

but sweet and pure. . . . We went home quieter than when we came; we thought of other things—that voice, that face; those great, simple, living thoughts; those floods of resistless eloquence; that piercing, shattering voice.” —*Horæ Subsecivæ*, Second Series, pp. 90-93.

It may be seriously doubted whether Chalmers would ever have become celebrated at all as a preacher if he had delivered his sermons extempore. When in the middle of a discourse he broke off to illustrate some point which he deemed insufficiently dealt with in his MS., those who remember his preaching will call to mind the almost blundering simplicity with which he spoke, and the contrast to the imperial utterances, the cataracts of eloquence, which came from his well-thumbed notes.

When Dr. Chalmers came to preach the opening sermon in the National Scotch Church, Regent Square, St. Pancras, London, his former subordinate, Edward Irving, for whom the spacious edifice had been built, prayed before the sermon, and read the Scriptures. He chose for that purpose one of the longest chapters in the Old Testament, and prayed for nearly two hours. The overcrowded congregation were quite fatigued before the sermon began, and Dr. Chalmers did not hesitate to express his pain and annoyance to some of his friends when the service was concluded.

One of the admirers of Dr. Chalmers, who was always running after the latest variety of popular preacher, sent her compliments to him one day, and asked him if he intended to preach at St. George's Church on the morning of the following Sunday? Dr. Chalmers' reply was characteristic of the man. He said, "Present my respects to Mrs. So-and-so, and tell her that divine service will be celebrated as usual next Sunday morning, and that it commences at eleven o'clock."

CORRESPONDENCE.

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

SIR,—It has been suggested by one of your correspondents that the believers in conditional immortality should be heard for their view of the future life. This, I think, is desirable if that very interesting subject is to be fully discussed in your columns. I will, therefore, endeavour to place before your readers our ideas as briefly as possible. And for this purpose the statement of the Apostle Paul in the 15th chap. of 1st Corinthians will serve to set forth our view very concisely. Which we understand to be—that to deny the resurrection of the dead, involves the denial of the resurrection of Christ and all possibility of a future life.

Very important indeed must that doctrine be, upon which consequences so tremendous rest, and a right understanding of what is meant by the resurrection of the dead is imperatively necessary.

There are those who assert that "the dead," referred to by the Apostle, means a spiritual *immortal* being, who is the real man, contained in the body, but altogether distinct from it. That death is the resurrection of the man from the dead body. The term "dead" being as properly applicable to the one as the other. I need hardly say that we dissent from that view, being of the opinion that a *deathless being*, and a piece of *inanimate matter could not be*, under any conceivable circumstances, spoken of as "the dead."

When the great Apostle to the Gentiles preached to the polished Athenians on Mars Hill, he was listened to with some attention, till he spoke of the resurrection of the dead. If by that he had meant the doctrine we have here referred to, he would not have provoked the scornful laughter of these representatives of the science of that day, for they were familiar with that idea. But the rising again to life of the body, which it was their custom to consume with fire, was to them not only impossible but absurd.

That this was what the Apostle meant, admits of no doubt. It was the resurrection of Jesus he had reference to, and it is the resurrection of Jesus he links with the resurrection of his people, to deny the one is to deny the other. Christ was to "be the first to rise from the dead." When He rose, He "became the first fruits of them that slept." But the first fruits is a sample of the harvest; the resurrection of Christ is the sample of the resurrection of His people; if His was the rising again of the identical body which was nailed to the cross, showing the scars and wounds which He received, so also must it be with His people. It is true there will be a difference between the resurrection body and the body as it now is. So also will there be a difference, equally great, in the bodies of those who remain alive at the coming of the Lord, when "this mortal puts on immortality," when the earthly house is changed into an heavenly and eternal house. The *soma psukikon* is not destroyed, but is changed into a *soma pneumatikon*. The identity remains. There is no such thing taught in the Scripture, as the transmigration of the soul from one body into another.

The resurrection of the dead then, upon which the truth of Christianity depends, and without which there can be no future life, is the rising again of the body to life, as taught by the Apostle Paul.

We are sometimes told that unless the soul is immortal, the resurrection of the dead would be impossible. That is to say, if man is wholly material. It is not in the power of God to raise him from the dead.

The grave consumes those committed to it, just as completely as the fire, or the teeth of wild beasts, therefore the resurrection of the same man or body is impossible, a creation of another body is necessary and the personal identity is preserved by the undying soul. One can hardly doubt that this was the opinion of these Corinthians, which the Apostle combatted so earnestly.

It is, I think, improbable that they denied a future life altogether, or a resurrection of some kind, but the resurrection of the dead, in the same sense as the resurrection of Christ, they evidently did not believe. But in this denying the resurrection of the dead, they were also denying the resurrection of Christ, and thus unintentionally, branding the Apostles as false witnesses. But what must their astonishment have been to hear the Apostle say also, that all those who had died in the faith, had perished, if they were not to be raised from the dead. Did the Apostle not believe that the soul—the real inward man—could exist just as well without a body as with one? And if so, supposing there never was a resurrection of the body that would not affect the existence of the man. Yet the Apostle says, "then they also that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished—if the dead rise not." He evidently thought that the personality of

the man was something material, for if the body is not raised, says Paul, "they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The same Apostle tells us that "life and immortality" was brought to light by Jesus Christ." This of itself, seems to us to involve the rejection by the inspired writers of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. For, supposing that doctrine to be true, the Apostle could not truly say that "life and immortality was brought to light by Jesus Christ," for the immortality of the soul was known to the Egyptians before the days of Moses. The silence of Moses with regard to that doctrine has occasioned some surprise amongst those who regard it as absolutely essential to religion. Not only is there no hint regarding the survival of the intelligent part of man, but the reverse is true. Again and again is it asserted that all intelligence ceases with the death of the person. In death, David remembers his God no more, he can no longer give God thanks nor praise His name. His thoughts have perished. The wicked cease from troubling, the weary are at rest. All go into one place, all are of the dust and all turn to dust again. Such is the language of the Old Testament regarding man in death. It is true there are many allusions regarding a future life in the Scriptures. But that life was to be entered upon by rising from the dust of the earth, where the multitude is represented as sleeping, and not by quitting the body at death, as those who believe in the soul's immortality imagine.

But the subject was involved in considerable obscurity previous to the resurrection of Christ. He gave a practical illustration of the mode in which eternal life or immortality is entered upon.

Outside of the Jewish commonwealth darkness reigned. There was plenty of speculative belief in the immortality of the soul, but in the presence of death that notion was powerless to impart comfort. As the Apostle says, they sorrowed as those who "have no hope." To these hopeless, despairing, mourners, the Gospel of life eternal, through faith in Jesus Christ, must have been indeed the bread of life. The effect of this doctrine is very strikingly shown in the inscriptions of the tombs of the dead, in the early days of Christianity. Joyful assurance of a resurrection unto life eternal, stands in contrast with hopeless, wretched despair.

Such to us is the teaching of the Scriptures on the future life. It is a gift from God, on the condition of faith and obedience. To those "who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, (God will give) 'life eternal.'" Those who despise the gift of God will receive the wages of sin, DEATH.

They will not live for ever, but be destroyed, body and soul, in the lake of fire. Such is an outline of the doctrine of

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,—I fail to discover much light from "Senex" or powerful "logical deductions" from "Spes." Poets and philosophers of all ages have extolled the wonders, sublimity and grandeur of the great temple of Nature, but they also sing and say there is decay at the roots of all and every thing in it, and yet "Spes" will put it "on the same footing with the existence and perfection of Divinity," and endeavour to show it teaches—"the immortality of humanity."

Sometimes we are told Heaven, or future life, is a "condition," not a place at all. What does our Saviour mean when he told His disciples, "In My Father's House are many mansions, if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you?"

Is it not wiser and more instructive to make our "logical deductions" from His teachings, than from "Nature" or "the Pyramids?" To a mind in doubt, or denying the divinity of Christ—His being Creator and God by nature, His teaching must come short of what it really is. The Christian, however, reasoning by Analogy from Material to Spiritual, looks on earthly mansions with all their elegancies, modern conveniences, and architectural beauty wherein man dwells the few short years he is here, and is satisfied that the Mansions God the great Architect of the Universe has prepared for his saints to live their "future life" will far exceed any thing in Nature! "Quartus" is right to request those writing on the subject to confine themselves to Scripture proof.

J. F. K.

CORPUS CHRISTI PROCESSION.

SIR,—You profess fair play toward all sects and creeds, and I must give you credit for giving a "hearing" to all in your paper. But are you quite fair toward the Roman Catholics in your last issue. You allude to the procession of Corpus Christi in very disparaging terms, as a nuisance and one that ought to be discontinued—that the Roman Catholics go out of their way to pass Protestant Churches. Mr. Editor, I have seen the procession of Corpus Christi for over forty years, and have never known an instance of the procession going out of its way to pass Protestant Churches. Indeed, from my own experience, Protestant Churches are more respectfully treated by the bands of the procession than by those of the volunteers. The procession is to the Catholic an act of devotion, and it says something for their principles when educated men humiliate themselves in the eyes of Protestants and publicly walk in procession. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that the procession is a means of grace. The devout Catholic believes in the teaching of his Church. You may sneer at this practise or that, at this relic or that as absurd. You may denounce the various doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as contrary to Scripture. You may ridicule the celibacy of the priests, the cloister, the confessional. The Roman Catholic has a very simple answer, "So the Church teaches, I believe the Church infallible."

Now, Mr. Editor, this doctrine is the foundation stone, the "Rock" on which the Roman Catholic Church is built, disprove this and then attack the practices and doctrine, but until this is done it is a waste of time and a source of irritation to discuss these topics. As for the Corpus Christi procession, I look upon it as a good means of keeping people from vice and wickedness for at least a half day. Anything that can keep 20,000 people from drinking, and sins in general is good, and this the procession does. In Brooklyn over 50,000 Sunday-School pupils parade the streets on the first of May. No one thinks of condemning this, and why not grant equal rights to Roman Catholics? My