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Query,
Mortality or Immortality?
An Excursus.
Professor Park, of Andover, when cautioning his students against self-confidence, told how, when in early life, he had gone through college and a theological seminary, and supposed that he knew almost everything pertaining to life and godliness, he went to a certain place where he preached a sermon. On coming down from the pulpit he met an old woman in the aisle, who, lifting her finger before him, said, "Young man, do you believe what you preached to-day?"

"Yes, I do."

"Well, I do not, because it is not in the Bible."

"And," said Professor Park, "I do not blame the old sister, for I do not believe it now myself.

The man who preaches the Word will not be obliged to take it all back in later years. He who holds fast "the form of sound words," "saying none other things" than the prophets, the apostles and the Saviour have declared would come to pass, will not have to spend the last half of his ministry in apologizing for the first half, or in building again the things which he has destroyed, and thus making himself a transgressor.—The Christian.
QUERY,
Mortality versus Immortality?

AN EXCURSUS.

The public press, both secular and religious, has recently been filled with worn out discussions as to man's inherent Immortality. As a rule, all of the so-called articles therefor or against, and proof so-called, pro or con, come from Plato or other heathen and ignorant—because unwarranted—sources; none of them from the Oracles of God. Now the stream of human life cannot mount above its own source, and, if one accepts Moses and Revelation, Adam was dust, and unto dust did he return; and his children must return there too, and have their own mold mingled with his, in that same old ancestral urn, the grave!

If, moreover, one accepts Darwin, and the Evolutionary Theory, then certainly man cannot rise above his source, and death inevitably "ends all"—no matter to what heights, pil lared upon but dust, its advancing species rise during their successive stages (generations) of individual existence. That which is mortal, and material (as an evolutionist must predicate man, via the monkey back to Protoplasm and chaos, to have been) can never hope to survive his own generation, nor escape from a planet doomed, itself, in due time, to expire just as man does in his own set time.

Now, I am not writing about pleasant topics, but on facts; and, without Revelation, they are inscrutable. By means of Revelation only may we obtain any light on things before, above, and forever beyond mere human ken. What do we want? A little light; and some thought from above our own standpoint; or do we prefer darkness? I for one would like to know the end, so that I can maneuver during the intermediate, in whose environment we are all placed, and it is reasonable that a Just God will have offered it to all who seek therefor.
Eternity is Eternity; Everlasting is only "from age to age within the limit of its own kind." Life is for its own generation, according to degree. There are two conceptions as to this; the mortal which we see in course, and know as of ourselves, knowing nothing of what was before, or of what is due hereafter, for and as of ourselves; there is no instinct in it; and still less do we know aught as to our ancestors, save some doubtful records—outside of the Oracles of God: and there is the real matter in question—Immortality (of which none but fools are convinced that they can know anything, of themselves). Upon this topic we are instructed, officially, that is in the Oracles of God, or Books of Revelation, as to some few facts. Now, what are the facts? Of course, we repudiate all the ordinary and loose theories founded upon self-made definitions:—Philosophy, the vain imaginings and aspirations of man ought to be eliminated from this discussion.

Seeing, then, that this is so, as to the hope of consistent Evolutionists, re Immortality, how much more so is it, unto such as reject Inspiration and Revelation, and return into their own circumscribed environment for Light in the dense gloom about them! And how much is all this intensified for those who are literally forced out of touch with what they were brought up in—upon coming to responsibility, and the age of discretion, and finding out who Santa Claus really is—so far as their predecessors are concerned!

When a man comes to reasonable age, and finds out that his teachers have had no foundations, that is the end of his faith in them; and few there be that go much further; and some there are who decline even to perpetuate the deception upon those that follow on behind (before?) them.

Now there is more hope, in controversy, of convincing such people, than there is of reaching anything honest, as to definitions, premises, logic and conclusions, among those who elect to continue dull, and to deceive, after their own eyes have been opened.

The grave is not a mere portal to a place beyond, it is a cul de sac, a vault, whose only way out is the way in; its exit is ad auras, and as we do not go in thereat of ourselves, we certainly will not come out through any inherent power that men possess. The Lord was placed in the sepulchre by fellow mortals, and was sealed therein and guarded by his mortal foes—but an angel came down from Heaven and rolled away the stone; this is a Type of the general truth, and the Key to our topic.

Let us, therefore, have a conversation with a reasonable "tramp," such as one often meets upon the by-ways of Science: Philosophy and Affairs; they are always open to convic-
tion, but to convince them one has to employ much better arguments than those that drove them from the churches! Upon matters of mere human (mortal) life, they are level-headed, common-sensed, self-made men; and it is clear that they will recognize a reasonable conclusion held down closely to its own premises upon matters that relate to Immortality, if put within their horizon, quite as readily as those that they have utilized in mere temporary affairs. The fact is, they are curious and often are quite anxious for real light upon the topic. Who, then, shall supply it? One of their own degree? Not much! How shall an uninitiated candidate instruct a fellow-groper after Light upon matters that concern the third degree of Life—seeing that neither one has even passed the Outside Tyler?

Now we met a fair man, not long ago, under such circumstances, and the following was about the size of his difficulty and contention; and his style of language, while natural to his own position and somewhat "light" as to yours (if so be you are instructed!), was to the point, to say the least; in fact, as we recall our own mood of mind before we fell upon Anglo-Israelism, and an understanding of Chronology as such, it was our own vernacular. So we understood him, and were doubly anxious to assist him to the Light, and, of course, with no offense; in reality, we rather enjoyed the zest of the situation and laid ourselves out to match it, and even to go one or two better!

Let us call our friend an Agnostic—"one who does not know," and has come to the conclusion that "no one else does!" We think he has stopped short of finding out for himself! When one is cited to the Bar by an adversary, the first thing to do is to examine the Law for himself; so as to see if the contentions are well-founded; if so, it were best to agree with him quickly: but if policy, injustice and a wrong interpretation is his only foundation, then one's own sense of justice will cause him to face the judge, with the Supreme Court as an appeal beyond the first hearing. He will be a Gnostic and "know" what he is about. But to the conversation; said our

Agnostic: "So far as man unaided can predicate, he is but developed dust; at death he must return to it in so far as his own individual identity is concerned; nor, after that, is there even one chance, forever, that the winds and laws of mere Nature will conjure back his own particular parts into their own identical consciousness—no, not to all eternity! The chances against it are infinity to zero!"

Gnostic: "True; hence, the necessity for Revelation, and its reasonableness; for your own sense of equity ought to be satisfied, and if there is a God who gave you such a sense,
he must have provided a satisfaction for it. Why don’t you investigate for yourself?"

Agnostic: “Why, I have; I was fooled until I got to thinking for myself; then I found out my teachers had stuffed me with their own ignorance. The Churchman told me so and so and I found out that he had no grounds for it, and I simply stopped.”

Gnostic: “So you didn’t investigate for yourself! Now if you had, you might have become a Reformer of the Church itself—you might have discovered the true creed from the Law.”

Agnostic: “Yes, or a Deformer with a theory of my own. No, sir. I stopped because I was square, and turned to Evolution and its collaterals.”

Gnostic: “Then you admittedly failed to examine the real Law for yourself, and went into a mire where you could have had no reasonable hope for much advance.”

Agnostic: “Well, in that case, yes: but I wanted both sides, but I found out that Evolutionists were more at sea, in mud, than the other fellows. Why, Evolution forbids immortality, as such, to man, who at present is merely mortal, as far as we can perceive; but Evolution does pretend to hope, or to expect, that some generation of his successors may, at some age and stage of progress yet to come, obtain a chance thereat. This, as to the main hope, is as absurd to me as to expect that some generation of men will be able to lift themselves up by the straps of their own boots! If this is the hope of Evolutionists, and if evolution is true only in this sense, ‘I pass!’ and, for one, I will take my chances without even their assistance. I conclude that I am evolved, and here I am; the evolution can go on, and there I will be, and you too, a la evolution. Yours truly.”

Gnostic: “My dear fellow, what you say about Evolution is so, but your position is unsound. You should have investigated Revelation itself, and for yourself. Your dissatisfaction with your teachers, when you got a glimpse of the Record, should have kept you at the Record, so that we could get a glimpse of what you found to be the premises. You simply slopped over into the fire, and found it hotter than the frying-pan!”

Agnostic: “I see your point, but it is blunt. Of course I investigated, but what did I find? I examined the other side, and this is my conclusion: Modern ‘higher criticism’ cuts off any ground for individual hope, as if founded upon facts, as to ‘identical’ conscious immortality; so, in this game of progressive euchre, ‘I passed’ again. They can ‘make it’ what they please for all of me. But, pshaw! I speak as a man! Pshaekel!”
Gnostic: “You are right again—your last remark is sound. You admit mortality (Psichiness) and the lack of any innate ‘knowledge’ of immortality (Zoeticness), yet you throw yourself into the soup and submit yourself to be boiled away! Modern critics! What can they know of Revelation, in that their entire bent is to dispute its reasonableness and authenticity? Why on earth did you tumble to them?”

Agnostic: “Oh, I didn’t at once; I groped about a bit, but I found out that sectarianism knows nothing about the matter, for it has ‘stacked’ its own pack, which is far more dishonorable than to gamble, and much more foolish than to play cards for mere pastime. The very soldiers beneath the cross drew lots ‘on the square,’ as soldiers still do; so you can count me out of the dis-Sectarian game, no matter what is to happen. What is not found plainly set forth in the Bible is not to be found anywhere else upon such a theme as Immortality!”

Gnostic: “My dear friend, I perceive that you have investigated more than your words imply. The fact is you are pretty familiar with the surface of the Bible. Let me take up the cue, and say a thing or two for both sides in my own way. I was once in exactly your own position, and floundered about until I got out of it.”

Agnostic: “Oh, yes; you returned—gave up thinking. I know all about that. Some one promised you the facts. ‘We are orthodox, and orthodoxy is all right, come over here,’ said some one (Anglican, Greek, or Roman, or some of their connections). Yet one visits them in vain; they neither shuffle the pack, nor do they ‘deal fair,’ even to a deck hand—who ought to know, and who does know, something about the games of chance himself by mere pastime! Why the church plays with marked cards, and always acts as banker. They all do, all the sects!”

Gnostic: “No, my friend, you are wrong. I went over nowhere. I did go back to the Bible, and there I am still. Now let me finish this matter in my own way, and you go your own way, and let it lie fallow for a conclusion: something will come up into your consciousness from it in due time, and truth can wait!”

WE PUT THE CASE AS PER TEXT.

This is a serious matter: so we will drop the trivial, and the by-way illustrations, as we are not in it for chances nor doubts, nor to cheat, nor to be cheated. If it is a mere game, we too are sufficiently amused; if it is a reality, in which you are both willing to hear and answer questions, we should be glad to sit down among the Doctors; provided we can agree upon the primary and axiomatic definitions. So enough: let us state the matter from our own most elevated position: per-
haps not the most elevated, but the highest to which we have reached, and subject to any “call down,” or elevation, within another’s horizon—upon irresistible proof or fair disproof.

Human life is mortal; its river rises in the dust of Eden, and sinks, like the Humboldt river, into the sands of the earth—far south. So, were it not for other promises, man’s life’s end were hopeless: for God only hath Immortality, and death is the opposite, the antithesis of life: “I think, therefore, I am”—I live; I die, I am not, as I do not think; or else “words” are useless to convey Truth.—Now, the Rock upon which Protestantism was built was a belief in the ABSOLUTE authority of the Bible; and the Bible is a unit as to man’s mortality—with a conditional hope as to Immortality only after a supernatural resurrection and subsequent “change.” Creation itself is supernatural—so is re-birth!

AN AGNOSTIC INTERRUPTION.

“But modern ‘Destructive Criticism,’ in so many of its foremost schools of Protestant Theology, has almost entirely eliminated the miraculous foundation of Christianity, so that its foundation passes away.”

Yes, and Doctor Lorimer says, that: “The Church of Rome, only, comes to the front as the champion of the Bible against the destructive critics.” What a strange outcome is this, of the Reformation!

And now, a leading secular Journal, in which the controversy as to Immortality has been most voluminous, finds: “That the uncompromising defenders of belief in Everlasting Individual Life for the soul, are usually Roman Catholic.” Thus things are all mixed up, for Papacy cannot give up the dogma of continuous, or everlasting life, and survive! So it accepts and interprets the Bible in order to find it there: while Protestantism, rejecting even the fundamental authority thereof, is forced to resort to the “vain philosophy” and sentiments of men! Thus, Agnosticism, and Antagonisticism multiply, and False Teachers, of all sorts of transient ilks, reap tremendous harvests in all sorts of directions—particularly through theories built upon their own definition of the Future Life, but all of course based upon Essential Immortality taken as if it were an axiom or self evident truth when predicated as to human beings. Where did they get this as a primary conception? Of course, only from Plato and the Philosophers.

The cause of all this confusion of Truth, and spread of Falsity is the failure of Protestant Faith in the Bible? and the persistence of Papal misunderstanding thereof! The Journal in question summed up its topic as “profitless,” and goes on to say: “Immortality is undemonstrable by human science. The faith that clings to it is beyond the reach of
scientific or philosophical argument, and happily, for it brings hope and consolation to those who have it."

The foregoing conclusion is itself confused, and begs its own question: for so fundamental a topic as "righteousness, temperance and judgment to come" is per se vastly important, and the truth thereon must be scientifically demonstrable—if it shall be offered as a tenet of sound faith. God expects a reasonable faith only, and has afforded the very best means for one to obtain it, scientifically;—to wit, the anticipated agreement of specific and chronological Prophecy with detailed, eventual, verified and harmonized History. The harmony of Moses and all the prophets as to the Messiah, and realized in Jesus as the Christ, establishes the miraculous nature of the First Advent; and their harmony as to Israel, as identical with Our Race, establishes the imminence of the Second Advent. With this comes in all the other essential teachings of the Bible: it is merely a question of, What are they? When thus found out, from an inclusive use of all the texts involved, it will be a simple matter to find collateral reasons, throughout all the works of God, wherewith to confirm the Faith. For if Christ be not risen our faith is vain, and if Israel cannot be identified and restored, there can be no Second Advent—that is the long and short and what the Prophets have to say, no matter what the modern Adventists (sic!) have to offer in cancellation of the unbroken faith, hope, and the constant traditions of their betters, the Elders. Let us have the truth, rather than cling to an undemonstrable faith; and if man is hopelessly mortal, "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die," along with Paul.

Now, as it was Christ alone that "brought Life and Immortality to light," the Doctrine involved could not have been an element of Old Testament faith! But, subsequently to and consequent upon the Revelation of Moses, Orthodox Judaism did doctrinate and accept, as from the Patriarchs, the certainty of an eventual resurrection, but not of continued consciousness during dissolution, nor of necessary immortality after resurrection. Hence, we hold that it is useless to cite Old Testament texts to prove that the patriarchs down to Moses, and the Hebrews from the Exodus to Christ, believed in the Triplicity of man, or that he is, (1) a body, (2) a soul, and (3) a spirit, each distinct, and any one of them, save the last (which, in the Hebrew is mere "breath"—whatever that may be), had a continued elementary and conscious existence after dissolution. That is, they did not believe and did not teach that even the second and third parts of man, as a compound being, lived in consciousness after death. There is nothing as to this found in Moses the Prophet, nor after him to John, in Judaism.
But there is plenty to establish the most ancient and subsequent Mosaic belief and teachings as to man’s Duality (of Body and Breath), by the union of which, and by which only, man became a “living (self-conscious) creature,”—or Soul if you will; but a soul similar, only, in his being and essentiality, to that in possession of all other breathing animals—for the animals of Genesis i. also were “living creatures,” or as we translate it, “souls”; and man became no more and no less, as you must translate it, if you are consistent, and if you substitute in the equation for \( x \) and \( y \) the same words every time.

Suppose a walnut was a living being. Let us argue a bit. It consists of three essential parts, shuck, shell and meat. It hangs upon a tree. We dictate certain things to it, knowing that it will violate them, but providing a future. Ripeness comes on, it lets go of the tree of its life, falls to the ground, and goes through a course. We strip off the shuck, and throw it away, the original walnut ceases; we dry the rest, for a spell, and then crack the shell. The life of the walnut is over. Then we eat the meat. In no stage of its existence (and certainly not in the last, the result having been devoured) could its body, soul and spirit (shuck, shell and meat) have preserved any further identity. It having, in all its stages, been duly devoured in natural course.

This reminds me of the old story of “Who ate Roger Williams?” That famous Rhode Islander died in due time and was duly buried; and an apple tree was planted at the head of his grave. In due time, adown the ages, all the boys of Rhode Island ate apples. At last, it became desirable to move his bones to some more honorable place upon the Island; but, lo and behold, upon digging down, they found nothing but a root, that more or less was in the exact form of a skeleton, speaking after the manner of men. Whether they transplanted it or not, I do not know, but that was all that was left of the shuck-shell of Roger, and his breath—the meat of the cocoanut—that once had vivified it into consciousness had gone back to God; having brought nothing into, and as I understand it, having taken nothing out of this world.

Now I have no doubt but that every essential element of Roger Williams’s final equation is marked, measured, weighed and numbered in the eternal pigeon-holes, or at least, carried into the Everlasting Books, or, when collected together from land and sea and air, and revivified by its own breath by One who never forgets, that Roger Williams will stand in his own lot, self-conscious once more—because resurrected!—that he is the same identity, and with no knowledge of the gap, long or short, between his cutting off and his resurrection. In the meantime, I believe that Roger Williams is in the same state of unconsciousness—“as if he had not been.”
Now the rupture of this "mortal coil" is caused by the separation of the only two things on record (body and breath) that established one's life or self-consciousness. This rupture is death, and is a natural and logical return to unconsciousness. The breath returns to God as it was, and the body to the dust as it was, and the consciousness, dependent only upon the union of two (there is no third mentioned), is mathematically and logically and theologically lost. Natural theology might think unto itself that, perhaps, in the long haphazard of Eternity, in isolated cases, some of the essential elements that constitute individuality might come together. Those who believe in the transmigration of souls, and in theosophy, have some such idea—that men are sort of half made over, and over again, and recover faint recollections of a past—but nature herself, who never made two things alike, would be surprised at even an isolated case, and we decline to entertain it as a law against all laws. If so, however, the same man would recollect himself, per saltum, over the gap, and go ahead. But no such law, to human minds, can hope to be universal. As then we are in the byways and hedges, and as we must give a reason for our faith, we must stick to the definitions and premises and conditions. We are doing it, so we appeal to Revelation—to a source above our own source, and must examine its evidence.

However, by this we do not intend to imply that the Elders of the old dispensation believed that "Death Ends All;" quite the contrary. They all knew of the Messianic promise; and they taught and believed in the resurrection of the dead at The Last Day—as one can see from Moses to Job, from Job to Daniel, and from Daniel to John who ended the sequence, far beyond Malachi the last of the Prophets!

Furthermore; there were, of course, Higher Critics in those days, and they developed into Sadducees and Herodians by the time of the First Advent. These sects did not represent any phase of orthodox Judaism, and are universally condemned (both in life and teaching) by the Saviour. They disputed the resurrection, the existence of spirits (by which we understand the existence of those orders of beings that are above man), etc., and were tinctured with Greek, Egyptian, and other confusions, all heathen and human, as to the immortal essence of existence. They prated much about Moses and the Prophets, but they did not believe in them at all, for various vain philosophies were in their councils, and hypocrisy only tenanted their hearts. They were modern in their day, men of liberal theories; nor even did they live up to these, except upon the corners of the streets and in the public places!
quite diverse from what he will admit in his study—beyond the
general hearing.

The "Scribes and Pharisees," however, "sit in Moses' seat," and we have Christ's command to "believe and to do" all that they taught—not to do as they did, but to put faith into works as each one's own common sense enabled him or her to interpret the message. Now Paul establishes that the Pharisees believed and taught "the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust." Therefore, I believe in it; I must accept this, if I accept Christ and Paul his Commentator. Hence any Sect of modern times that teaches any phase of the Faith at all in antagonism to a universal resurrection, is anti-
Paulistic and anti-Christian; as, for instance, that "the wicked dead are not raised, even at the last day." Why, even Felix trembled at Paul's exposition of the truth as to the Judgment sure to come for all! Let all the dupes that are befooled by modern Sadducees read John v. 28, 29, once a day for a week, and they will forsake their folly and see that the two resurrections referred to cover all men and thus are comprehensive or universal—no matter to what subsequent object.

It may, therefore, be perceived that such holdings, as to class resurrection only, are as it were riders, written in upon the law of Faith once for all delivered to the Saints, and are as dangerous heresies as those that teach the essential immor-
tality of all men. Man has two lives; this is taught by the plural (dual) "breath of lives" that God breathed into Adam; and we were all in Adam, according to the Scriptures, until we were born, and became units with no future after death via continuance promised, but with a resurrection vouchsafed! This is also taught by Job's expectation, by Gabriel's promise to Daniel, by Christ's explicit teaching of a Judgment after death and a resurrection of both good and bad, and by His acceptance of Mary's faith at the grave of Lazarus. Yes, and by St. Paul's definition of the Pharisaical position in the pre-

mises, and the Lord's condemnation of everything Sadduce-
cial. But there is nothing continuous—while in the state of death—taught in this, nor anything necessary thereto in the Word.

Yet there are two kinds of life taught in the Scripture, as well as two lives (whether they are of the same kind or not.) The former (kinds) are defined by the Greek words Psuche and Zoe (by which in English we understand, mortal—natural—
life, Psuchic; and Immortal—supernatural—life, Zoetic.)

Now, as it is Scriptural to believe in Messiah crucified, so it is Scriptural to believe in Him resurrected, and consequently alive again (Zoetically) for evermore; for the complete history of the Cross teaches the resurrection of the dead, and sets forth
immortality in a way and from a standpoint that is foolishness

to the Greek and a stumbling block to the Jews. But for just

that, as a stumbling block, Jesus was set up, as Simeon pro-

phesied: and was pulled down; unless one rears Him in his

own life and so appropriates Him as a means unto some share

in his Zoetic existence.

If a mortal die he may live again, according to Job; either

as mortal or immortal, according to Christ and Paul; if he is

raised a mortal he must die again (unless immediately there-

after changed or translated, as Enoch was, to or towards a

higher life). This death, because of the recovery of Psuchic life

only, is called the Second death and it follows the second psu-

chic existence. But if a man is raised, Psuchic, and changed,

translated, or becomes immortal, Zoetic, he cannot die again,

for his second life is made immortal, and thus indestructible—

in Christ; and because of His, Christ's own, Resurrection,

and Ability to supply the Addition.

Let me illustrate life and death (psuchic) by a familiar chem-

ical example: Suppose we have the two elements Hydrogen

and Oxygen in proper proportions, and in a nascent condition;

if we bring them together they unite and form a brand new

substance, Water. Here, then, is an entirely new chemical

creature, with wonderful properties and significations, diverse

from those of its body and soul elements before combination.

While it is water it is alive as such; but if we put it through

the usual destructive analysis it is separated back into its two

original elements, again nascent, and in their former propor-

tions—no more, no less. This is literal death to the water as

such, and to all of its properties. The water brought nothing

into the laboratory, for it did not enter as water, and certainly

it can carry nothing out, for it goes out into the laboratory of

God as hydrogen to hydrogen, and oxygen to Him who gave

it. After analysis the water is dead; and, as such, all of its

thoughts and properties are perished; in its grave there is no

memory of former or aqueous things, nor in its separated

elements are there any new things held by the released

hydrogen and oxygen, not possessed before they were united;

that re-analyzed water, dissolved from those specific parts, is

as if it had not been; and those parts (H and O) as if they had

never been united.

But suppose the chemist shall have retained them, the com-

ponent gases, in retorts; no matter how, nor how long, and has

eventually passed them back into re-union: then, that same

identical body of water is resurrected, and is literally brought

back into its own aqueous life; its very death is forgotten, its

period of unconsciousness is a blank. But, shall it not know

itself, and recover all that (and no more than) it lost tempo-
rily? Of course it must—its death has been a mere anesthetic experience. It thinks again, and therefore IS and knows ITSELF—but it must go to the chemist to find out what happened while it was DEAD!

Suppose it had been pure or filtered water (the vital emblem of truth), or suppose it had been foul, or filled with all sorts of impurities (the essences of evil): In the one case the retort that once held it would be clean, in the other it would be stratified with dust and earth and ashes: but when again these same waters came back into their own vessels they would not only be alive again aqueously, psychically, but in as different states as they were before analysis or death: the only thing to do, in order to make the latter like the former, is to filter it.

But note again, the Immortal Chemist not only had the power to create water out of the elements at the beginning, which He still permits even chemical magicians in this day of Egyptian gloom to do, but He alone has that reserved power by means of which He can turn mere water into WINE! This, the magicians cannot do! Now, as WINE is the emblem of "Immortal life," who, pray, shall turn this living wine back into water, the emblem of mere Mortal life?

Here, then, we have a most significant illustration of our topic. The creation of man with dual lives breathed into him, whereby, in the first state, that of mere Adamic existence, he becomes a living creature; of his fall and death, whereby he returns into the elements and ceases to be as he was in any sense at all, while Adamic or a living creature, animal, soul, or what not; of his resurrection, whereby he returns to his first or mortal state; and of the translation, whereby he is changed (in the twinkling of an eye) from Psuchic into Zoetic life—Immortality, or dies out again, which is the second death!

But our example is even more searching and appropriate: the properties of Oxygen, Hydrogen, Water and Wine are in clear contrast. If Hydrogen be added to fire it will increase the flame, for it is a perfect fuel; if Oxygen be added to fire it will intensify it, for it is a perfect supporter of combustion; if Water be added to fire it will put it out, for it is a perfect extinguisher; if Wine be added to fire, it may, if new, extinguish it, perhaps, but if old, it certainly will greatly add to the conflagration. Oxygen and Hydrogen intensify fire, and unite by combustion and form water; but Wine, especially if it be of "the best" (as that made out of water at Cana) increases flame—and that sort of wine is the very emblem of Eternal or Zoetic life. Now we cannot exhaust such topics in space so limited, but we can at least suggest new and important illustrations of the fundamental doctrine of "Conditional Immortality" as set forth in the Bible.