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ANTI-ANNIHILATION.—TRACT V.
MAN: HIS PERSONALITY.

BY REV. N. D. GEORGE.

When in Provincetown, Mass., awhile since, we heard a man say that on one occasion "more than one hundred sail came into that harbor." What did he mean by this? He meant that so many vessels came in there. "Captain Snow's ship was launched to-day;" that is, the hull of the ship, for there were neither masts, yards, rigging, nor sails. These parts are all neces-
sary for a complete ship. But no one thought of calling in question the fact that a ship had been launched. This is a common mode of expression to designate things, and none would conclude from this that a ship was either all sail or all hull. It is a mode of speech by which a part is used for the whole, and usage makes it proper. Materialists define man to be "living organized dust," yet Adam was called man before life was given him by his Maker. Gen. ii, 7. The Bible teaches us that man is a compound being, that he is both material and immaterial, that his body is made of dust, that in his present mode of existence there is an entity called "the soul," (Matt. x, 28;) "the spirit," (Eccles. xii, 7;) "a man," (2 Cor. xii, 2,) which exists in connection with the body. Death separates this entity from the body and we then say the man is dead, that is, the present mode of existence is broken up, and the dust-man is dead, while the other
part of the compound man is alive. Christ
gives authority for such thought and speech
in the case of the rich man and Lazarus.
Luke xvi, 22, 23. They were both dead,
yet there were entities that survived: one in
Abraham's bosom, the other in torments.
In common parlance we attribute personal-
ity to a corpse. We say, Mr. Brown lies in
his coffin. An officer, after a battle, orders
a detachment of soldiers to bury the men
lying on the field. As they do it they search
out their friends who have fallen and say,
Here is John and there is Samuel, applying
personality to the dust of dead men. The
Saviour, in raising the dead Lazarus, called
him by name, saying "Lazarus, come forth,"
(John xi, 43;) and God said to Adam, "Dust
thou art," etc. Gen. iii, 19. Thus we see
that we are authorized from the Scriptures
to apply personality to the physically dead
as well as to the living or to the compound
man. We come now to the question: Do
the Scriptures teach that there is an entity, aside from the dust-man, to which we may apply personality? Materialists assert that there is not, and that the soul is either the organized dust or an attribute of it, and dies with the body. This we deny, as we find both personality and separability attributed to something of man outside of the material organism. We have already briefly noted the case of the rich man and Lazarus, as given by the Saviour, which of itself establishes our point, but we will let Paul speak on this question. Paul understood the constituent parts of man as well, at least, as modern theorists. Hear him: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell." 2 Cor. xii, 2. The body here can mean nothing but the organized dust. If there is any meaning to these words it is this: Paul knew a man that could exist either in the body, that is, in the
physical organization, or out of it. If Paul had been inspired to teach that man is a unit in the sense of the destructionists, could he possibly have entertained a doubt as to the whereabouts of the man? If Paul was nothing but body, as materialists assert, would he not have known it as well as they? Hear him again: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." 2 Cor. iv, 16. Here we have the compound nature of man clearly stated. While the outward man, or physical part, decays, the inward man, the soul, is renewed, etc. But if man is a unit, and the soul, spirit, mind, or whatsoever materialists may choose to call it, is but an attribute of the physical nature, which, of course, decays and perishes with it, how can it, then, when that on which it entirely depends for its existence is perishing, be renewed day by day? Materialists may understand this, but we do not. Personality is, by
the apostle in this text, attributed to both soul and body. In 2 Cor. v, 1–9 the same doctrine is clearly taught, namely, that there is an intelligence capable of existing in, and being "at home in the body," and "absent from the body." "We in this tabernacle do groan," etc. Materialism admits of no "we" in the tabernacle, no personality. The tabernacle is the whole man, therefore it must have been the tabernacle itself that groaned! Peter agrees with Paul, and uses the same figure of a tabernacle. "I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle," etc., "knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle," etc. (2 Pet. i, 13, 14.) Peter was in the tabernacle, not the organized dust itself, and at his death he was to put off the tabernacle, that is, put off the body and not go into the grave with it. Thus we see personality is predicated of that which may be separate from the body. Hear Paul again: "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."
But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.” Phil. i, 21-24.

Now, why should Paul talk of abiding in the flesh when, if materialism is true, he could not possibly abide anywhere else? What departs if the whole man is but organized dust and all goes into the grave at death? Again, if materialism is true, Paul could have remained in the flesh for the good of his brethren for hundreds of years, and then have been with Christ just as soon as though he had died then. Eighteen hundred years have passed since Paul wrote these words, but, according to the ideas we controvert, he is no more with Christ to-day than an unconscious stone. But Paul, having received his lesson from heaven and no
from modern speculators, did not understand this, so he goes on talking of death as a *departure* by which he should go to Christ instead of going into non-being, and by which he should "gain," which cannot be predicated of a nonentity. A score or two of passages in addition to these might be presented to show the compound nature of man, and that it is perfectly scriptural to attribute personality to the whole man as he now exists, or to the dust-man, or to the spiritual man as a distinct entity. When pressed hard by the sword of the Spirit materialists are wont to fly back to the creation of man and put this question: "If man has a distinct entity, called the soul, why have we no account of it in the history of his creation?" This is supposed to contain a great amount of argument. Let us look at it for a moment. In the very brief history of creation, all of which may be read in ten, and that pertaining to man in five, minutes, it is not
stated that man was created with two eyes, two hands, and two feet. If the position was taken that Adam had not these parts, would it not be a sufficient refutation of it to show that all his posterity have them? If they have them, then Adam had them, even though we have no specific account of their creation. So if we can show from the inspired Word that man is a compound being, that he possesses a spiritual and distinct entity which survives the body, then it is clear that Adam was created with such an entity, even though we have no account of it detailed in the history of his creation.

The doctrine of the resurrection our materialists will not undervalue, as without it, so they say, there is no future life whatever. The original promise (Gen. iii, 15) includes the resurrection, as it is by this that the seed of the woman gains the victory. So say materialists. But here is not a word to indicate a resurrection. From this text
alone none would ever dream of that event. God made promise also to Abraham, (Gen. xii, 2, 3; xviii, 17, 18; xxii, 18;) repeated it to Isaac, (Gen. xxvi, 4;) and to Jacob, (Gen. xxviii, 14.) In this promise, as we think all Christians admit, is included all the benefits of Christ’s advent and reign, including, of course, the resurrection. But who would, either from the original promise, or from that made to the patriarchs, learn that there is to be a resurrection? Certainly the word does not occur, and no one would learn it from the language employed. Indeed, no one would find it in the five books of Moses without the aid of the New Testament. And even there (Luke xx, 37, 38) it may be doubted if the Saviour quotes Exodus iii, 6, so much to convince the Sadducees of a resurrection as to refute their doctrine of no future life; for the Lord said, I am “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;” and the Saviour adds,
"For he is not the God of the dead but of the living: for all live unto him." As if he had said, these patriarchs, though they died physically ages ago, have not ceased to be, as your materialism teaches, but their souls are now living, for if it were not so he could not be their God, for he cannot be the God of nonentities. We will add, too, that no one, confined to the five books of Moses, would learn that there is to be a future judgment and second death, doctrines zealously taught by many materialists.

Now when they can explain to us why the important doctrines of the resurrection, judgment, and second death are not explicitly taught in the history given by Moses, then, with better grace, can they demand of us to show by explicit language that God created an entity called the soul. In the history it is said, "The Lord God formed man of the dust," etc. The word *formed*
means created. In this sense it is used by materialists. Now, was there any other creation after the dust-man was formed? Let God's prophet answer: “The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretched forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.” Zech. xii, 1. Here is a direct reference to God's creative acts as recorded in Genesis. Of the three great achievements named, the formation of the spirit of man within him is the climax, and can it be supposed that this greatest act of the three was merely inflating the lungs of the dust-man with wind? This would be sinking Jehovah's sublime declaration with a witness! God “formeth the spirit of man,” etc. Did he create the wind in man then? Wind or air had before this event been created, not in man, but outside of him, and the inferior animals were breathing it. With this divine dec-
Aration before us, together with other facts to be noted, we come to the conclusion that when it is said that God “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,” something more is indicated than merely inflating a dust machine and putting it in motion. We cannot doubt but in this expression is included the creation of the substance sometimes called spirit (Eccles. xii, 7) and sometimes soul, (Matt. x, 28,) which cannot be killed by man.

Intellectuality is attributed to the spirit in man. Paul says, “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” 1 Cor. ii, 11. Here the spirit of man is declared to be the knowing part of man: the spirit God formed in man. Zech. xii, 1.

Mr. Grant, a leading champion of materialism, denies that the word spirit here means an entity, or being, and gives the
following: “There is an influence from our heavenly Father, the Holy Spirit, and there is an influence which proceeds from man.”—Litch and Grant, Dis., p. 71. We are at liberty, then, to paraphrase the text thus: “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the influence of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the influence of God,” and thus personality and intellectuality are attributed to mere influence and not to those who exert it! Truth presses hard when leading advocates of error are driven to such expositions.

Again. “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.” Rom. viii, 16. Is intellectuality here attributed to the Spirit of God? Then it is also attributed to the spirit of man, as all must see. “Therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” 1 Cor. vi, 20. Is the word spirit here used No 12.
to denote energy, activity, or the passions, as love, hate, etc., arising from the operation of the dust machine or body? If so, why should the apostle name spirit at all? If spirit does not denote a distinct entity, and is but an attribute of the body, then all that is necessary is to keep the body right and the spirit will be right, of course; and if Paul had simply said, "glorify God in your body," he would have covered the whole ground. But Paul was not a materialist, therefore he talks of body and spirit. He clearly defined his position upon this question when before the council, (Acts xxiii, 6-8,) where he declared himself a Pharisee, in opposition to the materialism of the Sadducees, who say "there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both," and Paul says, "I am a Pharisee." That is, I believe with them in the resurrection, in angels, and also in spirits, as distinct entities, and that they can
exist in a disembodied state. The Saviour sanctioned this doctrine when by his presence among his disciples "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit." Luke xxiv, 37, 39. The disciples were deceived as to fact; for it was the Saviour’s body and not a spirit that they saw; but they were not deceived as to theory. Mark the Saviour's answer: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." If the disciples were in error upon this subject this was the time of all others to correct their doctrine concerning spirits. Would a modern teacher of materialism have treated this as Christ has? Truly these modern disciples are greater than their Lord! They can scarcely find language sufficiently strong to execrate the doctrine, but the great Teacher never called in question this doctrine in a single instance. (See Tract No. I.)

"Then shall the dust return to the earth"
as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.” Eccles. xii, 7. A troublesome text for materialists. At death the dust nature returns to the earth as it was; and the spirit nature returns to God who gave (formed, Zech. xii, 1) it, and who will dispose of it according to its deserts. It is said that spirit (ruah) here means breath, or wind, which God breathed into man, and that this breath of life “returns to him in the expanse of heaven.”—Unity of Man, p. 32. But since God is the giver of earth as well as air, how does the last air a man breathes return to him any more than the dust returns to him? “God is a spirit.” John iv, 24. Bear in mind that pneuma, the word rendered spirit here, answers to ruah, rendered spirit in Eccles. xii, 7. Shall we rob God of his personality by saying God is a breath or wind? Another says: “A correct way of rendering the latter clause of the text Ecclesiastes xii, 7 is, ‘Then
shall the life return to God who gave it.'” Is it spiritual life? No; for this author ridicules the idea of such life. What is it, then? It must be animal life. Is this an entity capable of returning to God when the body dies? If so, then there was an entity superadded to the dust-man, which is stoutly denied by this class of writers. What is the killing of the body but the ending of its life? Admit the compound nature of man and all is plain. The spirit named is that entity called by the Saviour “the soul,” which does not die when the body goes to dust. Does another say that spirit means the passions, as a spirit “of love, of anger, etc., the effect, or an attribute of our physical organism?”—Blain, p. 42. But if man is a dust-unit, do not the mind and passions, which, as materialism asserts, are wholly dependent upon the dust machine, die with it? Do these constitute “the spirit” which returns to God? A
nonentity, returning to God! Absurdities multiply as we follow these expounders. Now how will these testimonies and others be met? Cruden's Concordance will be examined, the passages counted up where the word spirit is found in the Bible, the number of kinds of spirit will be given, making a great show of biblical knowledge. Mr. Grant says, "The 'spirit of error' is mentioned in the Bible, the 'spirit of bondage,' 'spirit of antichrist.' I find twenty-three different spirits mentioned."

The same treatment is also given to the word soul by the advocates of materialism, as this word has various acceptations. It is sometimes used for the principle of animal life, for the whole person, for the life of man, for a dead body, for desire, love, etc. These applications of the words spirit and soul are well understood by all thoughtful readers of the Bible. No one calls them in question. But we maintain that these
words are also used to denote a distinct entity capable of intelligence and existence after the death of the body. We have given a few texts where the word spirit occurs clearly showing this, and, did space allow, more might be presented. We will now give two passages in which the word soul occurs teaching the same. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matt. x, 28. The question now is not whether God is able to annihilate both soul and body in hell, but whether the Saviour here teaches that the soul lives after the body is dead. It is said that soul here means life? But what is the killing of the body but the ending of its life? The text by this is made to say, "Fear not them which kill the life, but are not able to kill the life!" Did the Saviour utter such nonsense as this? Does soul mean here an attribute of organized dust? Then the soul must cease to be when the body dies. and if so,
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Men can kill the soul, and have been doing it ever since they began to kill each other. But Christ tells us of a soul which survives the death of the body and cannot be killed by man. Could language be formed to more forcibly contradict materialism than this? In harmony with Christ's doctrine is the following: "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." Rev. vi, 9–11.

Inspiration here teaches the separability, intellectuality, and personality of souls.
There is no evading this. John “saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God,” etc. They were looking back to earth, wondering why the Lord had not avenged their blood, and they were told “that they should rest yet for a little season,” until their “brethren should be killed, as they were.” Personality is not only applied to souls, but to the bodies with which these souls had been connected. Observe, it does not say, the souls that were slain, but “the souls of them that were slain.” See also Rev. xx, 4.

To say nothing of many other Scriptures where the words soul and spirit and other forms of language occur, such as we have presented in this tract, we consider that these two texts from Christ and his servant John clearly teach the compound nature of man. It will be seen, too, that we are in agreement with God’s word in attributing personality to either soul or body, or to both.
when united. That the saints subsequent to death enter into peace and rest is admitted by most, if not all, who claim to be Christians. The Scriptures teaching this are, Isa. lvii, 2; Heb. iv, 9; Rev. xiv, 13, and a few others. The words *peace* and *rest* have a variety of applications in the Bible, and are used in it, without their derivatives, more than four hundred times, and are referable to the future state in but a very few instances. Now, what would be our estimate of him who should labor to make it appear that the texts we have cited have no reference to the future of man, because there are nearly four hundred more that have other meanings where the same words occur? Would he not be judged as either wicked or weak? Yet this is not very unlike the work of our opponents when the soul's immortality is in question. However much we may admire democracy in town affairs, a majority of words can never come
in to determine what is religious truth. "God is a spirit." This is declared but once, in so many words, in the whole Bible, while the words rendered spirit, both in the Old and New Testament, occur hundreds of times, and are applied to other things. But if the expression, "God is a spirit," were found a hundred times in the Bible, it would be just as much and no more a fact than it is now. Be it understood that the same unscrupulous ingenuity displayed in garbling, twisting, combining, massing texts, raising a dust on a few Hebrew and Greek words, and creating a smoke by stating the great number of texts where the same word occurs, and its different applications, can be just as forcibly employed to disprove the future life of the righteous as it can be to disprove the compound nature of man.
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