

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

as in tithe rent-charge—25 per cent.—the real fall, in comparison, will be something very different.

For between the Commutation and 1878 the rental of (all) tithable lands rose from £100 to £165; tithe rent-charge to £112 only (showing how much of tithe-produce has gone to augment land-value, for it would have risen, under the tithe system, to at least the same height as land-rental). It is of course true that the rise of 65 per cent. does not apply to a vast number of individual parishes or properties. But, upon the evidence of the property-tax returns, it is true upon the whole. A fall of 25 per cent. upon £165 rental would have brought it down to £124, while the same fall on £112 tithe rent-charge has brought it down to £84. So that rental is still, on the whole, 24 per cent. above, while tithe rent-charge is 16 per cent. below, the central unit of 1836—a difference of 40 per cental. To bring it down to the present level of tithe rent-charge, it would require a reduction, from the rents of 1878, of no less than 49 per cent.

This answer ought in justice to have been emphasized in Mr. Bridge's Report as fully as the tithepayers' complaints. The editorial remarks of the leading newspapers clearly showed that this was not the case, and that the titheowner, because he had not made reductions on the rent-charge receivable, lies, without defence from Mr. Bridge, under the imputation of being less liberal than the landowner.

Thus much on the facts; but of course there remains the further answer, that the titheowner is liable to no reduction, beyond that of the averages, as between the occupier and himself. The occupier undertook all the risks of his tenancy (or, if landowner himself, of his purchase or inheritance), and it is with the landlord (or, if landowner, with his predecessor in title) that he must, if he can, settle, if his risks have been miscalculated.

C. A. STEVENS.

ART. II.—HADES.

WHAT is Hades? From the Homily on Prayer I make the following extracts: "The Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life, the one proper to the elect and blessed of God." "St. Augustine doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture." After quoting certain passages of the Scriptures,

and of the early writers, the sermon adds: "As the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell."¹ Now the teaching of the Church as regards the Homilies, is that they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times" (Art. xxxv.). The Church has not altered this doctrine. The doctrine that was "godly and wholesome" some 200 years ago, cannot be otherwise at any time: it cannot change its character. As to the necessity "for these times," we might have fondly hoped that no such necessity does or could exist at present, were it not that indications abound on every side that such teaching is an absolute necessity, when men are advocating, what I hope I do not miscall, a vast subterranean reformatory for the wicked after death; a third place, distinct from heaven and hell, into which, it is maintained, the souls of all men go on death. This place is called Hades, and it is described as being divided into two parts, separated the one from the other by a great chasm, and that there can be no passing from the one to the other, but that the souls dwelling in them respectively can see one another, and even converse. One of these divisions is called Paradise, and Abraham's bosom; the other, what? I cannot find out. One writer tells us that it is "the baneful side of Hades." Another, that it "is not Gehenna." Whence has arisen this idea of a third place, of which the Scriptures know nothing, and of the existence of which St. Augustine "doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture"? The only answer is, Paganism. The Jews derived the idea, like many others, from their Pagan surroundings, and we from them, or, indeed, even direct from the Pagans themselves. Early in the Christian era the Church and the State combined christened Paganism, and in so doing Paganized Christianity.

Hades is, however, a reality, not as a *place*, but a *state*. Its meaning, "unseen," is fitly represented by the old Saxon word of the same meaning, "Hell." We must carefully distinguish between these two, *state* and *place*; they are frequently confounded, as if there were no real distinction between them. On death the soul of everyone is in Hades, in the unseen state; the place of its dwelling until the resurrection is an altogether different idea. If the souls of the unbelieving dead are in conscious existence, I can only believe that they are in Gehenna. But are they in conscious existence? Old Testament Scripture is silent as to the intermediate state, as one of conscious existence. It connects the future life altogether with

¹ Pp. 355, 356, edition S.P.C.K., 1864.

the resurrection. It speaks of our Lord's soul being in Sheol, which answers to Hades, but Sheol is used for the grave in Psalm cxli. 7, "Our bones are scattered at Sheol's mouth." And it is said of Korah, and all his company, that they went down alive into Sheol, with their tents and household goods even all that appertained unto them. By no possibility can we conceive that Sheol here specifies a place where the souls of the dead are confined. So far as Old Testament revelation is concerned, we can entertain no other opinion than that on death man sleeps in an unconscious state until wakened by the trumpet-call of the resurrection.

When we come to the New Testament we find, as we shall see, sufficient evidence, yet not overwhelming, that the souls of the righteous dead are, while in the intermediate state, in "joy and felicity," conscious existence of course. Of the souls of the unrighteous dead we are left in the same ignorance as in the case of the Old Testament. The only passage that ever is, or could be, adduced in this reference is our Lord's narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. How little this applies I shall further on consider. I shall here extract from Bullinger's "Critical Lexicon and Concordance of the English and Greek New Testament:"

ᾠδης. Hades, the invisible. Gravedom. Greek for Hebrew Sheol, which denotes a hollow abyss or cavity, as does the old English word Hell, or hole. Hades therefore denotes the realm of the invisible, Graveland, Gravedom. All the graves of the world viewed as one. The one Grave of the human race, not the grave of an individual. Acts ii. 24-34 is quoted from Ps. xvi., and refers only to Christ's burial.

With regard to our Lord's promise to the robber on the cross, our interpretation will depend on the way in which we read the words. Shall we connect the words "to-day" with the verb "I say" or with the promise as to Paradise? Shall we read, "Verily to thee I say to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise;" or, "Verily to thee I say, To-day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise"? The latter is the reading both of the A.V. and the R.V. In reference to the former, I quote again from Bullinger:

Paradise. The later Jewish teaching made Paradise that part of *ᾠδης* reserved for the blessed. But *ᾠδης* is gravedom, whither all go on death, and Paradise is the place of the risen saints. The Scripture teaches that Paradise was the dwelling-place of God with men in the first heaven and earth. It was barred from man at the Fall, and destroyed at the Flood. It will reappear again at the regeneration (Matt. xix. 28), when God shall fulfil His promise, and make the new heavens and earth (Isa. li. 16, lxv. 17, lxvi. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xxii.), of which the millennial earth will be at once the pledge and foretaste. Hence the Scriptures relating to Paradise now, are all future, as the abode of *risen* saints, not of *dead* ones. (1) In Luke xxiii. 43 the Lord gives the dying

robber a present assurance, instead of a future remembrance—"Verily I say unto thee to-day"—the future fulfilment being required by the absence of *ὅτι* (compare Luke xxii. 34 and Matt. xxi. 28 with Mark xiv. 30, Luke iv. 21, and xix. 9). (2) In 2 Cor. xii. 4 the verb is ἀρπάζω—"catch away," not "up." (3) In Rev. ii. 7 the promise is clearly future, pointing to Rev. xxii.

As to *σήμερον*—to-day, this day—Bullinger states the rule as to its use:

When it comes after a verb, it belongs to that verb, unless it is separated from it, and thrown into the next clause by the presence of *ὅτι* (that); e.g. WITH *ὅτι*: Luke xix. 9, *Ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι σήμερον*—"But Jesus said unto him, that to-day" (or, this day is salvation come, etc.); Luke iv. 21, *ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι σήμερον*—"But He began to say unto them, that this day" (or, to-day is this Scripture fulfilled, etc.); Mark xiv. 30, *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σήμερον*, etc.)—"And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that this day" (i.e., to-day, before the cock crow, etc.).

WITHOUT *ὅτι*: Matt. xxi. 28, *καὶ, προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε, τέκνον, ὕπαγε σήμερον ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μου*, etc.—"And coming to the first, He said, Son, go to-day, work in My vineyard;" Luke xxii. 34, *λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ μὴ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ*, etc.—"I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before," etc.; Luke xxiii. 43, *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν σοι λέγω σήμερον, μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ*—"And Jesus said to him, Verily to thee I say this day, with Me shalt thou be in the paradise." The words *to-day* being made solemn and emphatic. Thus instead of a remembrance when He shall come in (*ἐν*, verse 42) His kingdom, He promises a presence then in association (*μετὰ*) with Himself. And this promise He makes on that very day when He was dying, but when the faith of the dying robber read aright the inscription above Him and the signs around Him. . . . We place this passage in harmony with numberless passages in the Old Testament—such as, "Verily I say unto you this day," etc.; "I testify unto you this day," etc.; Deut. vi. 6, vii. 11, viii. 1, x. 13, xi. 8, 13, 18, xix. 9, xxvii. 4, xxx. 2, etc., where the Septuagint corresponds to Luke xxiii. 43.

Although a grammatical reason is assigned for this reading of our Lord's words, it meets with scant courtesy from Alford, who says, *in loco*: "The attempt to join it with *σοι λέγω*, considering that it not only violates common-sense but destroys the force of our Lord's promise, is surely something worse than silly." "The Speaker's Commentary" remarks: "An old but forced construction connects it (*σήμερον*) with the preceding words, 'I say.'" Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary" passes over the construction without remark, though it evidently favours the reading of the A.V. and R.V.

The second place in the New Testament where Paradise is mentioned is 2 Cor. xii. 2-4. St. Paul informs the Corinthians that in vision he was "caught up" (A.V. and R.V.), *ἀρπαγέντα*—caught away—*ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ*—as far as the third heaven—"caught up"—caught away—*εἰς τὸν παράδεισον*—into the Paradise: combined we read, "caught away as far as the third heaven into the Paradise." This can by no ingenuity

be interpreted "descended into Hades," assumed, as it is, by some that Paradise is a region of that supposed place. St. Paul's statement implies either that the third heaven is identical with Paradise, or that Paradise is a region of that third heaven. Into this heaven ascended our Lord, and there abides "until the times of the restitution—re-institution—restoration (R.V.) of all things." And from thence "He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead."

The third mention of Paradise is in Rev. ii. 7: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life— $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ζωῆς, the life—which is in the Paradise of God." It is sufficient to say that the tree of the life is not in the region of death—it is not in Hades. This promise stretches into that region of life where the saints will enjoy their everlasting life, when Death and Hades shall cease to be.

St. Paul's statements in 2 Cor. v. 6-8, and Phil. i. 23, respectively, now come under consideration. They are, "knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord—willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord" (R.V., at home). And, "having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." In the exposition of the passages in Corinthians, we must take into account the whole context with which they are connected. In the opening of the chapter, St. Paul contrasts the tabernacle of the present body with the habitation of the future. "In this," he writes, "we groan, being burdened, longing to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." He then repudiates any wish to be disembodied, as in the words, "Not that we would be— $\delta\upsilon$ θέλωμεν—unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality— $\tau\acute{o}$ θνητὸν—(R.V., what is mortal) may be swallowed up of life"— $\delta\upsilon$ πὸ τῆς ζωῆς—by the life. Death triumphs until the resurrection, and then, and in it, the life triumphs. As in 1 Cor. xv., "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory," but not till then. After such a repudiation of the wish to be unclothed—that is, disembodied—we surely cannot suppose that at the same time he expresses a wish to be unclothed in order that he may be present with the Lord. Must we not then understand him to say, While we are at home in the present mortal body we are absent from the Lord, and are therefore willing to leave this body, and with it the present life, in which we groan, being burdened, and to receive the immortal body, in which we shall be ever present with Him?

This view is confirmed by what follows: "Wherefore we labour that, whether we are present or absent, we may be

accepted of Him ;" and the reason assigned being, "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, whether it be good or bad." This will only be on the resurrection. This view is further strengthened by 1 Thess. iv., where the Apostle more fully instructs us that on the descent of our Lord, at His second coming, both the dead and living saints shall be caught away together, as one body, to meet the Lord in the air, "and so shall we ever be with the Lord ;" ever with Him in our immortal and incorruptible bodies.

Phil. i. 23 must be dealt with in strict accordance with this. It is the same desire that is expressed in both passages. The Apostle here writes, "having the desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better." The word for "depart" is unusual—ἀναλῦσαι—which implies loosing and returning, as of a ship loosed from her moorings to go on her voyage and return to her berth. This force is in ἀνά, answering to the Latin *retro*. The word is found in Luke xii. 16, "when he will return from the wedding." Now St. Paul's statement is "having the desire εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι." This I can translate only, "for the return of, and the being with Christ," that is, the return of Christ, and our being with Him, in accordance with 1 Thess. iv. 17. The return of the Lord from heaven, and the return of His people from the grave synchronize, each being the complement of the other.

That this was always St. Paul's hope he himself fully declares to Timothy, 2 Epist. iv. 6-8. I give the passage as in R.V. :

For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course (race), I have kept the faith ; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day : and not only to me, but also to all them that love His appearing.

The Apostle is standing on the verge of the grave, having won the prize, the crown, in the Christian fight and Christian race, and is about to retire from the stadium of life—what is his hope ? That he shall receive the crown on his death ? No ! But when the Judge shall come forth and place it on his head in that day, and on the heads of all who with the Apostle have loved His appearing. The intervening state between death and the resurrection is altogether overlooked, as if it were not.

But if these passages do not warrant the belief of the conscious existence of the souls of the righteous during the intermediate state, on what can we base the belief ? We can base it on the new spiritual life—the ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτῷ—which is imparted to the soul by the new birth of the Holy Spirit. It is

God's own life, eternal and immortal, and which therefore can never sleep, can never be unconscious; and we can with truth use the words of the prayer in our Burial office, "Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." Yet is it a state of expectancy: they wait for their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory," when the body too shall be born in this spiritual life from the grave, and the perfected man shall, like Christ the head, live to die no more.

It is necessary to examine some passages where the word "Hades" occurs. Our Lord's promise in Matt. xvi. 18 is, "The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (the Church). *Hades*, not *Gehenna*, whose gates will never be opened, for God will "destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." In Rev. i. 18, we read: "I have the keys of Death and of Hades;" these two are connected promises of the resurrection. In Hades is the soul, and in Death is the body. The metaphor of gates and keys is employed—the keys shall unlock the gates within which, as it were, souls and bodies are respectively confined, and let them free, and then the song of triumph shall be raised, "O Death where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?" This implies that there was a sting, and a victory too. And there was both a sting and a victory. Sin, scorpion-like, infusing its poison into the body, did sting it to death, and Hades had its triumph over the soul. But now, in the resurrection, the poison of the sting is neutralized, and the cry rises, O Death, thy sting, it did its worst; it can do no more—I live for ever! Hades, thou hadst thy victory; now is it reversed: thy gates shall close on me no more—I triumph over thee for ever!

And again, we have these two states presented to us in Rev. xx. 13, for the last time, as first delivering up the dead—souls and bodies respectively—which were in them, and then they themselves utterly destroyed, "cast into the lake of fire," as being enemies to the perfect bliss of God's saints. In these three passages in the Revelation, and in vi. 8, we have Death and Hades connected. If Hades be a place while Death is a state, we have an incongruity unparalleled. But when soul and body are separated, Death is the *state* of the body, the grave its *place*; and Hades is the *state* of the soul, Heaven, in the case of the saints, its *place*. The reunion of soul and body is the destruction of both states: "there shall be no more death."

"He descended into Hell" now claims our attention. This Article of the present Apostles' Creed has a history of its own.

The original is "Descendit ad inferos," most wrongly translated "He descended into Hell" (Hades). The correct translation is, He descended to those beneath. "Those beneath" describes the dead in their graves. The statement is no more than "He was buried." I give the history in the words of the Dean of Wells in his recent work, "The Spirits in Prison." He writes :

The history of the insertion of this article of the Creed presents many curious features. On the assumption that the rule of Vincent of Lerius, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," is the measure and test of truth, it would not be difficult to construct a tolerably strong case against it. It does not appear in any of the earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed. It is not recognised in that of Nicæa, either as first drawn up in A.D. 325, or as expounded at Constantinople, or as reaffirmed at Ephesus or Chalcedon. It is wanting so far in the authority which the consent of the first four Ecumenical Councils has given to other dogmas. It was not found in the time of Rufinus, in the creeds either of Rome or of the Churches of the East, probably only in that of Aquileia. It might even seem at first to be tainted with an heretical origin, having made its first appearance as part of any dogmatic formula in the creed which was put forward by the Arian party at the Council of Ariminum (A.D. 359). For nearly three centuries more it was still in the background, not appearing in the creeds of the East; sometimes found, sometimes not found, in those of the West. When it next meets us it is in the Confessions of Faith which serve as transition steps towards the so-called Athanasian Creed, and which was published at the fourth (A.D. 633) and seventh (A.D. 693) of the Councils of Toledo. It occurs without an explanation in the pseudo-Athanasian Creed. I have not shrunk from stating the facts of the case thus clearly, even though they may seem to make against the claims of this doctrine on our assent. They are instructive as reminding us that those claims do not rest on the decrees of councils, nor even on the most ancient formularies of Christian antiquity. Members of the Church of England might view even a much stronger case with comparative equanimity. It will be enough for them to remember that they have given their assent to this as to other articles of the faith, expressly on the ground that it may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ (art. viii., pp. 75, 76).

I am not writing in reply to the Dean of Wells, so that I shall not delay to point out the very ingenious way in which he has virtually tacked the eighth of our Articles on to the third, as if the words of the former had special reference to the descent into Hades, which is the subject of the latter, and quotes as if the Articles were one.

Bullinger also notes the late introduction of the Article into the Apostles' Creed. "The Article," he writes, "of the Apostles' Creed which implies an additional thought was added about A.D. 400, and is contained in no creed prior to A.D. 400, when it was used as the equivalent for the previous fact 'buried.'" This suggests to me another thought. At what time is it maintained that our Lord descended into the supposed abode, Hades? Was it on the moment of His death? or after His burial? If the former, then the Article is misplaced, and we

should read, "Crucified, dead, descended into hell, was buried." But whether we read as here, or as generally in the Creed, what incongruity! Of such the Scriptures are never guilty. For three of the averments refer to Christ bodily, as do all the other averments of the Creed, and this one alone, according to the Dean, to Christ out of His body. However, according to the order of the Creed, as we have it now, Christ descended into hell after His burial. Verily those who slipped it into the Creed were blunderers.

Let me reason briefly on the historic facts here presented to us. The words "*descendit ad inferos*" were unknown to the Apostles' Creed for centuries, and therefore formed no part of the true ancient Creed of the Church. It was not until after the lapse of seven or eight centuries that they crept at all generally into the Creed of the West, and then absolutely without authority. The Dean's reason for insisting on the truth of his interpretation of the dogma is stated in the following words: "In spite of that absence (of authority) it entered into the Creed of Christendom almost from the first"—*almost*, Mr. Dean, you admit, but not *from the first*—"and was associated with the belief that it represented the continuance in the unseen world of the redeeming work that had been completed on the Cross." How strange, the continuance of a work completed!

The Article does not appear in the Nicene Creed. This is the Creed of the Catholic Church. Why does it not appear in that which was an expansion of the Apostles' Creed? Was the Article before the Nicene Fathers at all? Can we suppose that they were ignorant of it? This is scarcely possible. But if they were, can there be a stronger argument against its existence as Catholic truth, known to and taught by the Apostles? But on the supposition that they were acquainted with it, its omission from the Creed they drew up is most significant. It must have arisen from one of two reasons: either because it was untrue, or superfluous, being identical with "He was buried," which they retained. And this latter is confirmed by the Athanasian Creed, which omits "He was buried," and contains the other form of the same truth. There is tautology in the Apostles' Creed as in our present use. In the Scriptures the word "descended" is not used in connection with Hades. Our Lord, like all other human beings, on His death descended into the grave; "He was buried," while His soul *went*, not *descended*, into the unseen state, called Hades. It is attempted to utilize Eph. iv. 8-10. But what was the ascent decides what was the descent. He ascended from the earth to the heaven above, as He had descended from the heaven to the earth in His incarnation. "The lower

parts of the earth" mean either "the low-lying earth," or, if anything more, they refer to His burial in the grave, from which He did ascend to earth's surface first, and thence to heaven." "He led captivity captive," is interpreted to mean "He brought with Him out of Hades a multitude of captives;" but this is to invert the plain meaning of the words, which is, not that He freed from captivity, but that He took captive, made captive, led into captivity.

It remains now to consider the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. Is this a parable? It is not so called by St. Luke. The Lord suddenly introduces the narrative without any hint that He is about to utter a parable. Archbishop Trench remarks, "The question about which there has been such a variety of opinion from the first, namely, whether this be a parable or a history (history real or fictitious, it matters not), does in fact wholly depend on the manner in which it is interpreted: if the ordinary interpretation be the right one, it is certainly not, in the strictest sense of the word, a parable." He says also, "according to that (interpretation) commonly received, it is certainly no parable, the very essence of that order of composition being that one set of persons and things is named, another is signified; they are set over against one another." Does this narrative comply with these conditions? It is a narrative—is it real or fictitious? Surely the latter. There are two kinds of fictitious narratives: one, a narrative of possibilities; the other, of impossibilities. The former is the parable; the latter, the fable. Jotham's narrative of the trees seeking a king belongs to the latter. (Judges viii. 8-15.) In this category I place the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus. It is full of impossibilities. That there should in reality be a place for disembodied souls to be gathered, divided into two quarters, separated by an impassable chasm, and where, notwithstanding, the souls of the righteous and of the unrighteous can behold each other, and hold converse, recognising each other as when in life in their bodies, is an impossibility to all except the highly imaginative, and those whose eschatology is irrespective of the resurrection; and yet the resurrection is the centre and circumference of Bible eschatology. Moreover, Abraham is represented as being lord of life and death, who had the power to raise Lazarus from the dead, and to despatch him to the rich man's house; a power that belongs to God alone. Abraham is also represented as having Lazarus in his bosom, a place totally inadequate for all the departed righteous to congregate in. For it is not the place which the Jews supposed, borrowing the idea from the Pagans, and which they designated Abraham's bosom, that is here presented to us, but the actual

bosom of the patriarch, for Abraham is addressed by Dives, and holds a conversation with him. Then finger and tongue are spoken of, which are utterly out of place when the body with all its members is separated from the soul. Then we have the cold water. Where was it to come from? Had Abraham it?—or was it in the flames? Could it be conceived as being in such a place? Moreover, the request, “dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue.” A drop of water hanging from a finger in the midst of burning flame! Impossible! And equally impossible that any alleviation of suffering could result from such a touch, even if such were possible. Yes, it is a narrative of impossibilities! Further, Lazarus is represented as having been carried, on his death, without burial—not his soul, but himself, else his finger could not have been spoken of—into Abraham’s bosom. But Abraham was dead, and the dust of his bosom was lying in the cave of Machpelah. Also, the rich man was buried, and through the grave passed into the flame—not his soul, but his whole self, for he speaks of his tongue. I can well suppose that it was the mistaken view of this fable that led the corrupters of the Creed, about the seventh century, to teach that our Lord descended through the grave into Hades, which is virtually taught by the order of the Articles as we have them now.

Our Lord spake this fable to reveal great spiritual truth. He depicts a Sadducee, one who denied a future existence and connected judgment. He is not charged with anything unbecoming his station in life. He kindly permitted the poor Lazarus, loathsome with uncovered sores, to lie at his gate, and be fed with the broken meat from his table; but he was an unbeliever in the revelation of the Scriptures as to the future; and this unbelief entails eternal condemnation: “between us and you (*ὁμῶν*), there is a great gulf (chasm) fixed, that they which would (*οἱ θέλοντες*) pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross from thence to us” (R.V.). He further petitions Abraham to send Lazarus to his father’s house, to testify unto his five brethren, “lest they also come into this place of torment”—testify to them that there is a future existence and future judgment, for they too were unbelievers. Abraham’s answer is that the Scriptures are sufficient, “Moses and the prophets.” “Nay,” is the unbelieving remonstrance, “but if one goes to them (*ἀπὸ*) from the dead, they will repent” (change their mind); virtually this means, not the Scriptures, but a miracle. The crushing reply is, “If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from (*ἐκ*) the dead.” These are the lessons the narrative was intended to impress: the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as the revelation of a future

existence and future judgment; and the fearful results of unbelief of that revelation. And that revelation, from first to last, connects that existence with the resurrection, which will be the consummation and full revelation of the now only partially and imperfectly revealed truth of the future life. The idea of a third place, distinct from Heaven and Gehenna, whose origin is remote in the paganism of Babylon, and was adopted by the Jews, and accommodated to their peculiar religious opinions, and was also accepted generally by Christendom, with further additions, is calculated to throw and has thrown into the background, if not actually disparaged, the resurrection, which is the great factor in the eschatology of the Bible, and with which St. Paul so connects the future life, that if resurrection be not, there can be no future existence for us: "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die" (1 Cor. xv. 32).

I should not pass over without notice, that in the third of the Thirty-nine Articles, "the descent into hell" is treated of as distinct from the burial. Taking into account the fact that the Homilies, which repudiate a third place, and the Articles were drawn up by the same hand, we cannot interpret Hell in the Article as a third *place*, and must therefore understand it to mean the invisible *state*, into which our Lord's human soul went on His death, and so continued while it was separated from His body. The whole Article is intended to express that our Lord's death was real, similar to the deaths of all men. We cannot, I submit, construe strictly the words "went down." They were taken from "*descendit ad inferos*," the descent being into the grave, though here applied to Hell, the incorrect translation of "*inferos*."

Briefly to state my positions:

1. The souls of all men are, on death, in Hades, the invisible *state*, not *place*.

2. The souls of the righteous dead, while in this state, are in "the Paradise," that is, Heaven, where Christ is, and are there waiting their resurrection for the consummation of their salvation, when they shall appear with Him in glory.

3. The Scriptures are silent as to the souls of the unrighteous dead, whether during this state they are conscious or unconscious.

4. There will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the righteous and the unrighteous, when all shall be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive the things done in the body.

5. The two states, Death and Hades, shall, on the reunion of soul and body in the resurrection, cease to be; there shall be no more death.

6. The words, "He descended into Hell," originally imported only our Lord's burial, and were blunderingly slipped into the Apostles' Creed about the seventh century, without any authority—the words "ad inferos" being in the Creed, as we have it, improperly translated "into hell."

7. As in the Creed at present they are tautological.

I cannot more suitably conclude than with the prayer in our Burial Service, already partially quoted, "that it may please Thee, of Thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL.



ART. III.—THE PRESENT PHASES OF THE MOHAMMEDAN QUESTION (SECOND ARTICLE).

THE growing numbers of its sectaries "point to Mohammedanism becoming one day dominant over a very large part of the continent of Africa. At present large numbers of negroes are Mohammedans only in name, and have not an intelligent acquaintance with the distinctive tenets of their own creed. In another generation or two they will probably be as fanatical and bigoted, and as difficult to deal with, as the Mohammedans of the Turkish Empire." These are the words not of yesterday, nor of one who criticised missionary enterprise, but they were spoken on October 20th, 1875, in the Church Missionary House, Salisbury Square, at a conference on missions to the Mohammedans, and they were spoken by General Lake, then one of the honorary secretaries of the Society. He also said, "In Africa for Mohammedans but little has been done, because little has been attempted," a statement of the case which unhappily is as true of to-day as it was then.

Of this progress in Africa, Bosworth Smith writes, "One half of the whole of Africa is already dominated by Islam, while of the remaining half a quarter is leavened and another threatened by it."¹ This is to claim the ground wherever a

¹ *Nineteenth Century* for last December, p. 796. As my references to this article, as also to his book, "Mohammed and Mohammedanism" (edition 1876), will be critical, I should like to acknowledge here the great amount of invaluable matter and suggestion there is in both. It strikes me that the author in his book did not quite do justice either to