

According to the teaching of White and Constable, where God forbids a sin, and does not publish a penalty, no penalty can be inflicted. Were this precious morality accepted, the members of a community, which had the Decalogue revealed from Heaven as their moral code, might deem themselves licensed, so far as exemption from penalty could license them, to murder, steal, and commit adultery, because the precepts forbidding these sins have no penalties attached to them. White tells us that even the "Chinese government considers itself obliged to read to the people periodically the Criminal Code."—Page 113. If so, it may be assumed that it has wisdom to do it, to make them familiar with the law, rather than merely to acquaint them with the penalty. We think it is manifest that neither of these modes of determining the meaning of the threatening given in Eden can satisfy any thoughtful and unbiased mind.

We shall now advance a step, and give some reasons why we cannot accept the view of death on which the doctrine of Conditional Immortality is based. We reject the doctrine.

1. Because it is based on an unfounded assumption, viz: that the primary and ordinary meaning of death is the cessation of existence, or the extinction of being. This notion pervades the reasonings of Annihilationists, and it is essential to the theory that this should be recognized as the primary meaning of the word. For only in this way can they hope to fasten such a meaning on death, as the threatened penalty of sin. We venture, however, to assert that it is a pure assumption, in support of which not one relevant fact can be adduced, and in opposition to which almost numberless facts array themselves.

Constable, with his usual boldness, claims the testimony of the dictionaries of all languages to the assertion. "that the primary and ordinary meaning of death is the extinction of being." He writes: "Every dictionary of every language of the earth is our witness of