had the making of the breath and God made the beasts and gave them the ability to breathe.

"If he take unto himself his spirit and his breath, *all flesh* shall perish together, and *man* shall turn again to dust"?—I do not think that all flesh there represents the beasts; I think all flesh and man are the same.

Then I will call attention to Psa. civ: 24: "So is this great and wide sea wherein are things creeping innumerable, both great and small *beasts* . . . Thou hidest thy face, *they* are troubled; thou takest away *their breath*, *they* die and return to their dust." Breath here is from *ruach*—spirit. Do you believe that God takes away their spirit and takes it to himself?—Does he say he takes it to himself?

Will you tell me where it goes?—It goes out, passes out.

Does it return to God who gave it?—I think not.

Could you take this book without this book going to you?—Yes, I take the book and send it to him. [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Williams' Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Now in the first place my friend wants to know the difference between "return" and "go." He does not understand that there is any difference between returning and going. Let me explain why I referred to the difference in relation to this passage, Eccles. xii: 7. My friend kept saying yesterday that the spirit *goes* to God who gave it. He had been setting forth the idea that a spirit, an entity, was formed and put into man in the process of creation. Then he says that the spirit *goes* to God at death. Now the point I make is this: According to Eccles. xii:7, whatever goes to God came from God. If it is a formed entity that goes to God then it was a formed entity that came from God. You may go to a place where you never were before in your life, but you cannot return to such a place, can you? You may say "I am going to New York," though you do not come from New York, but if you have come from New York, then you can say, "I will return to New York." "Return," therefore, means to *go again*. Therefore, if the spirit was a formed entity when it *returned*, then it was a formed entity when it came from God, and hence you have the pre-existence of an entity before the formation of man from the dust of the ground. I am showing now that that which came from God and that which goes to God is something given to the man and not the man himself. The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground; and what did he give to man? He gave him the breath, the spirit of life, that which God breathed into man's nostrils. Did God breathe a conscious man into man's nostrils? Are you willing to believe that? If this spirit that returns to God returns as an entity, a being, then it came from God as a being, as an entity, and if it came from God as a being then that must be what God breathed into man; and in that case he

breathed one being in through two nostrils of another being; try to explain that if you can. You see we must come to the conclusion that when man was formed it was man formed and man that was made alive, and when that man died and the breath of life, *ruach*, goes back to God, it has no more a conscious existence after it is gone than it had before it came from God. Whether it be the spirit of man or the spirit of a beast, they both go back into the great ocean of life from whence they came, and for man to exist again resurrection or reconstruction must take place.

Now the gentleman asks me if the word "it" is not sometimes applied to a being, and the proof he gives is that the word is applied to the Holy Spirit. But you must prove that the Holy Spirit is a separate and distinct being before you can make anything out of that. I deny that the Holy Spirit is a being. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit." Did He anoint Jesus of Nazareth with a person, with an entity, or was the Holy Spirit an effluence that proceeded from the Father? You have assumed too much when you have said that the Holy Spirit is an entity, for that is the very thing I shall deny when we come to the Creal Springs debate; it does not enter into our proposition here.

Now in regard to things under the sun; Solomon says, they have no more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun; my friend says "Yes they will have in the resurrection state." Now does Solomon say that, or is it my friend that says that? Solomon says, "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything; neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." There are two things here; the dead know not anything, and some of the dead shall never have a portion in anything that is done under the sun. But my friend does not pay any regard to what Solomon says, so he presumes to say, "Yes they will have a portion under the sun, but that will be in the resurrection state." Now I leave you to judge whether you had better accept Solomon or the mere assertion of my friend.

Now I want to call attention again to the subject of the "inner man;" the inner man, according to my friend, is the second man that is placed inside the first man. We are referred to the words of Zechariah, "He formeth the spirit of man within him." My challenge to him was this: Produce a single portion of scripture anywhere which speaks of an *inner man* or an inward man in an unconverted man. That is what I am asking for. I believe there is a spirit in man and a spirit in the beast; but the spirit in the beast is not an inner man, neither is the same spirit in man an inner man. The spirit in man is the life in man, the breath in man, or the mind in man, if you please, but the inner man is the man that is mentally formed when Christ is formed in us. My friend says there are two men distinct from each other, and that each man is a separate, intelligent being, and he challenged me yesterday to show that the inner man would ever die and become unconscious. Now I will show you beyond the shadow of a doubt that it is possible for a living man, whatever he is, inner or outer, to become unconscious. Let us see; here is a man who has met with an accident; it is necessary to amputate a limb. He is laid upon the table and finally the surgeon comes in and they administer chloroform, and in a few minutes the man is unconscious. Now I will ask my friend, Is the inner man conscious while that man lies under the surgeon's knife? Is there anything in that man that is

conscious? Does he know anything that is going on? You can cut off every limb from his body, or pull every tooth in his head, and where is the consciousness now of either the inner or the outer man in the case? What has made the man on the table unconscious? Chloroform has done it. Can you administer chloroform to an immaterial soul and cause that soul to become unconscious? There is no use disputing facts. Here is an actual fact that bears out the testimony I have been calling attention to. It occurs every day we live. Men are rendered unconscious—absolutely unconscious. You may say, if you like, that two men are lying on the surgeon's table, and then it still remains that they are unconscious and these men may both remain there for hours in absolute unconsciousness. There are some cases where men have been unconscious for years. It is recorded in the *Phrenological Journal* that sixteen years of unconsciousness elapsed in one case. So let there be for the sake of the argument as many men in one as you like. There is the outward man, the body, and the inward man, the immortal soul, etc. They all lie there unconscious. Now wait till the man wakes up, till the unconscious is restored and ask him, "Did you know anything during the time the surgeon was amputating your limb, or the dentist was extracting your teeth?" "No," he says. "I knew nothing at all about it?" There you have his own testimony. Ask the outer man or the inner man, I do not care which, the only answer is, I knew nothing at all about it. So we have proved by facts that man can be unconscious in life. He can live and breathe; the beating of the heart will go on, but he is absolutely unconscious. It is proved by facts, demonstrated beyond further controversy.

Now let us suppose a case of too much, too large a dose of chloroform; the physician gives the already unconscious man a little too much and the man dies under the surgeon's operation. Now then, is he conscious? Mr. Hall, here, presumes to tell you that if you administer one dose of chloroform, you render the man unconscious; but if you give him another dose so as to kill him, then he becomes conscious and knows more than he ever did when alive.

This doctrine, he tells you, is a degrading doctrine; and he asks. Are these people no better than the horses that pull them here? Are they no better than the hogs that eat the refuse of their tables? This is not the question, but I will answer it, however. I do not suppose there is a single one here of this kind of people, but I can take you to parts of the world and show you human beings that are on a level with the hogs that eat the slops. I can take you to hundreds of places in our cities and in various parts of the country where you have men and women that are not comparable to your horses. Now, my friend, did God neglect to form an immortal soul inside of them?

Again, I will ask you to look at the poor, unfortunate insane people that fill our insane asylums; is it the inner man that is insane or the outer man? When you go to their physician, does he try to find whether he can reach the cause of their insanity in an immortal soul, or does he examine the brain and the general health of the man and find out, perhaps, that there is insanity in the family? It has come down through the blood. Do immaterial souls run through the blood? Insanity is a matter of the mind; and disease of the brain may come from their forefathers. How does it come from forefathers? If the mind is an attribute of the immortal soul, which you say comes from heaven, why is this man insane? Ah, it is because a man thinks with the brain, not with an immortal soul. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—FIFTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's second half-hour for either a speech, or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

MR. HALL QUESTIONS MR. WILLIAMS.

- Mr. Hall:* Question—Did God form man of dust? *Mr. Williams:* Answer—Yes. Does the word form mean create?—It implies it sometimes. Does it mean that?—Yes. Did God create all things?—Yes. Did God create anything but entities?—Yes. What?—Trees, etc. What is an entity?—A living being. Is that Webster's definition?—That is a proper definition. Webster's definition is "An individual, an essence," Is a tree an individual?—No. Is the tree an essence?—No. Did he create spirits—No. You say the word form means create: Did he form spirit?—If you understand spirit to mean mind, yes. Did he form spirit? Did he?—Yes. The word form does not always mean create; when Moses said God formed man of the dust, that meant the creation of man. Zechariah says he formeth the spirit of man within him?—He forms the mind within him. Does he use the word mind?—The word he uses, *ruach*, is sometimes rendered mind. Is the spirit an entity?—What spirit? The spirit of man?—No. Is it an individual?—No. Is it an essence?—What do you mean by essence? Is the air an essence?—No. Is the air a reality?—Yes. Are not all realities essences?—An essence may be extracted from a reality, but a reality is not necessarily an essence. Does the air have an essence?—I do not understand the nature of your question? You told me an essence is a quality of a reality?—I did not say that an essence is a quality of a reality; I said in realities there are essences; a chemist can extract essences from realities. Is there reality in air?—Air is a reality. The air has essences?—The air has elements. These elements are real?—Actual elements. Is the spirit like air?—Air is spirit in one form. Since the air is an actuality the spirit is actual?—The spirit in one form. In what form is the spirit a reality?—In the first place God is spirit and he is real. Man's spirit is a reality and yet it is not an entity?—You can have many realities without entities.

Where did you learn your philosophy? Do entities differ from each other?-- Indeed they do.

Two entities cannot be in the same being at the same time?--No.

The eye is an entity; the word entity means a real thing?--Then you and I are not using it in the same sense.

In the sense I use it is the eye an entity?--I refuse to take your definition of it.

I have a right to put my own definition and have you answer according to that definition?--You haven't the right.

The eye is a real thing?--Yes.

From my standpoint it is an entity?--From my standpoint it is not; if your eye is an entity then every organ of your body is an entity.

Yes, of course it is; Webster's definition makes every organ of the body an entity. Can man's body entity and spirit entity exist together?--I do not regard them as separate entities. The spirit has no real being of itself. As spirit it has a real existence but not as a being.

It exists like the air?--It exists *like* the air. It is the air in one form and is appropriated to man's use when he breathes it.

Does God's spirit differ from man's spirit?--In a sense; when I speak of God as a spirit, I speak of God as a being.

Is there a difference between God's spirit and man's spirit?--In a sense.

Then how does God's spirit bear witness with man's spirit?--God as a spirit is God as a personality; man's spirit is spirit that flows out from God.

They are just alike, then?--In this way: The spirit man breathes and that beasts breathe is the spirit of God, but it is not God as a being; God is spirit in personality.

Is God's spirit breath?--It is spirit that flows out from him we breathe.

This air that blows here is God's spirit?--In one form of manifestation.

Then God's spirit and man's spirit are the same thing?--No.

No? You just now admitted it. Is his spirit breath?--Man's spirit is sometimes breath, sometimes life, sometimes mind.

In the sense we are using it is it breath?--I am using it in its various senses.

Breath is one of them?--Certainly.

Does God's spirit have a real existence?--Certainly.

Does God's spirit have life of itself?--As a living being? God's spirit is that which imparts life; it has no living separate existence as an entity itself.

It has life surely?--It is not a living being.

If it has life in itself it is actually alive?--Bread has life in it, but you have to appropriate it to your being before you get the benefit of it.

Does life come from God?--Yes.

Was it the result of direct creation?--It was the result of an organized being inspiring it in the process of respiration.

What becomes of life at death?--It ceases to be; technically and really it is a condition of being produced by the formation of man and the impartation of the breath of life.

When man dies where is his life?--It goes out into the ocean of life; you might just as well ask where the light of the candle is when it is extinguished.

When man dies and the spirit returns to God who gave it, what is it goes to God?--The life goes back as it was before it was given.

You said it went to nothing; now you tell me it goes back to God. Is man's life in the air he takes into his lungs?—That is the cause that produces life; life depends upon other functions of the body—circulation, etc.

Is life inherent in the air?—The basis of imparted life is in the air, but only under the will of Jehovah does it produce life.

You told me that air is God's spirit; that is what I breathe?—I told you that life is in the air, but only under the operation of the divine will does it produce life.

Life is in the air when it is divinely appointed?—When God sees fit.

If a man's lungs are filled with air will he live?—All other things being equal, yes.

When a man's life is extinct can you pump his lungs full of air and make him live?—Only under the operation of the will of God.

That shows that life is not in the air?—I do not say that it is in the air except under the operation of the will of God.

That shows there is something besides breath that gives life. Can a body be brought back to life by any human effort?—Not when absolutely dead.

Can an unconscious drowning man be brought back?—Yes.

Is there any breath in his body?—It is there but not perceptible.

Are you sure of it?—It must be.

Is there any difference between man and beast?—In life or death?

At any time?—Yes.

Do you believe Solomon's words cover the entire nature of man?—I believe Solomon's words refer to death.

Do you believe that he refers to the spirit and body both?—The entire man.

Have beasts any conscience or moral sense?—No.

Man has?—Some men.

It belongs to man?—It is peculiar to some men.

Does it belong to anything but man?—No.

Does Solomon speak of men in general?—When?

In Eccles. iii? Solomon is speaking of men and beasts when they are dead.

Very well; there is no pre-eminence in man over the beasts?—In death.

Men and beasts both go to dust?—Yes.

Does that make them alike?—So far as their condition in death is concerned, yes.

Do the spirits of both men and beasts go to God?—Yes.

Do you mean to have some beasts in your millennial reign? There will be some there; Ezekiel says there will be beasts slain in sacrifice. [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Hall's Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS:—I desire to devote the remaining fifteen minutes of my half hour, after this pleasant little socratic method we have had, to an examination of my brother's speech. He says the spirit must have come from God as an entity if it returns to God as an entity. I say man's spirit came from God just as man's body came from God. God formed the spirit in man just as he formed the body. Dust existed before the body did, and spirit existed before our spirit. The dust did not exist as a separate body entity, neither did the spirit exist as a separate spirit entity. Yet God made the entity. He says, then if that were the case God must have breathed that entity into man's nostrils. That

is right; I believe he did. Then if he did you have a pre-existent being that must have come from God as an entity. He says, Then you have an entity coming through two nostrils, which I suppose he claims would practically divide the fellow, though the spirit is not divisible by matters of time and sense, nor with things that pertain to the body; it is spirit. My brother denies in his speech that the Holy Spirit is a being. I am sorry to hear him make that denial; I am sorry that such a reflection should be made upon the divine personality of the Spirit. If you will turn to John xvi. you will find the strongest personality words can express used by the Saviour recognizing the personality of the Holy Spirit when he says, "If I go away I will send the Comforter, and when *he* comes *he* will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. Here is the Spirit's separate personality represented by the personal pronoun, speaking, directing, guiding intelligently, like an infinitely wise leader, and I rejoice to look up into his face, through faith, and recognize him as the power that sheds abroad the love of God into the hearts of men, as a gracious personality that makes his abode in our hearts, for know ye not that your bodies are temples for the Holy Ghost?"

He wants me to find a scripture that says there is an inner man in the sinner. I explained this morning that the inner man in the sinner is the spirit that God formed in man, and the reason the distinction is not made of the two men in the sinner is the fact that he is regarded as having both alike in opposition to God. Paul says, "I find when I would do good evil is present with me." Therefore with my mind, my spirit, that inner man, which is renewed day by day, I serve God, while with my flesh I serve the law of sin. The reason Paul makes the distinction with the Christian is because there are two forces in his life.

Now we come to the question about putting a man under the influence of chloroform. Suppose, brother, when God put the spirit of man into the body of man, he made the body the personality for the time being, and limited the separate action of the spirit inside the environment of flesh. He now makes it necessary to look through these windows, to hear through these ears, and to understand through the organs of our body. If the spirit, now existing as a separate entity, could at the same time depart from the body and exercise itself in its own separate entity, then it would be possible to leave the body entirely and let the man, as a body, be without the spirit at all. Therefore God has made it for the time being necessary that the spirit should exercise its functions through the organs of the body. When you administer chloroform to a man the spirit is inside of its environment. A man stands inside of that house; he looks through the glass. Somebody throws a pebble and he discovers that the glass is broken and he cannot see distinctly. You knock out the glass entirely and he sees better than ever. You say it is a strange thing that if you give one dose of chloroform you make him insensible, while if you double the dose he knows more than ever. That is actually the philosophy of the case on account of the fact that it releases the man's spirit entirely from the environment of the body; the glass is broken entirely and the vision is clear, while if it is partially broken the vision is obscure.

My brother says, in reference to the question about you being as good as your horses and your pigs, he can find some men, even in this country, inferior to pigs, degraded below pigs. It is on account of the very fact of this element within them that is able to degrade themselves below the level of the brutes; it is the ability that enables him to descend below the level of the brutes that also enables him to rise. My brother did not call your attention to the fact that the very

same man, degraded as he is, has a moral sense which his pig does not have; therefore even that man stands superior to the pig.

I have now answered every point made by the brother and I desire to call your attention to the fact that the brother has not advanced a step since his speech yesterday afternoon. Not another new argument has he brought forward, and I have introduced a large number of other scriptures. I am obliged to go on or sit down. I do not like to take the affirmative, do not like to lead when I am on the negative side, but when I have cleaned up everything on the face of the earth the man has advanced, what else can I do? I propose to show you that all that constitutes man does not die at death. Turn, if you please, to Luke xx: 37, 38, "Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush when he said, I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." Remember, all three of these men were dead at the time this language was uttered. Now if my brother is in the right these dead men were entirely dead, clean, good dead, and they have no life of any sort. Then God is not their God. But if there is still an element of their being that is alive, that has survived death, then God is their God, for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. How can he be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob when they are dead according to my brother's argument? The answer is here, "*For all live unto him.*" Every one of them had their spirits return back to God and are still alive and in his presence, in his sight. He knows of them; he is their God. That includes Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all of the dead until time shall be no more. Jesus positively says they are all alive, and I am not therefore going to believe that they are all dead in the sense my brother believes they are dead.

Turn to Matt. x: 28, "Fear not them that can kill the body and after that have no more that they can do, but rather fear him that is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Will you notice, man can kill our bodies, but they cannot kill our souls? That shows that the body and soul must be distinct. If my body and soul were the same thing, and if a man was to kill my body he would kill both together. If body and breath are all there is of man, man can kill him. Can any man kill him? Jesus Christ says he cannot do it. Why can't he? Can he kill the body? Yes; can he kill the soul? No. Then the body and soul are two distinct things. This shows that the spirit or soul in the man is distinct from the body and is not killed with the body.

Look further: Luke ix: 28. "And as he prayed the fashion of his countenance was altered and his raiment was white and glistening. And behold there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias." Both these talking with him, talking with Christ during his personal ministry, Moses and Elias! Talking? Jesus said they did. "Who appeared in glory and spoke of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." They talked to him about his death. Who was Moses? He died away back yonder. Who was Elijah? He was translated hundreds of years before and went back to God. Both gone. When have they had resurrection? How did they get back? My brother says that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from death to the resurrection. Was everything that constituted these men unconscious? If so, how could they get back and talk? God's word says they did and I believe it. Therefore his proposition is untrue. The presence of spirits who have come back and have been seen and heard and made themselves known is positive proof of the fact of the untruthful-

ness of the proposition. He could not make the proposition stand to save his life if there were only this passage. But we have only given you a start to show the absurdity of this doctrine of dirt which reduces man to the level of the brute and ignores the fact that they, having come from God, return to him again.

[*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SIXTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' First Speech of One Half-Hour.*)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I will now take up some of the objections my friend has offered that I did not have time to deal with in my other speech. The first thing I wish to call attention to is that often-quoted text by our friend, "He formeth the spirit of man within him." You will remember our friend referred us to several texts which speak of the inner and outer man, but his idea was that God formed one man out of the dust of the ground first, or rather second, for I understood him to say that he formed the spirit man first, quoting in the first chapter of Genesis, where it is said, "Let us make man in our image," and then after that he formed the dust or flesh man and then put the spirit man into the flesh man. Let us examine this spirit man, what he calls the inner or inward man. We challenged him to produce a portion of scripture where the phrase "inner man," or "inward man," is applied to the wicked, to those who are unconverted; but he has done more than this; he has applied the term inner man to the beasts of the field as well as to man. He has done more than I asked him to do, more than his theory allows him to do. But let that pass. I asked him to produce a passage where it could be shown that the inner man was put into the outer man after the inner man was formed. He referred me to Zech. xii: 1. I ask you to consider that text. Does it say God put a man into a man? Does it say God put a spirit man into a flesh man? Let us come up to the question. "The Lord which stretcheth forth the heavens and layeth the foundations of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." The spirit of man, not formeth a man and putteth that man into another man, but formeth the spirit of man; the man is one thing, the spirit of man is formed within the man; but he reverses this and forms the spirit of man as an entity, as a being, as a conscious man, outside of the dust man, and then puts the spirit man into the dust man, whereas the scripture he himself quotes says that God forms the spirit of man within *him*. What is this spirit of man which is within him? My friend will admit that the word here rendered spirit, which is *ruach*, is frequently rendered *mind*. Let him dispute this, I will give him a number of testimonies in proof: "Which were a grief of *mind* to Isaac and Rebecca"—Gen. xxvi:35. The word *mind* here is from *ruach* the same as is rendered spirit in the text he has been quoting. "For by me thy days shall be multiplied and the years of thy *life* shall be increased"—Prov. ix: 11. *Ruach* again; for life, from the same word. "For I know the things that come into your *mind* every one of them"—Ezek. xi: 5. "That which cometh into your *mind*."—Ezek. xx: 32. "But when his heart was lifted up and his *mind* hardened in pride"—Dan. v: 20. "Then shall his *mind* change"—Hab. i: 11. I might quote others if necessary, but here are portions of

scripture in which you have the very same word in the original, and this word is translated mind. Let us translate it the same in the text he has quoted: "And formeth the *mind* of man within him." Now the matter is settled; the mind is formed within the man; consequently the power to think comes from God by creation. It is the mind of man, the spirit of man in that sense, not the man, the real conscious, thinking, separate man, existing, thinking, acting, separate from the body, as my friend would have you believe.

Now the next portion of scripture he has dwelt upon, and which he has referred to twice now—we have four sessions of this proposition and there need not be any hurry about it—here is the next one: "Not the God of the dead, but of the living." My friend seems to make very much of this case, yet at the same time overlooks the Saviour's object in uttering these words. Let me call your attention to what the Saviour says, and that will show you the difference between what he says and what my worthy opponent says. My friend says, Now that the dead, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, are *not dead but alive* is proved by the fact that God is their God, and he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. That is the way he puts it; now what does the Saviour say? "*Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush.*" What is he proving? The resurrection of the dead. Why is he proving it? Because he is talking to the Saducees who deny the resurrection. How does he appeal to them? How does he prove the resurrection of the dead? Does he prove it by proving what my friend would have you believe, by proving that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive? What manner of proof would that be? To prove that they have been alive all the time certainly would not prove their resurrection from the dead. If they are alive, they are alive without a resurrection, and therefore what would the Saviour want to use these words to prove a resurrection for? According to my friend he would prove they are alive without a resurrection, and the object of the Saviour's words are frustrated by the interpretation my friend puts upon them, or rather by his mere bare assertion. I will read the text: "Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto him." How did he show the resurrection when he called God the God of Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob? *How did that prove that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would be raised from the dead?* Because God is their God. Are there any men that God is not the God of? Yes; thousands of them. If these men died without God, then, of course, they are dead and God is not their God and will not raise them. But here are men that have been converted and therefore God is their God. They have died and the Saducees say that inasmuch as they are dead they will remain dead. Now, says the Saviour, because God is their God he will raise them from the dead, but he is not the God of those who have died in unbelief. Inasmuch as he is their God they all live *unto him*, and they shall actually be made alive *unto themselves* at the resurrection of the dead. My friend comes along and defeats the object of the Saviour in the argument. Supposing the Saviour is here talking to the Saducees and saying to them, You will admit that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are dead; now I will prove to you that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will be raised from the dead. I tell you God is their God, and he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; therefore he must make them alive by a resurrection. But my friend comes along and says that they are not dead; but alive, and therefore they do not need a resurrection,

and so defeats the argument of the Saviour himself. Let it be remembered that Jesus is here teaching *the resurrection of the dead*.

As to Abraham, what has become of him? Let me direct your attention to Heb. xi: 13, where he names Abraham and all the worthy ones: "These all *died* in faith, not having received the promise." But my friend says, No, they did not die at all; they shuffled off the body and went to live away in heaven and are there enjoying the promise. "These all *died* in faith, *not* having received the promise; God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect" (verse 40.) When the resurrection takes place, Abraham will be made alive and all the dead who are to be raised, as we shall show you in the next proposition, and they with us shall receive the things promised. They died *not* having received the promise; they will be made alive to *receive it*. One will not get it ahead of others, six thousand years, which would be the case if Abel had received it when he died.

Now my friend says God breathed into Adam's nostrils breath that had life in it; I want to know if what he breathed into the nostrils of the beasts had death in it? What kind of breath did the beasts receive? It is said that "all in whose nostrils was the breath of life went into the ark." "The breath of life!" Why then talk about breathing into Adam's nostrils breath that had life in it? Does not Solomon say "they all have *one breath*?" If there is life in the breath of the man is there not life in the breath of the beasts? Why draw such a distinction except to support a theory?

The next thing my friend tells us is that God so constituted us that we love life, that is we love the present life. He is referring to Hezekiah when the message came to tell him that he must die, and "Hezekiah wept sore." My friend saw that there was trouble here. Because the message had come that he must die--my friend's theory is that "death is the voice which Jesus sends to call us to his arms." Then, at death, he is just about to "read his title clear to mansions in the skies," and why should Hezekiah weep if the message came to invite him to mansions in the skies? So to get out of the difficulty he says that God has so constituted us that we love life; but why love the *present* life if there is no death? if "what seems so is transition" from this life to eternity of life, and why is it said in the scriptures that the last enemy to be destroyed is *death*? Why is it an enemy if death is the seperation of the soul from the body to take the soul from earth to heaven? Then how is it that sin brought death? If man never had sinned he would never have died and would therefore never have been separated from the body. I asked my friend if God was going to bring men from heaven and from hell and he says that God is going to bring immortal souls from heaven and from hell and give them immortal bodies--actually going to bring the depraved wicked creatures out of hell and give them bodies of His own nature: immortal bodies, which are bodies of the divine nature, are then with immortal souls going back into hell to stay there through the ages of eternity! If you are willing to receive that theory, my friend, do not talk about a "doctrine of dirt," and about degrading men to the level of brutes! A man who will stand before you and say that God will give wicked wretches immortal bodies and send those parts of His own nature to hell to roast them there, I will not call this a "gospel of dirt." I am sorry my friend brought any such disrespectful word into this debate. I would not have repeated it had he not forced it upon me.

Now we come to the question of Paul's reasoning. Perhaps I had better leave that for the present, for the time passes. My friend keeps on repeating "spirit man," and "dust man." Of course you know these are his own invented words, not scripture words, and they therefore need no comment. It is necessary for him to invent these words in order to express a false theory. We come to the case of the Saviour's words, "Into thy hands I commit my spirit." This he gives us to prove that when the Saviour uttered these words he went to heaven. Look at the words. Is it "Into thy hands I commit myself?" If so then the Saviour did not die. Instead of dying he went into the hands of God. Only his house died, that house that had "windows" that my friend spoke of. But the language of the text is not so. Into thy hands I commit *my* spirit, or *my* life, and then what happened? *Christ* died and *Christ* was buried. and, says Paul, *Christ* was raised from the dead. That is what we believe.

In connection with this he refers us also to the case of Stephen, where he says, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." Stephen did not say, Into thy hands I commit my spirit self; my dust self will go down to dust. Stephen did not say, Into thy hands I commit my inner man. but "into thy hands I commit my spirit," my life, and then what happened to Stephen? Here I think my friend did neglect to read a little further; "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this *he fell asleep.*" But no, perhaps I am quoting it incorrectly. This is how it should be, Stephen's body fell asleep. But it reads that Stephen fell asleep. Now all I want my friend to believe is that when Stephen fell asleep he was asleep, and not awake. If you ask where he was asleep the prophet Daniel will tell you. "Many that sleep *in the dust of the earth* shall awake"—Dan. xii: 2. That is what happened to Stephen, then, when he died. He has been mistaking all the way through what Stephen calls "my spirit," for Stephen himself; Stephen himself fell asleep.

Now about the spirit of God bearing witness with our spirits that we are the sons of God, how does the spirit of God reach us? It is the word of God. The Saviour says, "My words are spirit." Therefore when the word of God reaches our minds, the spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, or with our mind. Therefore, as our friend showed this morning, we must "be renewed in the spirit of our minds." The mind is the property of the body is it not? I have already demonstrated this to you. You can soon tell. Take a club and fracture a man's skull and he has no mind. Then the mind is the property of the brain, and when you have interfered with the brain you have stopped a man's thinking power. Can you take that which is material and strike that which is not material? Let us here go back to the "formation of the spirit of man within him." I had always thought that according to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the soul was immaterial, without form, weight, tangibility or visibility. It does not weigh anything; it does not measure anything; you cannot see it; you cannot feel it; and yet my friend has been quoting a text which speaks of the spirit being *formed* inside of this material body.

The next thing our attention is called to is that "God is a spirit." This we referred to in the start that spirit is sometimes used for a being. "A spirit hath not flesh and bones," and yet it says, "Try the spirits . . . because many false prophets are gone out into the world." Spirits and prophets

are synonymous terms there. There you have spirits with flesh and bones; what spirit is this that hath not flesh and bones? They were frightened because they thought they had seen a ghost, a spectral illusion, a *fantasma*. You have the Greek word *fantasma* or *fatom*. He meant apparition, which is here called *pneuma*, bath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. Yet at that very time the Saviour was flesh and bones, but not flesh and blood, and still he had been changed to immortality. Angels have visited the earth, they had their feet washed; they had feet to wash, and yet they are spirit beings, so that spirit beings are not non-entities nor myths.

"The body without the spirit is dead;" as in the margin, "The body without the breath is dead." Our translators saw that the word rendered spirit, which in the Greek is *pneuma*, could be rendered breath. If the spirit my friend has been presenting is an immaterial spirit being, capable of existing separate from the body, and if the body is another man, and as he tells us these are actual men, actual beings, why is not the dust man capable of living as a separate individual without the spirit man? If the spirit man is independent of the dust man why is not the dust man independent of the spirit man? The spirit that the scriptures are speaking of is the life of man, that by which he is a living man. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." Now my friend wanted to know where the spirit went to. Here is a lighted candle; let us suppose now it is alive; here is a man formed of the dust of the ground; God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and he is alive. You blow out the light of the candle and the candle is dead so far as the light is concerned. Suppose I ask my friend where that light has gone? is the light existing separate from the candle? So when the spirit has gone out the life of the man is gone out; there is no life to be found, so far as that man is concerned.

We come next to the thief on the cross, whose spirit, my friend says, went with Christ to Paradise. Now what did the thief ask for? Lord, take my spirit to paradise? Lord, take my spirit to heaven? No; he said, Lord, remember me when *thou comest* into thy kingdom—that kingdom we have been talking about in the first proposition. What did the Saviour say? Verily I say unto thee, to-day I will take thy spirit with me to paradise? No; not a bit of it. "Verily I say unto thee to-day"—what does he say to him to-day? "Thou shalt be with me in paradise." When shall we have paradise restored? Paradise was lost by the first Adam; the same paradise that was lost is to be restored and that paradise never was in heaven and never will be. When Christ comes he will restore the paradise that was lost. The Saviour replies to his request and says, "Thou shalt be with me in paradise" when I come into my kingdom. "For the Lord will comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waste places and make her wilderness like Eden and her desert like the paradise of the Lord." Then the Lord will come into his kingdom and the thief will be there with him, in paradise. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SIXTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Half-Hour Speech.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am glad our brother is inclined to follow if he is not able to lead. He is now in this late hour of

the day giving attention to the speech I made yesterday afternoon. He is by the rules of the debate, in the affirmative, but by the facts in the case he is in the negative. He is so much behind, as you will be able to discover, that quite a number of arguments have not been hinted at as yet, but he promises to do this. If he fails to get through by to-morrow at noon it may be Sunday morning at ten o'clock he will begin on it and finish it up before he leaves. He is a long way behind at present, however. You will remember that just before dinner he brought out the thought that man's spirit is breath, and spirit and breath mean the same thing as to man. In view of that I want to read a few scriptures: Acts vii: 59, "They stoned Stephen, calling on God and saying, Lord Jesus receive my breath." That is the prayer of Stephen in dying. Acts xxiii: 5, "For the Saducees say there is no resurrection, neither angels nor breath." That knocks the breath out of all of us. It reads spirit, but my brother says that spirit and "breath" are the same thing, that being the case these Saducees positively taught that there is no breath.

I. Cor. v: 5, "To deliver such an one unto satan for the destruction of the flesh that the breath may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

Matt. x: 1, "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples he gave them power against unclean breaths"—folks using tobacco and such as that.

This gives you a sample of putting the position of my brother into the scriptures. I. Cor. ii: 11, "For who knoweth the things of a man save the breath of a man that is in him?"

This is the position the brother advanced, his own idea put into a few passages for the sake of trying it, to see if anything could be done with it, to let his own statements take the place of what God has said, and let you read God's word in the light of his doctrine.

In the questions this forenoon you remember there came up two or three questions in rapid succession which I answered briefly or refused to answer because in a discussion of such moment, involving the death of Christ more time was required. I therefore take this opportunity of saying that I believe the death of Christ was two-fold, involving both soul and body. He was a representative man and he died as a man's representative, and to make complete that representation he represented man both in material and immaterial being. I believe that the death of the body brings unconscious condition while the death of the spirit is simply separation from the source of living. It does not mean that the spirit is unconscious, for Paul says of men who are yet alive, "Ye are dead in trespasses and sins." Your spiritual nature is separated from God. They were possessed of moral sense and knew the distinction between right and wrong, but they were separated from fellowship with God. The only sense in which death can come to the spirit is separation from God, and eternal death will be eternal separation from God. The spirit continues its existence in the land of despair and shall never have fellowship with God. God calls that death, and that is what happened when Christ died in the spirit. The Father had been with him to comfort and strengthen and help him all through life; now in the dying hour the presence of God takes its departure. He died as a man, as a sinner. Such a separation took place between the Father and the Son before the expiration of the body. There was such a separation when he said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The separation then took place, and when he came, a few minutes afterwards, to say, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,"

into the hands of God the spirit of Christ went. A two-fold death in the two-fold character of Christ, dying for a two-fold man whom he came to redeem. My brother says he understood me to say that the spirit man was made before the dust man. He says again that I apply the inner man to the beasts of the field. I have no recollection of any such application. Then he goes on in his speech in regard to the Lord forming the spirit of man within him. There is a declaration made by Zechariah of the formation of the spirit, not one man within another man, but the spirit formed within the man. That is what the prophet says. He calls that which was formed *spirit* he does not call it a man. I do not quote Zechariah as authority for saying it is a *man*, but I turn over in the same Bible as a revelation from the Divine Spirit to man, and I find other inspired writers calling the renewing of the spirit of your mind the "inner man." I turn to Paul and ask, What is it that the spirit represents? Zechariah calls it spirit; we do not know what the spirit is, we do not know how to define it or understand it. Paul says it is the "inner man," "hidden man of the heart." By putting Zechariah and Paul together I have got a *man*. Taking Zechariah alone I have a *spirit* formed *in* man; taking another portion of the Bible, letting God's word explain itself; we have no difficulty in the case. Can this audience see that? Of course you do, and my brother ought to see it.

My brother says my argument destroys Christ's argument; that Christ is arguing for the resurrection to the Saducees. Just as the brother said, his argument was to them that there will be a resurrection of the dead. But these Saducees said there is no "angel nor spirit; there is nothing to raise." That is just what my brother would have said. He would have stood with them against Christ. There are no spirits; hence we oppose the resurrection of the dead. Christ makes his argument for the resurrection of the dead on the fact that the element in man that is now alive would, by and by, come back for a complete form. It is my idea that Paul makes his argument for the resurrection on the same basis. This may be discussed in our next proposition, but for the sake of the illustration Paul says the resurrection is like taking corn and putting it in the ground. It passes through the process of death, but there never is a loss of life. If you take a grain of corn and notice it particularly you will see there is a little germ in it. That grain of corn does not die. It is preserved through the process of death. This seed may go down through the experience of death, but the life in it does not die. So, Paul says, is the resurrection of the dead. Said Paul, "Every one of these dead people have a spirit, and every one of these spirits have survived death; every one of them has the germ of life and I am going to show you the triumph of God over the grave when he raises up the dead." Christ's argument is exactly the same. If Jesus Christ were here he would answer this man just as he did the Saducees.

But then, that question about Abraham. God is not the God of the dead. Does Abraham live to him? Over in Heb. xi. Paul refers to Abraham as dead and not having received the promise. Do I believe Abraham dead? I do. Do you believe it? You do. Did all that constitutes Abraham die? There is no controversy here that there is death. Your proposition is that all that constituted Abraham died. Did he thus die? To say so is to assume the proposition. I will prove to you that he did not die. We are going to find in an example by and by that this man is yet alive, this very same Abraham.

Let us see further. God breathed into Adam's nostrils breath that had life

in it. He says, Why didn't Mr. Hall allow that the same God breathed into the nostrils of the beasts? Because God did not say he did. God does say he breathed into *Adam's* nostrils the breath of life, but God does not say he breathed into the nostrils of the *beasts* the breath of life. I go as far as God's word goes; if he wants to go further he must take the consequences. I asked him this morning, and I ask him now to quote a passage to prove that God ever breathed into the nostrils of the beasts the breath of life. He says, I will tell you where to find it; in the same passage where God breathed into the woman's nostrils the breath of life. Why do we not find where God did this? Because woman was taken out of man and God's breath was in the man; but do you find where God took the beasts from man?

He comes to the question of Hezekiah. He says he cannot understand why people want to keep on living if death is the gate to everlasting bliss, as God's word abundantly teaches. He does not see why we do not want to take our departure at once. Because God has made it so. God has given us a love of this life. When the Christian knows that the dissolving scenes of time are passing, and the spirit is preparing to take its departure, and loving friends are bidding a last adieu, then his faith takes hold of God's promises and he realizes that the heavenly land of Canaan is in view, and when the time comes and the parting sighs become a reality, there is consolation and hope, there is joy and peace in the thought of our heavenly home. We can read our title clear to mansions in the skies for we have got them.

He asks if God will call back immortal spirits and join them to mortal bodies and then roast them in the fires of hell forever. Our answer to that argument will belong to another proposition, and he will find out all about it when he comes to that proposition.

He comes to the death of Christ. He said, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." He asks: "Did the spirit of the Saviour go into the hands of God? If it did, then the Saviour never died; but the Saviour did die." But I reply, Did all that it takes to constitute the Saviour die on the cross? He teaches it. This brother comes here with the fearful doctrine that the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God—for "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God"—he comes here with the doctrine that Jesus Christ died on the cross and went into a condition of unconsciousness, that he was lifeless wholly; for he thinks that the spirit of Christ was nothing but his breath, that he was praying God to take his breath when he died. This fearful doctrine this brother undertakes to preach is closely akin to the infidelity that would announce that Jesus Christ was but a man, a mere man. We need some sort of a Saviour, some sort of a process whereby we ourselves are raised. Jesus Christ in the dying hour had a spirit as well as a body. On the cross the body died. On the cross the spirit did not die, but the spirit of Jesus Christ went up to his Father.

Then comes Stephen. He says Stephen did not say, Into thy hands I commend myself, and he says I forgot to read just a verse further that says that "Stephen fell asleep." I saved it on purpose for my brother to read it. What does that mean? He died. Does falling asleep mean dying? I admit it; I grant it. Did all that constituted Stephen die? That is your proposition. I say it did not; I say there was one element in Stephen that helped to make up his constitution that did not die. That is what Zechariah called the spirit, and what Stephen called the spirit, and what Jesus called the spirit, and what Paul called the inner

man, the hidden man of the heart, the renewing of the mind. I challenge my brother to say that *it* died. Stephen's *body* died, but Stephen's *spirit* did not. He commended it to God, and into the hands of God it went.

My brother says you may strike a man on the head with a club and destroy his mind. Very good; I believe that the mind is wholly dependent on the brain, and if the mind constituted the soul, then you have destroyed the soul with a club. Jesus says that man may kill the body, and you can do that by hitting a man on the head with a club, but no man can kill the soul. Hence he said we are to fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Can you destroy a man's soul by hitting him on the head with a club? No. That proves, Jesus Christ being our teacher, that the mind is one thing, and the soul is another.

Then comes the saying, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." John said, try the spirits because many false prophets had gone forth, and these false prophets had flesh and bones. Are they spirits? Look out! We will get an entity sure enough! You said this morning that spirit was breath, and now you pretend to say that these spirits that were to be tried were the flesh and bone prophets, and that therefore Jesus Christ made a mistake when he said that spirits did not have flesh and bones? This was a *phantasma*, and the people imagined that they saw a spirit or a ghost, and Christ let them know that he *was* a real person. But, brother, the word translated spirit in that place is not *phantasma*. And wasn't that the very finest opportunity in the world for the Saviour to look into the faces of his disciples and say, Why, my dear brethren, don't you know there are no spirits? But what did he say? I am not a spirit; I am a real presence; spirits do not have flesh and bones. Then here *are* spirits, though they are not material beings with flesh and bones, yet there *are* spirits, Jesus Christ being the teacher in the case.

We come to the thief on the cross. Let us take a little time to look into the question about the thief. You will find a reference to it in Luke xxiii:43. The Saviour was on the cross dying as a malefactor; one thief reviled him and the other prayed to him and his prayer was this: "Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." The brother intimates that prayer contemplated that the thief had an idea of the future coming kingdom, and when the Saviour came in that kingdom he wanted to be remembered. It may be that this was the idea of the thief since he probably was himself a Jew, or at least had associated with the Jews, for he was put to death in Jerusalem, and, no doubt, therefore thought that there was coming a time when the Messiah's kingdom was to come in Jerusalem, and he wanted to be remembered in that kingdom. But Christ at once understood his difficulty, and he knew how to deal with it. Not away beyond the future will I hear your prayer; I keep no poor penitent man waiting hundreds of years for the answer to his prayer; you may fix your time, but *now* is God's accepted time. *To-day* I will answer you; *right now* shalt thou be with me in paradise. Not away beyond in the future when you think I am coming in my kingdom in this materialistic reign, but *to-day*. How is Jesus going to answer it? What is he going to give him? Into what will he take him? Jesus solves the problem and looks into his face and says, "TO-DAY shalt thou be with me in *paradise*."

Let us see if we can find where paradise is; if we can, we can find where the thief is and where Christ is. Turn to Revelation ii: 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the *tree* of life which is in the *midst* of the paradise of

God." There is paradise. Jesus said to the thief, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." Where is paradise? The tree of life is in the midst of paradise. Wherever you find paradise you will find the tree of life in the middle of it; wherever you find the tree of life you will find paradise. If I could make a circle on this board and draw a tree in the middle of it, wherever you find the circle you find the tree. Let us take this tree as a pointer. Turn to Rev. xxii: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it and on either side of the river was there the tree of life." Who said that? John. What did he see? He saw the tree of life. Where did he see it? In the middle of the street, and on either side of the river. There is God on his throne, and the river proceeding out of the throne. Where is the tree of life? In the middle of paradise. Where else is the tree of life? In the midst of the city. Then the city and paradise is the same place. The 14th verse: "Blessed are they that keep his commandments that they may have a right to the tree of life and may enter through the gates into the city." Where is the tree of life? In the city. Who has a right to it? They that do his commandments. When do they enter? Whenever they pass out of this life and go into the holy city. Where is paradise? God's throne is in it; the tree of life stands in it, and they enter it that keep his commandments. That is where the thief went that day. That is the heaven we speak of.

Turn to II. Cor. xii: 1: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell." Did you ever know a man to talk like that who was a Christadelphian? I know Paul never knew a Christadelphian. If my brother had been there he would have said, "You are the most poorly instructed Christadelphian I ever saw! Don't you know a man could not be out of his body? When a man is out of his body he is dead. Have you lost your mind? Has anybody hit you on the head with a club? What is the trouble that you cannot tell whether a man can be in the body or out? Don't you know if he gets out he goes out like a candle?" I tell you, Paul wasn't a Christadelphian. "How that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." It is a vision, a revelation. God makes it and Paul calls it such. There was paradise to which the thief went. The declaration is that the tree of life is in paradise, and the tree of life is in the city of God. If it is you might reasonably expect to see marvelous things. What did he say? Listen: "And heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Heard what? Heard *words* that a man could not be allowed to utter. Who did the speaking? Those in paradise. He looked in and saw paradise. He looked in and saw paradise and heard somebody talking. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SIXTH SESSION.

Mr. Williams' second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.)

MR. WILLIAMS QUESTIONS MR. HALL.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I will now ask my friend a few more questions.

Mr. Williams: Question—When you said that God breathed breath that had

life in it into man, did you mean to imply that the breath of the beast had no life in it?—*Mr. Hall:* Answer--No sir.

You think the breath of the beasts has life in it?—I suppose so.

When a good man dies and becomes separate from the body, where does he go?—I believe he returns to God.

Goes to heaven?—Yes.

When Abel died and was separated from his body, did he go to heaven?—I think so.

Is he there yet?—I think so.

Saved?—I think so.

When Noah died, and Abraham and David, did they go to heaven?—Yes.

Do you know that Peter said that David is not ascended into the heavens?—Yes.

You say he is?—No sir, not in his body.

Abel, Noah, Abraham, and all the ancient worthies from the time of Adam down to the time of Christ had gone to heaven and were saved?—Yes; I think so.

Then when Christ died to save them they were already saved, and now suppose Christ never had died, would they have lost their salvation?—Christ is said to be a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Their salvation had been rescued.

Was Christ actually a lamb slain from the foundation of the world?—Not actually.

When was Christ actually slain?—When nailed to the cross.

Four thousand years after Adam?—Yes.

Doesn't the apostle say Christ is our *forerunner*?—Yes.

That Christ is the *first* fruits?—Yes.

How then do you have all the ancient worthies saved before the first fruits?—Because Christ is the first fruits of them that sleep, not to those being saved. He was the first born from the dead.

Jesus was not the first to be saved then?—Christ never was lost and did not have to be saved.

Didn't you say Christ died in a two-fold sense and became separate from God.—Yes.

Do you think God inflicted a two-fold death on one that was in no sense among the lost?—He took on him man's condition. He died for our sins.

Was he not under the law of sin and death?—He was put under it.

Didn't he die to redeem men, and doesn't the apostle Paul say, "Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ . . . through the blood of the everlasting covenant"?—Yes sir.

Then didn't it require the blood of Christ to redeem Christ from the dead?—No.

Doesn't it say he was brought from the dead through the blood of the covenant? Did it not take the blood of the covenant to redeem him from death?—No sir; that is not my understanding of Paul's words.

That is what Paul says. You said the Holy Spirit must be a person because a personal pronoun is used?—That is one of the arguments.

Does it follow that every personal pronoun indicates a personality?—Not from that argument alone.

I will give you a case to consider now. "His servants ye are to whom ye

yield yourselves servants to obey; whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness." "His" and "whom" are personal pronouns; is sin a person?—Sin represents a person in the apostle's argument.

Is sin a person?—No sir.

Yet you have a personal pronoun to represent sin which is not a person; could you not have a personal pronoun to represent the Holy Spirit and yet the Holy Spirit not be a person?—I think so.

We come to I. Cor. xv. where Paul says that if there be no resurrection of the dead their preaching was vain and then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished; I want you to tell me how their preaching was vain if all good men had gone to heaven without a resurrection and all good men could continue to go to heaven without a resurrection; why did their preaching salvation depend upon a resurrection of the dead?—Because if there were no resurrection of the dead it proved that nobody had gone to heaven or been saved; if there was no resurrection the whole thing was a failure and proved so.

Were there not thousands of men, according to your view, already saved in heaven?—Yes sir.

Did they depend upon the resurrection of Christ for their salvation?—From the very beginning the resurrection of Christ was contemplated as the ground of their salvation.

Suppose, then, as Paul says, that Christ had remained dead in the grave and that there was no resurrection, as some claimed, how could Paul say that they which had fallen asleep in Christ had perished, if they were in heaven?—On the ground that he was presenting the entire argument hypothetically; if there was no resurrection of Christ those asleep were dead; they had no spirits; they were all perished.

Then do you believe that they were asleep in the grave, as Paul says, and they that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished if the dead rise not?—The whole is a hypothetical argument.

Hypothetical in this sense that they had perished if there was no resurrection; yet you say they could not perish because they were in heaven?—Because on account of the fact of the resurrection the argument is an entire failure, for it is all hypothetical.

What do you understand by the divine nature?—The nature of God.

Immortality?—Yes.

Why do you ask the question in *Hall's Campbellite Catechism*, Is not the Christian a partaker of the divine nature? Is it the Christian only who is a partaker of the divine nature?—In the sense Peter speaks of it.

Is the immortal soul divine nature?—Not of itself.

Is not the immortal spirit divine?—No sir; that is human nature.

Where did the immortal spirit come from?—God imparted it when he made man.

Is it not a part of God's nature?—It was while God had it; it is human nature now.

In what sense did you say we are God's offspring, and in the image of God?—We are God's offspring because we have God's nature.

That immortality in us you say is the divine nature?—No sir.

Isn't there divine nature as well as human?—No sir; God has immortality as well as man.

Where did immortality come from?—God imparted it.

Then you ask the next question, Can the Christian any more lose that nature than you can lose the nature of your parents?—That is right.

Is the Christian in possession of the divine nature in the same sense that he is in possession of the nature of his parents?—At his birth.

When did he come into the possession of the divine nature?—At his new birth.

Is he a Christian when he is born?—You mean his natural birth?

Didn't you say he can no more lose the divine nature than he can lose the nature of his parents?—Yes.

Is this divine nature his by reason of his birth?—The new birth gives him the divine nature.

When he is born again you mean?—Yes sir.

Then a Christian is not in possession of the immortal nature until he is born again?—Yes, he is.

If he cannot be in possession of the divine nature until he is born again, and since the divine nature is the immortal nature, how can he possess the immortal nature until he is born again?—As pertaining to God the immortal nature is divine; as pertaining to man, it is not divine. It is the new birth that mak s him a child of the spirit.

Is a wicked man a partaker of the immortal nature?—Yes.

Does he get immortal nature from God?—Yes, by creation.

If a wicked man is lost, and that wicked man is still in possession of the immortal nature, and the immortal nature is God's nature, then is not God's nature lost?—No sir; the wicked man's immortality is not necessarily God-like.

Didn't God form the spirit you are trying to prove is an entity?—*Trying to prove.*

Didn't God form the spirit out of his own being?—Yes.

Then when that spirit goes to hell doesn't that part of God's nature go to hell in the case of a lost soul?—Yes

If a Christian is lost wouldn't a part of the divine nature be lost?—Yes.

Now if a wicked man is in possession of the same immortal nature——? He is not in possession of the divine nature.

If a wicked man is in possession of the same *immortal* nature that the good man is in possession of wouldn't that immortal nature be burning in hell forever?—His immortality will bring on endless suffering, but it will not be God's nature.

Whose nature will it be?—Man's nature; God's nature is supreme and divine; both alike are immortal.

You believe all the good go to heaven when they die? [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Williams' Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

Our friend has resorted to the same trick others do; it is a trick of the clergy, trying to work upon your sense of the ridiculous by reading breath where spirit occurs. He has entirely overlooked the definitions I gave of spirit when I started. Didn't I say that God is spirit? Didn't I say the word spirit is applied to angels and sometimes to mind, sometimes used for disposition, sometimes for breath? I stated this positively before I started out, because I anticipated some trick of this kind. You may take any word you like from the original Greek, and it has various meanings, and you cannot interchange these words without making them

appear absurd. Even synonyms are not always interchangeable. Now I will treat him to the same thing and pay him back in the same coin. It would be absurd to say God is breath, because there is the context to show that spirit is not used in the sense of breath. We must govern the meaning of words in the Scriptures by their context. He ignores the various meanings I gave and the various uses of the word for the sake of a cheap joke so he could get you to laugh at it by reading breath where the word spirit occurs. That was nothing to laugh at if you had only considered what I said when I began, that the word is sometimes used for breath and sometimes for men, angels, God, mind, disposition, etc. Then you could place the word in the proper position whenever you came to it. Now I will call attention to a few places where to change the word spirit to immortal entity will be just as absurd. II. Kings ii: 9—Let a double portion of thy (Elijah's spirit) immortal entity be upon me." Job ix: 18—"He will not suffer me to take my (breath) immortal entity. How would that sound? Absurd, of course. Again, In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, the *breath* of all mankind. There we have again *shuach* for breath. Is that immortal entity? Again Job xxvii: 3—"All the while my breath is in me." Is that immortal entity? That would sound absurd, wouldn't it? Because, you see, you cannot interchange the words. Again I will read from Job xxxiii: 4—"The spirit of God hath made me and the breath (immortal entity) of the Almighty hath given me life." Job xxxiy: 14—"If he set his heart upon man; if he gather to himself his spirit and his breath (immortal entity)." Eph. i: 23—"Be renewed in the spirit (immortal entity) of your mind." Would you be willing to read it this way? But what does it mean? Be renewed in the disposition of your mind—a disposition that shall be well pleasing in the sight of God. "For though I be absent in the flesh yet am I with you in the spirit"—had Paul got out of his body again? Had his immortal entity gone to the church at Colosse? "The God of the spirits of all flesh." Suppose we read the God of the immortal entities of all flesh; that would give immortal entities to all flesh. And so I might go on multiplying texts, but this will prove nothing for him nor for me, but it is simply a little sophistry. My friend saw fit to try to raise a laugh on the part of those who could not see under the sophistry, and by such tricks and turns of words thousands of people are deceived. I am sorry to see it. My friend has behaved pretty well all through, but I am afraid now he has begun to step aside. I hope he will retract before it is too late.

"Fear not him that can kill the body." My friend comes before you to prove the immortality, the deathlessness of the soul, its indestructibility; and yet he quotes a text which shows that the soul can be destroyed. What does destroy mean here?—"Destroy *both* soul and body in hell?" The destruction of the soul is to be in the same sense as the destruction of the body. Therefore you have a body that can be destroyed and a soul that can be destroyed in the same sense. Now God cannot destroy a part of his own nature—that which is indestructible. Do I limit the power of God? No. I do not limit the power of God; at the same time God cannot lie, nor die, nor destroy that which is indestructible. If the soul is indestructible then God can no more destroy the soul than he can destroy his own nature; yet the text he quotes says that God can destroy both soul and body in hell; then the soul is not an immortal soul. There is a sense in which the word soul is used for life and the life the Saviour is referring to there is the life which no man can take; God can take it, can destroy it, and he will destroy it when he

burns up the chaff. This will be discussed in our last proposition, where we shall show the absolute destruction of the entire man when destruction will find its full limit in the elimination from the world of every enemy, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and God shall be all and in all. God will remove from the earth everything that is obnoxious to his will, and everything will be pleasing and acceptable in his sight.

My friend says Christ's death was two-fold. Where does he find anything about Christ's death being two-fold? "He poured out his soul unto death." Here is a soul that died when he was crucified on the cross, it became dead, and was buried. Let us take the apostle's words—This Christ that I preached unto you in Corinth died; I have already told you in the gospel that he died and you believed that he died; that same Christ was buried, and if there was no resurrection of that Christ then you have no Christ; then why is your baptism for the dead? What is your baptism for? Your baptism is of no use. O yes it is, my friend says, because my Christ didn't die and go into the grave; he went to heaven; therefore baptism would be valid whether his body was raised or not. The very Christ that died is the only Christ that Paul knows of; the only Christ Christadelphians know of, and they believe that he died and rose again. When Christ died—if we must take our friend's view—there were two of them, and only the outer one died; the outer one never lived without the inner one according to him; and the inner one lived through all eternity. I wonder if he believes Christ had the divine nature; if so then the divine nature could not die; then he denies the death of Christ. Where then is your Saviour? But let us believe what the scriptures tell us, that Christ died and was buried and rose again, and if he had not been raised there would have been no salvation for those that died in faith. Therefore, Abel died, says Paul, and Noah died and David died and they all of them died in the faith that Christ would come and that he would die and go down into the grave and break the bars of the tomb and thus open up a way of resurrection to life. None of them were saved before the Saviour came; they simply reached down to Christ in hope that he would come and break forth from death and the grave and thus become the resurrection and the life to those that should believe in him; then, though they were dead, yet should they live. Because the Saviour says, I have been down into death and have broken the bars of the tomb, I am now the resurrection. If I had not come and done this then all those that have fallen asleep in me had perished and gone forever. Therefore a life beyond the grave depends on Christ becoming the resurrection. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SIXTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

MR. HALL QUESTIONS MR. WILLIAMS.

Now I will proceed to ask my friend a few more questions.

Mr. Hall: Question—Do the Old Testament writers use figurative language?

—*Mr. Williams:* Answer—Sometimes.

Did Solomon mean to speak of all the dead when he said, "The dead know not anything?—All the dead that died knew not anything.

That takes in everybody that died?—Yes.

Does that statement include you and me?—When we are dead it will be true of us.

Does he speak of the same dead when he says, "Neither have they any more a reward?—No; he is speaking of the dead who will never live again.

Does this word "they" have a nominative?—Yes.

What is the nominative?—It is the same "they" used in Job: "Till the heavens be no more *they* shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep.

This connection does not depend on some other passage to find out its meaning; it says, "The dead know not anything . . . neither have *they* any more a reward." It refers to something in the verse?—It refers to those that shall never have a portion in anything done under the sun.

That is what it says; "They" is a pronoun; what does it refer to?—It refers to those who have died and who shall not "have a portion forever in anything done under the sun."

What is the nominative in that sentence?—"The dead."

Neither have *they*--what does "they" refer to?—The dead.

Now that includes you and me?—When we are dead.

That includes everybody; "Neither shall they have any more reward?"—That will include those that have no more a portion forever in things done under the sun.

You have lost your case. In Psalm cxlvi: 3 does David exhort us not to put our trust in princes?—He does.

Were these human princes?—Yes.

Why not trust them?—Because their "breath goes forth; they return to their dust and in that very day their thoughts perish."

Is that the reason?—Yes.

Is that breath their spirit?—Yes.

Does it die?—It never lived as an entity.

Does it die?—A thing that never lived cannot be said to die. I ask you does the light of the candle live after it is put out?

What part returns to dust?—Man.

Does the spirit return to dust?—The spirit returns to God who gave it.

What Hebrew word is rendered "thought" in that passage?—I do not recollect.

Do you know the word in Job xvii: 2?—I do not know.

It is given by Mr. Young as "purpose," purposes. In that very day their thoughts, you quoted it yesterday, their thoughts perish. They are no longer able to fulfill their plans nor carry out their purposes. David's argument was that when they died they could not fulfill their pledges.—Shall I explain it?

In a minute. Is not that what Job said in Job xvii: 11—"My days are past; my purposes are broken off, even the thoughts of my heart," is that not the same idea in that passage?—Job wasn't dead yet. His purposes had failed to be fulfilled. When you asked me in regard to Job, first I was in doubt what you referred to.

Job said his purposes were broken off; is not that what David said in regard to those princes?—Will you give me time to explain?

You did not give it to me but I will give it to you?—When their purposes are

broken off in death they have no power to have purposes because their thoughts have perished.

Job means the same?—It just means that “the dead know not anything” as Solomon says.

Job you admit was still living?—Job was.

Can the thoughts and purposes of man be broken off while he is still alive?—Certainly.

Is he still conscious?—Certainly.

Does Paul speak of the outward and inward man?—Yes.

What is the outward man?—The real man.

In other words, the body?—I did not say the body, I said the whole, living man.

Does the outward man die?—Yes.

What is the inward man?—“Christ in us the hope of glory.”

Is that what Paul says it is?—Yes.

Does Paul say it is a man?—Paul says it is the new man begotten in us by Christ.

A man?—It is a man in a mental and moral sense, as we speak of a man being a new man when he changes his character.

The inner man never had a living existence?—The inner man is an attribute of the man, the real man.

It was a real, physical, personal man. In Ephesians iii: 15, does Paul speak of the same thing?—The same thing; the inner man is “Christ formed in you the hope of glory.”

Was it made of dust?—The inner man was made of nothing but character.

Not being made of dust will it return to dust?—That goes without saying.

Where will it go?—It does not exist as a man or an entity; it is recorded in the Lamb’s book of life as character.

You think the inspired scripture uses language in that way?—I think, as you said a little while ago, that some use figurative language.

You think that is the sense of these passages, that that is the belief of Christadelphians?—As far as I know.

Is that what the Bible says?—The Bible does not say everything; you have to use common sense.

How does God strengthen this inner man?—By the word of truth.

By his spirit?—The spirit in the word.

What part of the man receives this spirit?—The mind of the man.

Will you quote a passage that says that it is the mind that receives the witness of the spirit?—It is said that his spirit bears witness with our spirit—*pneuma*, which is properly rendered mind.

Is our inner man a spirit?—In the sense of mind or character, not in the sense of entity.

This inner man is the mind that returns to God?—I never said that; the spirit or life returns to God; I said that the inner man represented character.

Is the adornment on the body?—On the person.

What is the hidden man of the heart.—Sincerity; believing the truth; living up to the truth.

Would Peter call it that?—That is the definition.

Peter says, “whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning . . .

but let it be the hidden man of the heart?"—The heart belongs to the body and the hidden man of the heart is an allusion to the affections of the heart.

What is the word for man?—*Anthropos*.

That is the word commonly used for man; now it is the same; it refers to the inner man of the heart; does that word used in I. Pet. iii-4 mean man?—It is man in the moral sense.

Was it a *man*?—It is a new man, by being "begotten again."

He wasn't alive before he was born; that is, converted. Now was it incorruptible?—In the sense implied by the language.

What is the word for incorruptible?—*aphthartos*, I think it is there.

Is this the same word in Rom. ii: 7?—Yes, and there it applies to nature; here it applies to character; the same as we use the word an incorruptible man in character.

It is the same word?—Yes.

Was it real immortality then?—It was real incorruptibility; but the reference is to character, not nature.

Is it the same word in I. Tim. i: 17, "God only hath immortality?"—I think it is.

It is there applied to God?—It is.

Does it mean immortality?—It means immortality of nature.

Now then notice and I hope the audience will pay attention; we have the word for man, commonly rendered man in the Bible, applied to spirit; and we have the word which is the Greek word incorruptible, which is the same identical word rendered immortal where it applies to God's nature, here applied to spirit; so if there can be a destruction of God's nature, there can be a destruction of man's spirit. Is not this an immortal soul?—Are you still questioning me? If so let me answer [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Hall's second speech of fifteen minutes.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS:—I wish to have your attention now for fifteen minutes in reviewing some things said by the brother. I first want to call attention to the opening remarks. I think my brother spoke as if a little heated. He spoke of the tricks of the clergy and spoke with a little more sharpness than I think the occasion called for. I am really afraid my brother's liver is getting out of order. I know his mind is all right. I have not uttered a word that was intended to be disrespectful or offensive. I am here to meet my brother honestly, openly, frankly, and squarely, without hiding or evading a single point, but I do have a right to claim that the brother's position must be sustained. In the questioning this morning the brother said that breath and spirit and spirit and breath were identical, and I simply took the definition and applied it to some scriptures, and made it absurd, and you laughed at it and it hurt him. It wasn't the fault of the application; it was the fault of the position. The brother is on the absurd side of the subject. And I only used it in just a few passages where I might have multiplied it by hundreds. He says now in reply that this word *pneuma*, translated spirit, means more than breath; it is applied to God, to angels, to men as well as to air. Very good! We are leading the brother ahead; he is enlarging himself; he will be a bigger man after this debate is over than when it began. When he began to talk about it this morning, in spite of all the efforts I made to draw him out, I could not get him to admit that the spirit was more than breath,

but when he saw himself as he really is, he was obliged to modify himself and admit that the spirit does involve an entity; that it involves God, angels and men: these are *entities*. He doesn't yield the point that the inner spirit is an entity, but he yields the point that spirit represents entities. Now he undertakes to pay me back in my own coin. I am always willing to receive it the same way I am willing to give it. I am not willing to give him money which I am not willing to take back again. He quotes II. Kings ii: 9, "To receive a double portion of thy immortal entity." That is not so absurd when you come to think about it. This brother will not deny that God is an *immortal entity*. Job ix: 18, "Thou wilt not suffer me to take my spirit, my breath, my immortal entity." Suppose I take what the brother admits for granted that the word does sometimes refer to other than immortal entity. But in this case there would be no absurdity without that admission; Job was prevented by his friends from doing violence to his soul. There is no absurdity in the least. Then he said that all mankind have one spirit, one breath, one immortal entity. Does this mean that mankind all draw the same breath or the same kind of breath? We believe that they all have the same kind of spirit or immortal entity; there is nothing absurd in that. Then he said, "be renewed in the immortal entity of your mind." Renewing the immortal entity is renewing your mind; the spirit of your mind is your immortal entity. Instead of showing absurdity by the examples he gives, my brother really contributes that much to my side of the subject. Did you know, brother, that this is a *Baptist Bible* you are dealing with? Christadelphians were never heard of till long after the Bible was made.

Now God can destroy both soul and body in hell. He says that shows that it is not an immortal soul, for an immortal soul cannot be destroyed. That depends on what you mean by the word destroy. It does not always mean annihilation. It may have that meaning in some places. It has got to be determined by the connection. When Jesus talks about destroying soul and body in hell fire he is not talking about the annihilation of either one of them. They both go to hell fire and they still exist in a condition of death which is spoken of here as destruction. They are cast into it, but neither ceases to exist nor even becomes unconscious when that is done. But then I would like to admit the claim made by the brother. He admits God can destroy both but man cannot do it. That shows there is a difference between body and soul. Man can destroy the body. You can take a pistol and shoot my body; you can take a club and strike my brother on the head, and in one minute he is dead; the doctors pronounce him dead, but you cannot do that with his soul. The reason God can is because God is omnipotent; hence the divine being can accomplish that which is impossible with man. If soul and body were the same thing you could kill both just as easily as you could one. God can kill both. You have got to get them in range of the divine power before you can touch the soul. That passage from the lips of Jesus Christ proves the immortality of the soul.

He doesn't understand how Christ died a two-fold death, or where I find it. I find it in the fact that he died in soul. "He poured out his soul unto death." He died in body; his body expired on the cross. He says I am teaching them to hope in a Saviour that died a two-fold death, and that had in his death infinite merit because he was God. My brother teaches a mere man who died to save himself! I preach a Christ that never sinned, a Christ, therefore, that never died to save himself from sin, a Christ who put himself under the law to redeem them

that were under the law. This is the Christ I preach, a Christ crucified in his body and who poured out his soul unto death.

Now I proceed with my thought on the paradise question. I had called your attention to the fact that the thief was to be with Christ that day in paradise. I then turned and found out where paradise is; I found it where the tree of life is, in the city of God. I turned and found that Paul in his glorious revelation was in paradise. He had a vision, a revelation from God. There was no mere dream about it. He heard unspeakable words. Heard what? Words. What are words? Signs of ideas. What are ideas? Conceptions of conscious minds. Can a man who is unconscious express himself in words? Did Paul hear words? He says he did. Where? In paradise. Where is paradise? Up where the tree of life is in the city of God. What have they there? Words. What kind of words. Unspeakable words which it was not lawful that man should utter, which he could not repeat. I say therefore in heaven, in paradise, they have language there, people talking, and when a man is enwrapped in vision, in a revelation from God, he can hear the words of paradise that would not be lawful to repeat here. I tell you, those of you who have lost friends in this life, who have stood by the side of the open, cheerless grave, lift up the eye of faith, the heart of hope and realize that those who have departed have entered into the paradise of God, and that they, with faithful Abraham and all the good, are now singing the songs and talking in a language that you could not utter. Let me read you some statements:

Conscious beings only can utter words; Paul heard words uttered in paradise. Therefore paradise is a place of conscious beings.

God's throne is in paradise. God's throne is where God is; therefore God is in paradise.

God is in paradise; at death the spirit goes to God; therefore departed spirits are in paradise.

Departed spirits are in paradise; they enter paradise at death and leave it at the resurrection. Therefore in paradise we have conscious spirits from death until the resurrection.

Therefore my brother's proposition from one end of it to the other is untrue. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SEVENTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' First Speech of One Half Hour.*)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I have a few more portions of scripture that I want to present for consideration, and I will do so in my first speech so that my friend will have time to refer to them afterwards. We have talked some time in regard to the question of the soul. My friend has said that he believed in the immortality of the soul, and he thinks he has proved it because we read in Matt. x: 28 of a soul that can be destroyed in the same sense that a body can be destroyed, that is that God can destroy both; but he thinks that because the soul there spoken of cannot be destroyed by man therefore it is an immortal soul. Now I will read a few testimonies that give various

uses of the soul. I will read from my little book called *The Great Salvation*. My friend referred to this once as though it was an offence to read from my little book. I do not see why he should refer to it in this way, for he has been reading from a manuscript book of his own all through the discussion. He has written in his book and copied in scriptures and read them to you here; and in writing this little book I copied off certain portions of scripture. The first is on page 14. Animals are called souls, and the word soul is applied to the life of the beasts. Numb. xxxi: 28—And levy a tribute unto the Lord of the men of war which went out to battle; one *soul* of five hundred, of the *persons*, and of the *beeves*, and of the *asses*, and of the *sheep*. They all have souls. I do not think my friend will presume to say that these are immortal souls. Gen. i: 20—(The very first place where the word *nephesh*, the word rendered soul, occurs) And God said. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath *life* (*nephesh*, soul, see margin), and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. Gen. i: 30—And to every *beast* of the earth, *fowl* of the air, and to *everything that creepeth upon the earth* wherein there is *life* (margin *living soul*) I have given every green herb for meat. Gen. ii: 19—And Adam called (named) every *living creature* (Hebrew *nephesh*, soul). Gen. ix: 10—And I will establish my covenant with every *living creature* (Hebrew *nephesh*, soul), that is with you of *fowl*, of *cattle*, and of *every beast* of the earth with you. See also verses 15. 16. Job xii: 10—In whose hand is the *soul* of every living thing and the breath of all mankind. There you have the soul of every living thing in distinction to the breath of all mankind.

Souls die and are destroyed. Josh. x: 28—And that day Joshua took Makedah, and smote it with the edge of the sword; and the king thereof he *utterly destroyed* them and *all the souls* that were therein. See also verses 30, 32, 35, 37, 39. Judges xv: 16—And it came to pass, when she pressed him daily with her words, and urged him, so that his *soul* was vexed *unto death*. Job vii: 15—So that my *soul* chooseth *strangling* and *death* rather than my life. Psa. xxxiii: 19—To deliver their *souls* from *death* and to keep them alive in famine. Psa. lxxviii: 50—He made a way to his anger; he spared not their *soul* from *death*. Isa. liii: 12—Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his *soul* *unto death*. Ezek. xiii: 19—And will ye pollute me among my people for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread, to *slay the souls* that should not *die*, and to save the *souls* *alive* that should not *live*? Ezek. xviii: 4—Behold, all *souls* are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; and the *soul* that sinneth, it *shall die*. Verse 27—Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his *soul* *alive*. Matt. xxvi: 38—My *soul* is exceeding sorrowful, even *unto death*. Jas. v: 20—Let him know that he converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a *soul* from *death*. Rev. xvi: 3—And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every *living soul* *died* in the sea.

Souls destructible and destroyed. Psa. xxxv: 17—Lord how long wilt thou look on? Rescue my *soul* from their destructions. Psa. lxiii: 9—But those that seek my *soul* to destroy it shall go into the lower parts of the earth. Acts iii: 23—And it shall come to pass, that every *soul* that will not hear that prophet *shall be destroyed* from among the people. In the following testimonies the Hebrew word *nephesh* and the Greek word *psuche*, which are so frequently rendered *soul*, are rendered *life*. Substitute the word *soul* for *life* in the reading of these and it will be

seen that, instead of the soul being indestructible and immortal, it is the opposite. Ex. iv: 19--Go, return unto Egypt; for all the men are dead which sought thy *life*. Matt. ii: 20--For they are dead which sought the young child's *life*. Matt. iii:4--Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day, or to do evil? to save *life*, or to kill (life or soul)? Rev. viii; 9--And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had *life* (soul) died. Rev. xii: 11--And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their *lives* (souls) unto the death.

Souls go to and are delivered from the pit, or the grave. Job xxxiii: 18--He keepeth back his soul from the pit (grave) and his life from perishing by the sword. Also verses 28, 30. Psa. xvi: 10--For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (the grave), neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Psa xxx: 3--O Lord, thou hast brought up my *soul* from the *grave*; thou hast kept *me* alive that I should not go down to the *pit*. The "pit" and the "grave" are here synonymous; also "my soul," and "me" and "I." Psa. xlix: 15--But God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the *grave*; for he shall receive *me*. Psa. lxxxix: 48--What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his *soul* (himself) from the hands of the *grave*? There were souls that could be delivered from death. Isa. xxxviii: 17--Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered it from the *pit of corruption*; * * * for the *grave* cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth. Acts ii: 21 --He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his *soul* was not left in hell (grave), same word as is translated grave in I. Cor. xv: 55.

We gave the definition of the word soul, and now we have shown that it is used for life, for the whole man, for the mind, for an intensity of feeling, but it is all in relation to man as an organized being that lives by virtue of breathing the breath of life that was breathed into his nostrils. We have shown the absurdity of breathing an immortal soul into his nostrils. Our friend tried to give you a little joke, but he didn't say anything to explain his process of breathing one immortal spirit entity into a man's two nostrils. Of course he said--I hardly like to repeat the words--that "it would be a good way to divide the fellow," and that we would have two men. He has a strange way of making a division of one man into two. According to him all you have to do to get two men is to cut one man in two. If this is the case, and if the immortal entity in passing into "the nostrils of the "fellow," as he said, was divided, then man has two immortal entities, which would be too many again.

Now we come to the question: "Fear not them that can kill the body." I am allowing all the way through for the different uses of the word soul, where it is spoken of as creature, of the living man, etc. In this case the Saviour was preparing them for the suffering they would have to pass through, and the thought is that they were not to fear them which could torture them. He was preparing them for the thumb screws that would be put on their thumbs, and the bodily sufferings they would be subjected to. They were not to fear them who could thus torture their bodies, and that was all they could do; they cannot torture your minds if they are fixed upon God and Christ. Many of them did so. While the enemies were torturing their bodies the true Christians fixed their minds on God and on Christ, and they could even smile with joy that they had hope in the thought that they were suffering for Christ. Their minds were centered upon him, and though they tortured the body they could not harrass the

mind, because the man's faith and the resolution of his Christian will would not allow them to disturb his mind or draw it away from being centered on the hope set before him.

"But rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." There are two different words for hell. One is hades, the grave, and the other is Gehenna. Fear him that is able to destroy your entire being where? In Gehenna. Where was that? The place where they burned up the dead bodies and the refuse of the city. When your body and your soul are cast into Gehenna, you are as chaff destroyed. Even the very text he has quoted shows the destructibility of the soul and not the immortality of the soul. There are two words in the Greek here for "kill" and "destroy"--*apokteeno*, meaning to torment and torture, and *apollumi*, meaning to destroy and sometimes to annihilate. The persecutors of the Christians could torment and torture the body with their cruel instruments of torture, but God only can destroy, annihilate the whole being, body and mind in Gehenna, and therefore the exhortation to fear not the former, but the latter, which had to do with their final destiny in the day of judgment.

Our friend has tried to show us that a person can be dead and alive at the same time. How can a person be dead and alive at the same time? Can he be dead and alive *in the same sense* at the same time? Can a man be physically dead and physically alive at the same time? Can a man be legally dead and legally alive at the same time? No, he cannot; but a man can be physically alive and morally dead. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." She is alive physically and dead morally. That is all there is in those words. It is speaking of two kinds of death. A criminal is dead legally the moment sentence of death is pronounced upon him. Therefore you could say of that man, he is dead while he is alive. Take him to the gallows and put him to death, then he is dead physically, but he cannot be alive and dead in the same sense at the same time.

The transfiguration has been referred to to prove that Moses and Elias must have been literally there because they talked. Now my friend has not noticed the Saviour's words, "See that you tell not the *vision*." That was a vision of the kingdom of God. My friend tells us that they are both dead. I thought everybody knew that Elias was alive, that God translated him, that he was taken up in a chariot of fire, and only Moses was dead. The question is was Moses there at that time? If Moses was literally there he must have been raised from the dead. Didn't John hear all the redeemed talking when he was shown things that would be hereafter? He even saw the resurrection of the dead and heard the redeemed sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, and yet in that great company that John heard singing there were hundreds that were not yet born; so you see for him to hear them singing did not prove their actual existence at the time he heard them, for he sees and hears in a vision. So in the mount of transfiguration, they were carried forward to the kingdom of God in vision, and in the vision they heard them talking, but it was no more necessary for Moses and Elias to be actually there to speak, than it was necessary for those to be raised from the dead and be actually there for John to hear them sing the song of the redeemed. We must allow for the vision. They were carried forward to the time when Moses and Elias will be seen and heard actually, but the whole thing was a vision then. They saw and heard on the mount of transfiguration, and John in vision heard the redeemed sing. The time when he will actually hear them sing will be when they, some of them who were not then born, will be born and converted and will

have worked out their salvation. So John says, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day and saw things that shall be hereafter." Neither of these testimonies prove the actual existence of those they saw and heard.

Now I want to call my friend's attention to one remark he made: He said that when Abraham was gathered to his fathers that could not mean that he went down into the grave; it must mean that he was taken where the fathers were, where the fathers were then alive. Where was Abraham taken to when gathered to his fathers? I believe what is meant by the verse is that he was gathered to his fathers in the death state, in sheol. The fathers had died and were buried; therefore when Abraham died he was gathered into the same state. If you will examine the phrase carefully in the various places where it is used you will see that this is the meaning the scriptures give it. But do you remember that Abraham's fathers were idolators? I will give you the text, Joshua xxiv:22, where it says, they worshipped other gods. Now then did these idolators go to heaven? For Abraham to be gathered to his fathers was for his immortal spirit to be taken to heaven, my friend says. Very well, then there were idolators in heaven.

Again, I will call my friend's attention to another passage, because he has had so much to say regarding Abraham being alive. Turn to Isa. lxiii:16, "Doubtless thou art our father though Abraham be ignorant of us." Why was Abraham ignorant of them? Because Abraham died before they, as a nation, came into existence. If Abraham had been then alive how could he be ignorant of the fact that his descendants had become a nation?

Now about this question of paradise and whether Paul was in the body or out of the body. My friend had very much to say about this. Let us first fully notice what Paul says: "It is not expedient doubtless for me to glory; I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth)." My friend says, Why Paul, you are the worst informed Christadelphian I ever heard of! Don't you know a man cannot get out of his body. My friend there blindly hoped to make a point. He failed to see that if Paul, fourteen years before this time, had been literally out of his body then Paul literally died fourteen years before, and yet did not know he had died. I will ask my friend, according to your theory how does a man get out of his body? Your theory is this: an inside man literally gets out of his outside man when death takes place; according to that, if Paul got out of his body in doing that Paul must have died fourteen years before. Why Paul, what is the matter with you? Don't you know whether you died fourteen years ago or not? Do you think it is possible for you to have died fourteen years ago and not to have known it? Of course, Paul, if you had died you would have known it! You are the worst informed Baptist I ever heard of, the idea that you should tell of the possibility of having been literally out of your body fourteen years ago and not knowing it! Our friend, Mr. Hall, will tell you better than that, that if you get out of your body you are dead. You see this way of talking is a sword that has two edges. But all this will not settle the question. We must be reasonable; we must come down to the question and look it right in its face. I do not know that I shall have time to follow up my friend's argument here now. We will try. What is the apostle talking about? There were those in Corinth who were finding fault with Paul. They had called

him a fool, as you will see in the sixteenth verse of the previous chapter, and they had charged him, an apostle, with being beside himself. When you say a man is out of his head what do you mean? or that he is beside himself? Can a man literally get out of himself and stand beside himself? We use these phrases with a perfect understanding that our meaning is that a man is not in his right mind. These men had charged Paul with being beside himself, out of himself. You remember that it is said of the prodigal son that "he came to himself"; had he gone away from himself? Had the inside man taken a journey without the outside man? What does it mean? It means when he had recovered himself, and came to think reasonably.

My friend says, there is a house over there, and a man is in the house and the window is cracked, he cannot see plainly through the glass, but if you break the glass he can see better. In this he tried to make an argument in reply to my illustration on the surgeon's table. But remember when a man lies on a surgeon's table absolutely unconscious, he cannot even see dimly, though his eyes, or windows, are there all the same and not cracked; he is not like the man in the house, for he is absolutely unconscious and cannot see at all. My friend says all you have to do is to break out the entire window or knock out the man's eyes and the man can see perfectly. According to this when Paul got out of his body all the windows were knocked out of his house and yet Paul did not know it. But all this does not settle the question. You have called me a fool, you in Corinth, the apostle is saying; very well! have it so if you like. I will pass for a fool. I will throw myself in the third person; I will talk about a man I knew fourteen years ago. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SEVENTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's First Half-hour Speech.*)

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I trust in coming together this morning we still have a feeling of profound gratitude to God that he has manifested towards us such kindly care and preserved our lives and given us an opportunity to continue our honest and earnest investigation of his word of truth. I shall follow where my brother leads; he is in the affirmative.

My brother seems to think I complained because he read from his little book. I was not conscious of making any complaint; I simply mentioned the fact that the brother was giving us what had already been prepared, indicating that for many, many years he had gone over this subject; he had written on it and had it in print, and had nothing to do but to present what he had already said. A discussion of this subject is to me comparatively new. He complains that I read out of a little book. That is correct. You will discover that this little book is filled with clippings from the Bible. I simply took a Bible and cut all the parts out for convenient reference and pasted them in this little book. That is all. It is Bible I am reading, straight out from one end to the other, simply pasted for the sake of convenient reference.

The brother spent a long time this morning in the discussion of the soul. He tells us it is a translation of the Hebrew word *nephesh* in the Old Testament;

that it applies to fishes and beasts and birds and so on. In all that he is correct. Every particle he read from the Scriptures is right. The word occurs 754 times, and is rendered soul in the neighborhood of 400 times in the Old Testament; it frequently refers to the bodies of men, frequently refers to beasts and frequently to fishes. How are we going to determine when it refers to material and when to immaterial things? How are we going to determine the meaning of the word? The brother gave us the correct way yesterday; you have got to determine by the context. If you will examine every single passage the context will show that not in a single instance could there have been a reference to the inner entity in every instance where there was a reference to the animals or to man's body. Understanding that we can understand how the soul can be destroyed, that it can go into the grave. What is all this argument for? The testimony in Matt. x: 28 is "fear not him that can kill the body but cannot kill the soul." There is the use of the word soul in reference to something that cannot be killed by man, and that therefore cannot go into the grave. There is the use of the word soul in contradistinction to the word body, and the brother says we just determine the meaning of the word by the context. The brother says that the Saviour's idea was this: Fear not them that are able to torture your body, but cannot torture your mind. Will you say that the word rendered kill in this place should be rendered torture?

Mr. Williams—I will say that that is a translation of the word, and one of the meanings given by authorities.

I am glad of it. I will grant you it sometimes refers to torture. You have got to determine by the context what its particular meaning is. My brother says, Fear not him that is able to torture the body. It is a very peculiar condition of mind in which man may be tortured in his body and the mind not have any interest in it. Paul never reached that condition, and yet Paul was one of the most intense and earnest of believers. Didn't he prove to us that Paul was awfully tortured on account of people calling him a fool. How his mind was tortured! How he defended himself! Wasn't that a torture of his mind? Yet Paul was a believing man. Paul had torture of body and soul when they laid stripes upon him and stoned him. Yet here is this statement that you can torture the body but you cannot torture the soul, if that word kill means torture. This proves that another interpretation of the brother is a mistake.

About that breathing of the spirit into a man's nostrils indicating a division. I never said the spirit was two men entering in; I said that division illustrated the two men.

Then the brother said, Can a man be dead and alive at the same time in the same sense? Certainly not; there is none of us claiming that. He has got to prove by his proposition that all there is of a man is dead; I prove to you that one part of a man may die and another part be alive; a man alive physically and dead morally; that moral quality has reference to the inner man while the outer man may be alive. By and by this outer man may be dead; can the inner man be then alive? And I proved to you that it could. A man may be dead in a moral sense here and alive physically and in the next life he may be dead in a physical sense, and alive spiritually. You have got to consider man in man's two fold nature; in the one he may be dead and in the other alive.

Again; Moses and Elias. He said Elias was translated. He thought that I said he died; well so far as this world is concerned he is dead. As a matter of

fact his passage out of the world was by translation. In the days of Jesus Christ they both came back. My brother says this was a vision, but does a vision always mean a dream? A vision may sometimes be an actual occurrence. Pet. i: 16 says they were eye witnesses of his majesty, and he refers to the transfiguration. It was not a vision in the sense of a dream but of an actual sight. The vision John had referred to things that should be hereafter, but these apostles were permitted to see in a vision Moses and Elias, and right in this connection they heard these two visitors talking to Jesus about his death, his decease which he would accomplish at Jerusalem; they talked about things that were going to happen in a few days or a few months afterwards; these men heard them talking about it.

Then the brother tried to show that Abraham's being gathered to his fathers was his being gathered into the death state. Correct; Abraham was gathered into the death state and in the death state he found his fathers. He said Abraham's fathers were idolators, and that would make idolators be with God. Both are in the death state. Every spirit returns to God; every sinner has to report to God. They are assigned to the proper place in the death state. We are going to see something further about that directly, however.

Now about Paul being out of his body, he says I have got to have Paul actually dead. No sir, Paul didn't have to be actually dead. If Paul had been actually dead, Paul would have known it. Yet Paul had a vision of things which were beyond this state and he did not know whether he was actually in the body or out of the body. He said he didn't know; but he knew one thing; he was persuaded that God had made a revelation to him. The exceeding glory of the occasion was transcendent of earthly knowledge. He did not know; he forgot what belongs here; he did not want to be called on to testify as to whether he was in the body or out of the body. He got a glimpse of paradise; he saw it. The brother said it was a revelation of what is to be. That is a mere assumption on his part. We will wait till he proves it.

The brother has affirmed: "All that constitutes man will be totally unconscious from death until the resurrection." He has not quoted a solitary passage of scripture that proves it, or that even intimates it. I have quoted a number of passages that show that there is consciousness on the part of the inner entity. I quote from Luke xvi: 31, what is called the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. There was a certain rich man clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day. He was in this world, and he lived like other rich men. And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus who lay at his gate full of sores. He lived in this world just like other poor beggars do. And it came to pass that the beggar died—just as you will die, just as I am to die. My brother presumes in his proposition that the whole man died. The body died, that is granted, but did their spirits die? Did the inner man die? It is said that the rich man died and was buried, and in hell—that word is translated from *hades*, the death state—in the death state that rich man opened his eyes and saw Abraham afar off and cried to him and said, Father Abraham, have mercy upon me, and send Lazarus—there is Lazarus also, in the death state—and they are in reach of communication with each other—and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. Abraham cannot comply with this request; then the rich man said, Send him back that he may warn my brothers. I say here is an exposition of the fact by the Lord

Jesus that there is life for the spirit in the death state. I have not time to develop that thought further. This is the only speech in which I can advance any new evidence.

I turn to Phil. i: 21-25, "For me to live is Christ and to die is gain . . . yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; which is far better . . ." This is what Paul says. I am in a condition of trouble. I am in a strait; I have to choose whether to die or to remain and work for Christ. I am here in prison and possibly will be condemned to death if I do not take proper means to defend myself, and I am in a strait what I shall do about it. If I live it will be for your good; if I die it will be for my gain. If I go I will go to Christ; my body will be crucified and it will go to the ground and I will be with Christ. Where is Christ? Stephen saw him seated at the right hand of God. He is over in the next world. He has no communication with us now; physically we are cut off from him. If I depart I will be with him. There is a man looking in the face of death and contemplating the possibility of dying and being with Christ on the other side.

II. Pet. i: 13. "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle"—referring to his body—"to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle even as the Lord Jesus has showed me." . . . "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables"—now notice, the apostle Peter is going to draw some conclusion in view of death from the revelation he saw when Moses and Elias came and talked with Christ. He is going to get consolation out of it. "But we were eye witnesses of his majesty; for he received from the Father honor and glory, when there came to him such a voice from the excellent glory, saying, This is my son in whom I am well pleased." We have also a more sure word of prophecy. Note: We have had an assurance in prophecy of life for the dead; we have all of God's promises; now we have had a conclusive *demonstration* of it: a light has shone in a dark place; we never understood it, never clearly recognized it; we believed about it, and our faith was strong in God's word; now we have seen a demonstration of it. Peter and the other disciples saw men in the death state who came back, who were *alive* and in *actual* existence.

II. Cor. v: 1-8, "For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed, we shall not be found naked." Paul's idea is. I do not merely want to die to get out of the body, and be done with the troubles of this life; I am not going to commit suicide, I want this mortal condition that brings me this torture of mind and body laid aside, and I want to be, not naked, but clothed with the other life, that mortality might be swallowed up of life . . . "Therefore, we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." Absence and presence are conditions of consciousness. You cannot tell if you are absent from any place today unless you are conscious. Paul says that we want to die and lay down this tabernacle and be swallowed up of life, absent from the body and present with the Lord. That shows that Paul knew that when this body died then his presence with the Lord would be a fact.

Rev. vi: 9-11—"And when he had opened the sixth seal I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony they

held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood in them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them." Here is a vision. Look at it! There are people dead; he said they had been slain, but their souls were not slain, because Jesus said, Fear not him that can kill the body, but is not able to kill the soul. Their souls had not been killed. Now where were they? Under the altar. What altar? "I saw the Lord stand on the altar, and he said smite . . ." That is the millennial dawning; that is the time the Lord is coming to take vengeance, and these saints were under that altar, and God answered their prayer for vengeance when the time for vengeance came. Now the souls of these people who had been slain were right before God's throne where God himself is standing. They were under the altar; their bodies were dead and their spirits, souls, were talking. We want to know how long before you avenge our blood? God replied to them, You have got to be patient for a little while; put the white robes on you and rest till your brethren are killed like you. The resurrection has not come, and their bodies are slain, sleeping in the dust of the ground, and here are their souls, there on the other side of death, between death and the time of the resurrection. This then covers the very period of the time of my brother's proposition. Listen to what the proposition says: "All that constitutes man will be totally unconscious from the time of death until the resurrection." And here John saw these souls after they were dead and before they were raised from the dead: here is a passage that comes right in between my brother's proposition and knocks it into smithereens.

Let us notice further. The declaration of God's word is we have eternal life. That is promised to believers. I want to call attention to some passages briefly on that line. John iii: 14-16, "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life." There eternal life is promised the believer. It begins in this life the moment he believes. He puts himself in the position to get that promise the hour he becomes a believer. Eternal life has no cessation in it. It is put in his hand at once, and has the assurance of God, like the souls under the altar, who rest and are robed in white.

Further than that; John vi: 54, "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," *hath*, "and I will raise him up." Notice, will you, he *hath* eternal life. Is there going to be a death about it? Yes; the body has got to die and resurrection is coming to the body, but notwithstanding the dying body he has eternal life; it belongs to that spirit made in the likeness of God. Let me submit, if there is a period of time from the death of man till the resurrection, then perishing is the result for that length of time. The man has gone out like the light of the candle and would not have any existence anywhere. If all that constitutes man dies at death, then man perishes. The body perishes, the breath perishes, the soul perishes, and that statement of Jesus Christ never could be true.

John xvii: 2, 3, "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." What is eternal life? To know God. Do they know him now? Christ has revealed him to you, and you know him. This is life eternal and it never perishes.

I. John v: 10-13, "He that hath the Son *hath* life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life." If he believes in Jesus Christ he has the witness in himself; he knows it. He that believeth not God hath made him a liar. And this is the

record that God hath given us eternal life and that life is in his Son. Our life is in Christ and Christ is in us. We have him as a present possession, because he is formed in you the hope of glory; because you have the witness in yourself, you have got the life that shall never die; when he comes by and by the body shall perish, but when Christ, who is our life, shall appear; then shall we also appear with him in glory. We shall stand by his side. we shall hear his voice in the resurrection and spirit and body shall glorify God together. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION--SEVENTH SESSION.

Mr. Williams' second half hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.)

MR. WILLIAMS QUESTIONS MR. HALL.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I want to ask my friend a few questions:

Mr. Williams: Question—You remember yesterday you called my attention to the Hebrew word rendered “thoughts” in Psa. cxlvi. Do you remember what that word was? It was *eshtonoth* was it not?

Mr. Hall: Answer—Yes sir.

You called my attention to the fact that the word there was *eshtonoth*, then you referred to Job xvii., where he says, “My purposes are broken off.” Did you not say or imply that the word used for purposes in Job was the same word translated thoughts in the other text in Psa.?—No sir.

If you knew the words were different, why did you bring the two passages together?—My question was, Is this the same thought as in Psalms.

You knew at the time that there were two different words; then didn't it follow that Job's use of the word for purposes would have a different meaning from the other?—Probably may.

Are you aware of the fact that the word *eshtonoth* does not occur anywhere else? Why was it, according to the Psalmist, that the thoughts perished? Wasn't it because the breath had gone forth?—Yes sir.

Then it was because a man's breath had gone forth, and he returned to his dust that his thoughts and purposes perished; that is what I have been claiming?—He cannot carry out any purposes; he is unconscious so far as this life is concerned.

Does the Psalmist say that?—It is implied.

Are you aware of what Job says right after the verse you quoted, “If I wait, the grave is my house, I have made my bed in darkness?”—Yes.

Do you believe that?—Yes sir.

Very well; that is good! I want to ask further in relation to the thief on the cross: The Saviour said, “Verily I say unto thee to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise. Do you understand that that very day the thief was with Christ in heaven?—Yes sir.

Three days after this he said, “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father?—He had not gone after his resurrection.

Does he say to the thief, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise, and three

days after, Touch me not for I am not yet ascended to my Father?—Let me explain: Christ has a dual nature; his body went to the grave, his spirit went to paradise; therefore he could say that the thief would be with him in paradise because his spirit represented him.

The "me" is his spirit?—Yes sir. After his resurrection he had ascended in a glorified form; therefore he could say to the women, I have not ascended, and just a little while after he could say, Handle me, Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side.

Didn't you tell me the "me" was his spirit, and didn't he say I am not yet ascended?—That is right.

And didn't the same person, the "me" who you say was to be in paradise that day say, three days later, I have not yet ascended?—I have explained it; I am willing to leave it that way.

About the man in the house looking out through the window, did you compare that man to the man on the surgeon's table?—You can make the comparison if you like.

Can the man on the table see dimly?—Nearly every man has some degree of consciousness.

Does he know when the dentist extracts his teeth? or when the surgeon is cutting off a limb?—Still he has a knowledge of other things.

You have a man in a house looking dimly through a window; you think that is the state we are in now?—Yes sir.

Does that house in your illustration tumble down because the man leaves it?—In the illustration it would not be so.

When your inner man goes out of the house, the house tumbles down and goes to pieces, and in your house over there you go out and the house stands?—The illustration is not the house.

Now do you think that Paul could really mean that fourteen years before he might have literally gone out of his body?—Paul said he did not know it.

If Paul had left his body, would he not have died to bring about that?—There may be a possibility of the spirit being separated from the body.

It does not say a word about such a possibility?—It does; I am standing where Paul did and looking at it from his standpoint.

Supposing I asked you to give me a text in the Bible to prove the immortality of the soul, what would you give me?—Several.

Give me one?—I like I. Pet. iii: 4.

I want one where the word soul is used?—Matt. x: 28.

Is that the best you can give me?—No, I do not know that it is the best; it is one.

You said that Elias was translated, and that he was dead so far as this life was concerned?—He passed through the same process as death and resurrection.

Then did he die?—No.

Death is not translation?—No sir.

You referred to John who saw in vision the resurrection; John heard words, heard them sing, "Thou hast redeemed us out of every nation and kindred and people." There were the redeemed singing the song of Moses and the Lamb; Did he hear those words in reality?—Yes; I think so.

Then the fact that he heard words in vision did not prove that the speakers were in a conscious state at that time?—Not at that time.

Then does the fact that Peter and John heard Moses and Elias talking prove that they must necessarily have been there actually and consciously?—Yes. because the words they heard related to matters concerning Jesus Christ which were to occur just afterwards.

Does it matter what the words were as to whether there was consciousness?—Of course.

Does the Saviour call it a vision?—The apostle says they were eye witnesses.

Not actual eye witnesses of Moses and Elias?—Well, eye witnesses of things that occurred on the holy mount.

Were they eye witnesses of Christ actually in the immortal state?—I think so.

Then he was actually in the immortal state?—I think so. He represents himself in that way.

So really and actually he was in his glorified state?—That is wholly immaterial.

It is not immaterial, because it has to do with the difference between a vision and a reality. He was made to appear to them in that state; inasmuch as he was not really immortal, he was only made to appear as he was to be; so then the appearance of Moses and Elias was a vision; Moses and Elias could not be there personally?—You are trying to get me to say Christ was not really immortal.

Then he was not really glorified; I will, however, refer to Rev. v: 10?—I will have to have a few revelations on it before I could accept it.

I will quote revelation then: You said a little while ago that he that hath the Son hath life; that when a man is converted he comes into possession of eternal life; then a man does not come into possession of the power to live forever until he is converted?—He has that in his immortal nature.

Then if he has the power to live forever before he is converted, which you say every wicked man has, he does not need eternal life as a gift?—The difference is eternal life shall be one of endless happiness.

Does it say that? Do you say eternal life is in the Christian as soon as he is converted, actually in him?—Yes sir.

Very well. When Paul is writing to Christians, you remember he says, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God;" do you believe that?—I do.

Then he adds, "When he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory?—That is the first time we are going to appear in glory with him.

Then eternal life is not *in us* until he appears?—Yes. we have Christ and the life also.

"He that denyeth the record that God gave of his Son maketh God a liar. and this is the record that God hath given us eternal life, and this life *is in his Son*. This is a serious matter; we do not want to make God a liar. Where is that life?—In his Son.

That is right?—We have it in him. and he is in us now. [*Time called*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SEVENTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Williams' Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Now we will call attention to where I left off in regard to Paul being in the body or out of the body. I think we shall be able to give you what the apostle says and means in clear language. I was showing you, when the time was called, that the apostle and those with him had been called fools, and it was said that they were beside themselves and I had illustrated the use of the phrases, "a man is beside himself," "a man is out of his head," another way for saying that a man is insane or foolish. Again I had referred to the case of the prodigal son, where it is said he came to himself. Here are phrases that are used, and yet' at the same time we never dream of saying that because a man is beside himself, he is out of himself, and stands beside himself literally. Very well, Paul says, *have it your own way*; I will say for the sake of argument I do not know whether I was beside myself or not; whether I was a fool or not. Of course Paul is speaking ironically, throwing it back in their teeth. He virtually says, I throw myself into the third person and I speak of a man I knew fourteen years ago; such an one caught up to paradise. What is the point? I leave it to you whether *God would take a man*, giving him a view of paradise, if he were a fool or beside himself. His argument was made ironically; he says, I will not even boast of myself; I will boast of a man I knew. You see his modesty and his tact. Now, what was the vision Paul saw? for it is a vision here too. One translation is, "I was caught *away* to paradise." My friend would have you believe Paul might have been taken to heaven bodiless, and if he left his body he must have died in order to leave his body and go to heaven, and if he died, then he confessed he didn't know it. It would be strange for a man to die and go to heaven and not know it! or even to suppose the possibility of his dying and not knowing it.

Now, what is paradise? We can find out what paradise was by going back to the garden of Eden. The Septuagint rendering is, "The Lord God planted a paradise eastward in Eden." Christ is going to restore the lost paradise. The paradise lost was on the earth, and the earth is now cursed; Christ's mission is to remove the curse from the earth. So Jehovah says, "As truly as I live the whole earth shall be filled with my glory." That is what the gospel makes known to us. Paradise shall be restored when the kingdom of God is set up in the earth. It is the mission of Christ to restore the earth to its paradise state from which it fell by the first Adam. Now Paul is caught away to paradise in vision. Let us see now what paradise this was: turn to II. Pet. iii: "The heavens were of old, standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." There was one world consisting of heavens and an earth, and it perished. "But the heavens and the earth which are now are kept in store," and these "shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." Here is the second heaven. Here is the same kind of heaven the king of Babylon fell from, and this shall pass away. We have the first heavens and earth which were then—before the flood, then the heavens and earth which are now, the *Mosaic* heavens and earth, the Gentile heavens and earth, and these shall pass away; then we have the third heavens; and what shall dwell in them? Righteousness; and that is

the heaven to which Paul was caught forward in vision and saw glorious things, John saw this new heaven and earth filled with the glory of God, and this is the kingdom of God.

Our friend referred us to the book of Revelation, and he told us that wherever we find the tree of life and the city of God there we find paradise. He read from chapter xxii. To get the context we go back to chapter xxi, where the city is described. He says, "And I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it . . . And the *nations of them which are saved* shall walk in the light of it." There are nations there, you see. "And the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it." It seems that this city is on the earth. Then again: "And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there be no night there; and they shall bring the glory and the honor of the *nations* into it." Not that the nations are to go to heaven, are they? Here is the millennial reign which my friend had admitted is to take place. Of course this magnificent city is possessed by the saints of the Most High. Christ is there and they constitute the new heaven, the kingdom of righteousness. The governments of the world and all the nations of the earth shall come up to this city when the law shall go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and there shall be peace on earth and good will among men. Paradise will be here, the glorious city of God, the New Jerusalem, that Jerusalem which is spoken of as coming down from God out of heaven. Thus it will be of heavenly origin, but here on the earth, and in it the tree of life shall be. This is in the third heaven. Here he heard them singing that song, "He hath made us unto our God kings and priests and we shall reign on the earth." Then he adds, "And he showed me a pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb, and in the midst of it and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life . . . and the leaves of the tree were for the *healing of the nations*." Are there nations in heaven that need healing? No, but when Christ establishes his kingdom and paradise is restored, the nations will be here and they will need healing. Then the nations will come up to the city and bring their honor into it, and shall be glad and sing for joy. Now paradise lost is to be restored, and the third heaven is to be the kingdom of God. Peter says, "We look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Christ says he is like a nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return, and when he returns he will bring the title to his kingdom and paradise shall be restored, and he will establish his kingdom under the whole heaven, and he shall be the tree of life, Christ himself, in the midst of the paradise, and he will heal all the nations of the earth and reign until he puts all enemies under his feet and then God shall be all and in all.

Now why does the apostle call it the third heaven? There must be a reason for it. The reason is given by the apostle Peter: he gives heaven number one, and he says those heavens were overflowed with water and perished. No water has overflowed the heaven where God dwells; since then we have the Jewish heaven and earth which are now, and the Gentile heaven and they continue until the stone shall smite the image on the feet; then the third heaven, the new heaven, comes and in this dwells righteousness. This heaven Paul was permitted to see in vision. That is paradise and the tree of life will be there. When we look into the matter in this light we clear away all the mists and my friend's ghosts and hobgoblins are gone.

Now what have I proved to you? I have shown first that man is of the earth, earthy, that the Lord God formed him out of the dust of the ground, and made man alive by breathing into him the breath or spirit of life; that made him a living being and so long as he can appropriate to himself the breath of life the functions of the body continue. We have shown that when he dies his breath goeth forth, he returns to his earth and in that very day his thoughts perish. So the wise man says that when that takes place, the dead know not anything. We are told, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." Why? "Because there is no work nor device nor wisdom nor knowledge in the grave whither thou goest." Now the apostle shows us the importance of the resurrection. My friend saw fit to disparage this doctrine and to call it a gospel of dirt. We have shown a glorious hope of a resurrection from the dead. All the worthy and unworthy must remain in the dust of death until the time comes that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," and then every man shall be judged according as his works shall be. Man does not get his reward when he dies, but when Christ comes. This is true of all the ancient worthy ones that died in faith not having received the promise. Here is the beautiful plan of God. He holds in abeyance the destiny of all men. They sleep in the dust of death until all come before him in the day he has appointed for judgment. Christ tells us when he takes his departure to occupy till he comes. Life is the time to serve the Lord. In death there is no knowledge nor device nor wisdom. I have called attention to the 38th chapter of Isaiah where a message came to a good man that he must die, in answer to his prayer God added fifteen years to his life, and he said, "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption. For the grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee." My friend comes to show you that you could praise him better when you are dead than when you are alive. But in death you cannot praise him, for the dead know not anything. All that constitutes man, therefore, in the death state is unconscious. [*Time called.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION—SEVENTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's second half-hour for either a speech or fifteen minutes to question and fifteen minutes speech.*)

MR. HALL QUESTIONS MR. WILLIAMS.

Now let us have a little more experience in your kindergarten work:

Mr. Hall: Question—Was man made in the image of God?

Mr. Williams: Answer—Yes in a sense.

In what sense?—There were beings that appeared to Abraham and they were called "Gods;" they were in the form of men and Abraham took them for men.

Were they Gods?—They were called Gods.

Could we make an image of God?—Man is an image of God, the Elohim.

Paul says, "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man?"—We cannot in reality make an image of God.

In what sense can we?—So far as the form of the Elohim is concerned, but not so far as Deity's personality is concerned.

It is God's personality we are talking about; not God's nature, his personality is spirit?—He is spirit.

That is the reason we could not make an image of the invisible God. Has man a mortal body?—Man is a mortal body.

Is this mortal body an image of God's personality?—I do not know the image of Diety's personality.

You just said that no man could make an image of God's personality?—I never said that man was like God's personality, meaning Deity.

Has man a spirit?—Man has a spirit and so has the beast.

Is man's spirit like God's spirit?—I do not know that you could make such a comparison.

Both are spirit?—God is spirit in focalization, yet God's spirit is everywhere in diffusion; this is different from God in focalization.

Is he spirit in focalization?—Yes.

Can anybody make an image of man in his physical form?—I have answered that.

Does the word *neshama* mean soul?—It may sometimes, where the word soul is used in the sense of life. I could soon tell you if you give the text.

How many times does this word *neshama* occur?—I do not know.

Does it represent soul or breath?—It represents life.

How many times does it occur in the Bible?—Not more than four or five times if my memory serves me.

It occurs twenty times; do you know the full definition of the word?—In one sense it means breath.

Here is the definition I give; inspiration, breath, soul. Does that word ever occur in connection with anything but man?—I think not.

Please make a note of that?—By the way, I think it occurs in the verse I quoted you, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life," man and beast.

It refers to man as you will see; you are mistaken, my brother?—Let us see (Mr. Williams turns to see). Gen. vii: 15. I will correct myself; it is *ruach* of life here.

There; there, that is enough! Now what was the penalty man was to suffer the identical day he sinned?—Dying thou shalt die.

Did he die that day?—He became a dying man.

Does the Inspiration say, Thou shalt become a dying man?—He commenced to become a dying man as soon as he sinned.

You then say he did not die that day?—I say that from that day he became a dying man.

He continued to renew his life; however; and lived nine hundred years?—He continued to live as a man of sorrow.

Do you believe *sheol* means a single grave?—*Sheol*, as used in this case, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave," would mean more than one grave; commonly *sheol* means the death state.

If there are any spirits in conscious existence after death we would expect them to be in *sheol*?—I understood you to believe that the spirit went to God.

Do you believe everybody in *sheol* or *hades* is unconscious?—Where you speak of it literally; sometimes it is spoken of symbolically or figuratively.

You do not believe anybody could speak from *sheol*? In Isa. xxxii: 2 it is said, "The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of

hell." This is said of Pharoah, king of Egypt?—Not Pharoah at all; it is recorded of the king of Babylon in Isa. xiv.

That is another passage, brother, and another chapter?—You referred to sheol in Isaiah before.

This is Isaiah xxii: 31.

Does the midst of sheol mean the state of death?—Yes.

You say they do not speak from hades or sheol; yet the rich man is represented as talking in hades?—Hades there parabolically represented the condition of the Jews.

They are represented as talking in that death state?—The Jews believed that as you do, and the Saviour used their theory as an illustration.

You believe this is not a fact?—I believe it is a parable; he represented the two tribes by one man and the ten tribes by five men.

In the illustration of the rich man and Lazarus Abraham is represented as being alive?—In the illustration; as a matter of fact Paul says, "All these died in faith."

Then you think the Saviour took the illustration from the tradition of the Jews?—Yes.

Would he have done this if that theory was false?—He would have done as he said he would do, spoken all things in parables to them "seeing they might see and not perceive."

You do think he selected a common error for the purpose of illustrating a great truth, and did not undertake to say one word to correct that error?—He said, "I came not to call the righteous;" I make known my parables to my disciples but not to them, lest they should see, and hear and understand and be converted.

Did Jesus ever say a word during his life against this common idea?—Against which common idea.

This idea of the death state?—His whole life and teaching was a protest against the theory; he taught that men would perish if they did not believe in him.

You say the idea of their perishing was a protest against the theory; then a man who believes will not perish?—He will not perish because he will have a resurrection from death to life.

A man who does believe will have an existence in death. Did any apostle ever say a single word against this idea?—Yes; the apostle Paul did: "If there were no resurrection of the dead all who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished."

You assume; then this has already been discussed?—Paul says that Epaphroditus was sick and nigh unto death, but God's mercy saved him from dying, and that surely was not saving him from going to heaven.

You think that is an argument against the spirit's existence in death?—I think it is an argument against its conscious existence.

Did you ever write a book on this subject?—Certainly.

Did you ever write a book in which you did not speak of the condition of the dead?—Yes; I have written one on trine immersion and feet washing.

Whenever you have mentioned it, it has been distinctly against the conscious condition of the dead?—Certainly.

Did Christ or the apostles ever write a solitary sentence against it?—All their writings were against it; even the case of the souls under the altar, because their souls had blood and your souls have not.

Do you find in all the history of the past any protest against this doctrine?—The history of the past is full of a protest against it: Take Justin Martyr; I will take Luther, if you like. He said the doctrine of the immortality of the soul came from the Roman dunghill of decretals. Tyndall also said about the same thing. [*Time called.*]

(*Mr. Hall's Second Speech of Fifteen Minutes.*)

I wish to emphasize the fact that there is not one solitary word from the lips of the Saviour, nor in any of the apostles' writings that specifically mentions the doctrine of the condition of the dead being in an unconscious state, in which they uttered one single word to show it. He admits that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was selected by the Saviour because it was a common belief of the Jews and Greeks as well; yet Jesus selected it for the purpose of an illustration, and there is not the slightest protest against it from the introduction of Jesus Christ till toward the middle of the Christian dispensation, and he makes but an indifferent statement concerning it, and he is the only one in the history of this world for more than five hundred years that says one solitary word against it. Neither in Bible history, nor literature, nor theology is there a word to be found opposing the idea of the conscious existence of spirits after death until toward the middle of our Christian era.

Now, reviewing some of the points he gave us. He thinks the reason Paul told of the vision of paradise was because certain people called him a fool, and he wanted to prove that he wasn't; let us see how he tried to prove it to them that he wasn't a fool. "Fourteen years ago I had an experience; I saw things pertaining to the life beyond. I do not know whether I was in the body or out of the body." I do not know whether that would establish the fact that he was not a fool from the fact that he did not know whether he was dead fourteen years before that time! They would say. Isn't that just what we told you? That is a magnificent reason for the position the brother takes. Whatever the reason, I want to call attention to the fact that Paul had a vision, that he was caught away into the third heaven, that he heard people speak in a language it was not lawful for him to utter; he is not allowed to utter it here amongst men. My brother said paradise is not in heaven; Paul said it was in the third heaven. The declaration of John is that the tree of life is in paradise. My brother says that cannot be, because the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations. It don't say the healing is to be done in heaven. There is going to be a time when heaven itself is coming to earth. My brother's argument is simply an intimation that he don't believe the thing Paul is talking about. The God of heaven is but the God of a certain cosmos he thinks. We have the Noahic heaven, the world up to the time of Noah—the world that then was; then we have got another heaven that now is. This is his idea. I want to just admit for the sake of the argument that Paul lived in the heaven he names. There is the first heaven that preceded the days of the flood; that is the first order of things, the *cosmos* that then existed; then the *cosmos* that followed embodied all things from the time of Noah until the time of the coming of Christ, including the Mosaic dispensation. That would be the second heaven. Then from the introduction of Christ to the present would be the third heaven, and Paul lived in this third heaven and had this vision in this third heaven, and while in this third heaven he caught this view of paradise, and realized what is an actual matter of fact on the other side

of the river of death. Now, the brother, I think, spent all of his fifteen minutes on those two or three points.

I want to present before you a review of some of the things I have said by which you will determine the character of the brother's proposition. He affirms that all that constitutes man is totally unconscious from the time of death until the resurrection. He turned to, the figurative, hypothetical expressions of the Old Testament which speak of those that die going down in the body, falling asleep, and not knowing anything. I have followed him in this, every single one of these, specifically and separately; I haven't overlooked a single passage the brother referred to, and I showed you that every one of these inspired writers spoke of the body that went down into the dust. We believe the body dies and becomes unconscious in death. But in opposition to that idea the brother ought to have told us what it takes to constitute a man. A man in the New Testament sense has two beings in him. While the outward man perishes day by day the inward man is renewed; and these two have distinctive destinies, one dying the other getting stronger and stronger, and when the time comes for the man to die his body goes down in the dust, but does this inner man, his spirit go to dust? Again and again I challenged him to show that the spirit dies and he has not given a solitary passage. I find then that this spirit that is in man at the time a man dies returns to God who gave it. The body goes to dust, but the spirit doesn't. I find that in the creation God formed his body out of dust; I find also in Zech. xii. 1 that God formed a spirit in man. When he talked about creating the body he said "formed," when he talked about creating the spirit he said "formed." He breathed that spirit into the body. Wherever there is a human body there is a spirit; when the body dies it goes to dust, the spirit doesn't. I thus showed you in this creation of man there is a two-fold nature. Then I showed you further that in the nature of man something was made in God's image. I showed you it could not be the physical being. The Bible says you could make an image of man out of rock or brass or gold, but you cannot make an image of God. More than this, it is atheism to try it, it is an outrage to God to undertake it. There is no possibility of there being an image of God in the dust body, yet some part of man was made in God's image. The very constitution of man requires another part beside the body. The body could not be made in God's image. You cannot make the form of God out of material; nobody ever saw it; this body could not be that which is in God's image. Hence it must have been the spirit; I could call it man. There is an image then of God in the inner man. By and by man lost the image. I showed you that the image is restored again. Man that is born of the spirit is spirit. The conversion is in the spirit, and the image is restored; "In the image of Him that created him," said Paul. So then man in God's image is spirit; this spirit that is renewed becomes the inner man, the new man, the hidden man of the heart. Then we turned to Peter and I proved that the inner man is incorruptible. That same word is translated immortal and applies to God. When it is applied to the resurrection of our body it is called immortal; here it is applied to the spirit. Here then is an immortal spirit, an immortal entity; it is in God's image. When it lost that image it did not lose its identity; the spirit was not lost; thus the moment it is restored it becomes incorruptible; its immortality makes it absolutely incorruptible. Further than that, I proved by a line of argument that the word mortal is never applied to the spirit; that while the spirit of man is never said to be immortal.

In the next place I called attention to Moses and Elias. I showed you that they came back into the world and talked and that the beloved disciples heard them and saw Christ when he had taken on the glorified form. They heard Moses and Elias who had already gone out of the world hundreds of years before; they came back and made a visit to the earth and were actually seen and heard in conversation with Jesus Christ by those men who were eye witnesses of the whole thing.

I turned to the question of paradise and proved to you according to the argument we have just been making this morning that Paul was caught up into heaven and had revelation presented to him, and he looked on and heard people talking over in paradise and heard things they said and which he wasn't allowed to repeat. He was permitted to realize that there are beings in paradise who can talk, can give expression to ideas. Is anybody in a position to talk who is not alive? Therefore the people Paul saw and heard must have been alive.

I called attention to the rich man and Lazarus. He says it is a parable, but if it were a parable, so far as the argument is concerned, there would be no difference. There you see two men alive; one rich and the other poor; their character is going to be tested on the other side. There on the other side of death they are both alive. The rich man is in the lower region of the death state, and he tells the conversation they had. Jesus Christ, the great Teacher come from God, has given us an idea of the death state being inhabited by spirits who are conscious beings, talking and calling for help and being denied help. [*Time called.*]

Mr. Williams—A word of explanation: In my answer to your question in regard to the word *neshama* I find I looked at the wrong verse. If you will look at the 21st and 22nd verses of the seventh chapter you will see that my answer is right. The word is applied to the beasts of the field. *Mr. Hall*—read it: *Mr. Williams* reads, "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and of every man; all in whose nostrils was the breath—*neshama*—of life." Here is Young's Concordance for you to see that I am right.