Chapter 1

Previous preparations before reading

Let's keep our concepts clear

Sometimes concepts are not clear in our mind because we have never answered for ourselves, categorically, the questions that arise. To help keep our concepts clear, I have presented the following questionnaire to be answered before reading.

In order to express a rather cloudy concept, we sometimes have made-up phrases or words. This concept we have stored in our minds, and in spite of the fact that we don't have it clearly established, we want others to understand it and accept it without defining it or proving it.

Before reading this book it would help for the reader to answer for himself the questions I ask in the questionnaire. This, I do in order that the reader has his ideas and concepts about the soul clearly and well defined.

Since the questionnaire will not leave his hands, the reader can be honest in answering. This will help him greatly in later reasoning. **Here is the questionnaire.**

Previous and Pre-reading and Private questionnaire to clear up the reader's own concept on the soul

Mark with an "X" the answer that most resembles your concepts, or write it out if required. You may have to mark more than one line in one question.

1-	What is the human soul:
	_It is a spiritual entity that lives in a flesh body.
	_It is the entire body of the human being when it has the God given breath of life.
	_None of the above. The soul simply does not exist.
	_The soul is the following:
	_ In the person's brain.
	_ In the person's brain In the person's kidneys.
	_ In the soul, which is the spiritual entity living a body of flesh.
	_ In the heart.
	_ In the heartThey live in the following:
	_

4-If someone would tell you he met with a relative of yours, you automatically assume that relative exists.
Yes No Don't know
5-Do you believe that a non-existing thing could meet with another non-existing thing? Yes No Don't know
6-What does the word "spirit" mean?
It is the power that fuels matter on all living things, from a microbe to an elephant or a man.
It is the air we breathe, thus the Greek is used the word "pneuma", which means "air".
Soul and Spirit are one and the same.
The Bible sometimes uses "spirit" when referring to a non-carnal being, and some other times in place of the word "soul".
7-What is the human being
It is a flesh and bones being just like animals, no different than they, with the exception of being more intelligent.
It is a spiritual being living in a body of flesh.

('\20	l continues	Continues to exist
	ises to exist	Continues to exist
D0	1 t Kilow	
9-Is th	e soul indest	tructible?
Yes	No	Don't know
10-Do	vou boliovo	that the souls of the dead
	benefit the	
_		Don't know
		2 on vinio (<u> </u>
11-Wh	at is the bre	eath of life?
Sin	ple breathin	g
The	soul of a pe	erson
Do	n't know	
The	spirit of the	e living
12 Day	a :4	ongo to gov that a non ovig
1 2-1706		ense to say that a non-exis
being i	NIA	Don't know
being i	No	Don't know
being i	_ No	Don't know
being i Yes		
being i Yes	s it make s	Don't know ense to say that a non-exis
Yes	es it make se s resting?	ense to say that a non-exis
Yes	es it make se s resting?	
Yes	es it make se s resting?	ense to say that a non-exis
yes 13-Doe being i Yes	es it make so s resting? _ No	ense to say that a non-exis
yes 13-Doo being i Yes	es it make so s resting? _ No	ense to say that a non-exis

What are the main affirmations of those who deny the existence of soul as a spiritual being living in a body of flesh?

The doctrine that denies the existence of the soul also denies that such doctrine denies it. Since the word "soul" is in the Bible so many times, and that doctrine **cannot deny** it, these people maintain they do believe in the soul, but instead they change the meaning of the word "soul", and say that it means the coming together of the body and the breath. In other words, to this doctrine any living person is a soul, and when this person dies the soul disappears, ceases to exist, just as if it had never existed.

When one points out the passages that talk about a soul speaking with a live being, as in the case of the transfiguration, they allege that it is merely a vision and did not really occur. The same applies to the rich man and Lazarus, and with everything that is shown to them.

When asked how a human being will resurrect if he has no soul at the time of death, this erroneous doctrine says that God keeps them in his memory.

According to this heretic belief, possibly inherited from those who believe in evolution, **the human** being is no different than the animals, except that it is more intelligent.

The anti-soul doctrine alleges that if the unbodied soul existed it would be an injustice, because some souls would suffer more than others, since one who died three thousand years ago would have suffered more than one who dies today.

*

Summary of this book and its thesis

This book deals <u>exclusively</u> with the existence of the soul as a different entity, apart from the flesh body. In other words, the soul is a spiritual being living in a flesh body. What this book contains is the Bible passages and the reasoning that prove that the human soul, as an entity of its own, apart from the body, does exist. It also refutes the false argument of the anti-soul doctrine.

To believe in the existence of the soul as a separate spiritual entity, apart from the body, does not mean that one believes that the soul is indestructible, for Jesus himself says it can be destroyed in Gehenna.

To believe in the existence of the soul does not mean that one believes that the soul of a dead person can communicate with a living person. That is prohibited by God and therefore God will not allow a soul that is in the justly place he deserves (Heaven or Hell) to leave such place.

As per those who say can communicate with the dead, more than 99.9...% is pure talkativeness, and in the very rare rest, they are demons acting through certain persons that lend themselves to it, as in the case of the medium from Endor.

In spite of being such a clear reality, the antisoul doctrine <u>pretends to understand</u> that those who believe in the existence of the soul as a separate spiritual entity, also believe in the communication between the living and the dead. They pretend to believe it because it is the only way to "prove" that they have a good argument against the belief that the soul exists.

The souls that are in heaven cannot see or hear what happens on Earth, and much less in a

selective way, as in knowing what is happening to their family at a given moment. They know what is happening on Earth only by what they are told by the new souls arriving, and that, if among the great multitude of souls arriving there, they can detect one who knew their loved ones, friends, town, country, etc..

*

What is wrong with believing that the soul does not exist

To start, every false doctrine is of satanic origin. The truth is from God; lies were invented by the Devil. That is enough for any Christian to seek the truth about whether the soul is the same flesh body with breath, or if it is a separate spiritual entity living in a body of flesh.

Another reason is that this doctrine makes the individual believe that his sins are only punishable by death, in other words, ceasing to exist. According to this belief, there is no Hell to pay for what one has done. But since the word "Hell" appears so many times in the Bible, this false doctrine also changes its meaning, saying that Hell is nothing but the tomb. They deny the existence of Hell, because they admitted it they had to admit also that soul does exist.

*

Which steps we will take to prove that the soul exists apart from the body

a) I will demonstrate that our Lord Jesus Christ, who himself was a spiritual being alongside his Father God, introduced himself in a human body. If

a human being is only flesh, the Lord would not introduce himself in someone else's body, as demons do. Chapter 2.

- **b)** God is not the God of the dead but of the living. Therefore, when the Bible says that God is the God of people who have died, it is saying that those people still live in spite of their bodies having died, which shows that the soul exists. Chapter 2.
- c) I will introduce several passages which show that the soul is something different than the body, and under no circumstance should we say that the living body is the soul. Chapter 3.
- **d)** Right in the book of Ecclesiastes, which is the basis which the anti-soul doctrine uses to back their heretic belief, we can prove that the spirit is not the air we breathe. Chapter 3.
- e) We will reason on the reality that those beings that do exist cannot meet with beings that do not exist. Much less beings that do not exist could meet with other non-existing beings; which prove that the soul exists as a separate entity form the body. Chapter 4.
- **f)** We will see how God's prophets considered Him the God of spirits, not the God of bodies. Chapter 5.
- **g)** By the way the biblical characters speak we can tell that all of them believed in a non-material soul living in a flesh body. Chapter 5.
- h) In this section I will demonstrate that if the soul did not exist, if the human being would be only matter, we would have to conclude that the bad "chemical" feelings of a person would not be their fault, since they know nothing about chemistry. Chapter 6.
- i) On the issue of Christ's Second Coming we can also show that the soul does exist, since our Lord

Jesus Christ brings them with Him. In order to negate these realities these sects have to use a sort of juggling of words that makes no sense. Chapter 7.

- **j**) Since the Bible says clearly that the souls that do not accept Jesus' forgiveness will end up in Hell, we see that the soul does live apart from the body it inhabited. Chapter 8.
- **k**) Peter says that Christ preached to those that had been dead before the crucifixion, therefore the soul exists. To deny this, the anti-soul doctrine invents a fairy tale about angels marrying human females. Chapter 9.
- 1) One of the pseudo arguments used by the antisoul doctrine refers to Paradise and the thief at the cross. I will demonstrate in this section the error in this belief. Chapter 10.
- **m**) I will show the absurdity of believing that the dead rise with their own previous personality because they were in God's memory, and not because their soul existed. Chapter 10.
- **n**) The original sin affects only the flesh of human beings, not their souls. Chapter 11.
- o) The difference between the soul and the spirit is comparable to that between human beings and animals. Chapter 12.
- **p**) The theory of a "warehouse" of created souls, where they are kept until they are sent to bodies here on earth. Chapter 13.

*

Why I number my lines

It is my belief that every author that holds a thesis must be accessible for discussion with those who disagree on the subject, and should not hide inside an ivory tower so opponents cannot argue and prove him wrong. Therefore I number each line so that anyone who wishes to object anything I say can easily point out where it was said, by just mentioning the line numbers. For example, this explanation is between lines 319 and 328.

>

Summary of Chapter 1. This chapter is dedicated to prepare ourselves to start reading; a reading that at the same time is a debate. I add a small questionnaire in order to clear up certain preconceived concepts the reader may have on the issue.

Then there is the section in which I show the main affirmations of this false doctrine that denies the existence of the soul as a separate entity from the body. Later I explain the contents of the book and what is harmful in believing this doctrine, finishing up the chapter by saying in a brief way how we will show the errors of the affirmations of this erroneous anti-soul doctrine, and why I number the lines in the books I write.

Chapter 2

We can tell the soul exists by the words of the divine beings

Christ would not inhabit the body of another person, demons do that

The anti-soul doctrine says that the human being is but a breathing body; that the living body is in itself a "living soul"; that everything in the human body is physical; that there is nothing spiritual in him.

According to the anti-soul doctrine the personality of the human being lies in the brain. There live, according to this heresy, the feelings, the personality, etc..

If, as the doctrine says, the body is simultaneously a soul, there can't be any doubt that when a body is conceived, so is a soul. Therefore, at any given moment in which a pre-existing being enters a human being, that body is home to two personalities.

"And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb" (Lk 2:21)

Jesus existed in Heaven before being introduced in the body of the baby conceived in the belly of the Virgin Mary. How then, can a pre-existing being enter a living soul (the body of the baby that Mary had) that has already a brain, and therefore a personality? In other words, according to this heretic doctrine there were two different beings, two personalities inside that body. One would be the

personality of the "living soul" or conceived body within Mary, and the other would be the personality of the Christ that came from Heaven.

They could not negate this duality because according to this doctrine the body is a living soul in itself, while Jesus came from the outside.

So as we can see, to assume the **non** existence of the soul leads us to the absurd thought of imagining Jesus inside the body of another being who is at the same time a "living soul" with its own personality, feelings and thoughts.

Christ existed before the world was. When he came to Earth the only thing he did was to "clothe" himself in flesh, but his "self", his personality, his thoughts and feelings were still the same he brought from Heaven.

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee **before the world was**". (Jn 17:5)

Therefore, we must conclude that this anti-soul doctrine is mistaken. The truth is that Jesus, the man, the person of Jesus Christ, had a flesh body, and his own "self". In other words, that person everyone saw had the body born of Mary and the spiritual being come from Heaven.

He had a body of flesh; and living inside that body was the sacred spiritual being that had come from Heaven. So if Jesus was a spiritual being "clothed" in flesh, why not us?

If Jesus was more than just flesh, his personality, his "self", was not in the flesh, because he existed before coming to the flesh he inhabited. In other words, his feelings, his knowledge, his way of being and thinking, in a word, his personality, did not live

in the flesh in which he was clothed, nor in its brain, but in the spiritual being that came to live in it. Furthermore, it is evident that the flesh, including the brain, is not what gives a person his feelings, thoughts, personality, etc.. If a breathing body is a soul, then when Jesus resuscitated and ascended to Heaven, He would go there riding into the soul of someone else. Consider how many absurdities you have to accept when you believe those heretic doctrines.

Why then, do so many deny the existence of the soul? God created our soul and it comes to live in a body of flesh when God sends it. Our feelings, our thoughts, our inclinations, in other words, our "self", and our personality is not in our brains, is not in the flesh that rots. It is in the soul, in the entity which is not a carnal entity and comes to live in our flesh when God sends it.

If it were not so, we would have to assume an enormous blunder: that there were two people in the body of Christ: one that was formed by the flesh and its brain, which according to this doctrine makes a "living soul", with its feelings, thoughts, etc.; and the other, Christ, who introduced himself in that body. In other words we would have to admit the foolishness that Christ lived in one body with two personalities: one, that of Christ that came from Heaven; the other, the human body that when developing its own brain, heart, kidneys, etc., would have its own personality, different than that of Christ's.

If according to this heretic doctrine the feelings, thoughts, and all of the human being lives in the brain, then we have to foolishly reach one of two conclusions: either Christ inhabited someone else's body, just as demons do, or the body of Christ did

not have a brain, which is where this doctrine places the personality, thoughts, feelings, etc., which is an even more foolish conclusion.

*

God is not the god of the dead, but of the living, therefore souls exist

God is the God of the living souls, not of the dead bodies. The Sadducees did not believe in the existence of the soul. Neither do their modern homologous.

If the soul did not exist apart from the body, then Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not exist anywhere at that moment when the angel at the burning bush told Moses, in present tense, that God was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But they did exist at that moment because the angel tells him in present tense that God was the God of those patriarchs, and here, in the following passage, Jesus himself says that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living

"31 But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying: 32 <u>I am</u> the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living". (Mt 22:31-32)

If after saying that, Jesus reassures that his Father is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that is because they existed and not because they had ceased to exist. Since these patriarchs' bodies had decomposed in their tombs, the only thing to which Jesus could refer to as living, as existing, was their

souls. **Therefore the soul exists,** apart from the body, as a spiritual entity.

If, as stated by this heretic doctrine, the soul did not exist, the patriarchs that had died could not exist, because their decomposed bodies were in their tombs. And if they did not live at that moment when the angel was speaking, then God could not be their God, for Jesus says that God is the God of the living, not of the dead. How then, could God say "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob?"

"Moreover he said: I <u>am</u> the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God".

(Ex 3:6)

In the passage with the burning bush, God does not say, "I will be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob when they resurrect", and He does not say, "I was their God when they were alive". He clearly said that He was, right at that moment when he spoke, the God of the three patriarchs. Therefore they were alive then, in spite of their decomposed bodies. Therefore, the soul does exist.

The Holy Spirit would not give useless instructions to non-existing beings

The instructions given below by the Holy Spirit would only be useful for the martyrs of the Great Tribulation; if not for them, these instructions were totally useless.

If the souls under the altar really did not exist, as the anti-souls say, then it is absurd to believe that the Holy Spirit is giving useless instructions to people that do not exist. This is the kind of foolishness and absurdities that the fanatical sectarianism leads to.

The existence of a soul apart from the body, as something that really is the true personality of the human being, is clearly defined in this passage shown below. Those who do not want to believe in the existence of the soul, say that the human being is in itself "a soul". In other words, the body plus the "breath of life", as they call it, constitute a soul. That is what they say, makes "the soul". So, if that flesh rots, that "breath of life" cannot think, or feel, or communicate with God nor anything. However, according to this passage the soul does exist as a spiritual entity separate from the flesh body it lives in. Let's see.

"9 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. 10 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? 11 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 6:9-11)

We see that John sees the souls; therefore the soul is something that can be seen in the spiritual realm. If the soul did not exist, John could not have seen them, they simply did not exist. John would not

make up something that did not exist, for it would confuse the readers; and much less would the One who inspired the visions: the Holy Spirit.

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

If John had known that the soul did not exist, he would not have invented the concept of the soul, nor would he have brought it from some pagan religion, and apply it to a Christian vision; and much less would the Holy Sprit who led him in these visions.

If John would have wanted to mention the dead Christians on Earth, and believed that the soul did not exist, he would not have said he saw the souls of the dead, he would have said he saw the people that had died.

If the knowledge that the human being was a soul only while the flesh was alive, was in John's mind structure, he would not have thought of calling them "souls" when speaking about those brethren whose body had separated from their "breath of life" and had rotten. He would not have done it because then he would have known that they were not a soul now. He would have known that they did not even exist, so he would not just invent a heretic concept, nor would he bring it from any pagan religion. That is what those who don't believe the soul does exist say is done by those who believe in the existence of soul. Neither would he say that they spoke, thought, remembered, and felt, because these would be, in his mind structure, attributes of the flesh.

For the same reason he would have never said they were given white robes, because the "breath of life" cannot be clothed, like angels do, and other spiritual beings. Neither would anyone have spoken to them to answer their question or give them instructions, because they did not really exist. And those instructions would not apply to other brethrens. In other words, these instructions were not even good to teach others.

Those who do not believe in the existence of the soul imagine that the Holy Spirit gave useless instructions to people that did not exist.

*

The Lord Jesus Christ says you can kill the body but not the soul

The anti-soul doctrine says that the human being does not have a soul, but is in itself a soul. It says that the soul is the result of the union of body and the breath. In this verse, **Jesus Christ himself marks the difference between the soul and the body.**

If this heretic doctrine is right, and the body and the soul are the same thing, it would be illogical for Jesus to mention the possibility for a human being to be able to destroy the body of a Christian, but not his soul. If a person were merely body and breath, by destroying the body they would destroy the soul. But we see that, evidently, it is not the case. The best part of this argument is that the Russellist translation of this verse has not been altered.

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell". (Mt 10:28)

Those who deny the existence of the soul say that the person does not have a soul, but is a soul. If that were true when we kill a human being we kill a soul; there would be no way for someone to destroy a body without destroying the soul at the same time. So as we can see, Jesus, who knew more than all the anti-souls put together, clearly says that someone can kill a human body but he can't kill a human soul.

 If a human being, instead of being a soul living in a flesh body, would be a soul, then another human being could kill a soul, because that is what the person being killed is. Every time someone commits murder a soul would be destroyed. But Jesus says that **no one**, **only God** can destroy a soul.

One other thing that can be assumed from this verse is that **Christ placed more importance on the soul than on the body.** Therefore the soul is the real person. The body is nothing but the clothing of the soul, the clothing of the person.

We can also see here that souls are not going to suffer eternally in Hell, but they will be destroyed at some point; <u>I suppose</u> after they pay for the suffering they caused others. I think that because the Lord says clearly that God can destroy the soul in Hell.

*

Christ differentiates between body and soul

Here Jesus makes a difference between body and spirit. He says the spirit is willing, or ready. We can see that, what Jesus calls "spirit" is not a simple "breath of life", but something that wants to be ready, but lives in a fleshly body that gets in the way or derails it.

"Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak". (Mt 26:41)

We can see that the Lord recognized that His disciples' souls wanted to do the right thing, and watch in prayer, but their tired flesh prevented it. It is evident that Christ marked a difference between body and soul.

If the soul did not exist, what is being thrown into Hell?

The denominations that deny the existence of the soul usually deny the existence of Hell as well, but in this passage we can see that there has to be a soul as something different than a living body. They deny the existence of Hell, because if they admitted that it exists, they'd have to admit also that souls do exist.

"4 And I say unto you my friends: **Be not** afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. 5 But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into Hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him".

(Lk 12:4-5)

In this verse's translation, Russellists claim that we should fear the one who "after killing has the authority to throw into **Gehenna**". (Because Russellists deny the existences of Hell, they use the word Gehenna.) Evidently they are referring to God, who is the only one with such authority. If the

soul did not exist, if the human being were only a body, what would be thrown into Gehenna after he has been stripped of his life and his "soul" has been destroyed? If they have taken his life, the only thing left is the cadaver. What would Herod care, who died centuries ago, if his body is thrown into Gehenna, given that he is no longer existent; he does not feel or hurt.

If when the body dies, the person ceases to exist, (because they say that soul don't exist), then, what is cast into Gehenna after death? If the human being has no soul but is only body, and man is cast in Gehenna, then, what is Gehenna, just an incinerator of corpses? Remember that this passage says that "after being killed they are thrown into Gehenna. If there is no soul, only the body remains.

If on the other hand Gehenna (or Hell) is the tomb, as some claim, why should we fear (as the verse states) to be thrown into the tomb after we are dead? After all, both the righteous and unrighteous end up in the tomb anyway. **And if the soul did not exist,** why fear more peril even after death?

*

Summary of Chapter 2. The anti-soul doctrine teaches that the personality and emotions of a person are in the brain. Since Christ came from Heaven to inhabit a conceived body in the womb of the Virgin Mary, this doctrine would have to admit the absurd fact that the Lord lived in a stranger's body, like demons do. That is blasphemy.

From the mouth of Christ himself we know that God is the God of the living, not of the dead. So if He is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, it is because their souls existed at the moment it was spoken.

According to Rev 6:9-11 we can conclude that there is a soul, since the Holy Spirit would not give useless instructions to people that do not exist.

The Lord Jesus himself says we can kill the body but not the soul. Therefore, they are both different. He makes the same difference between body and soul when He says that the spirit is willing, but not the flesh. Also when He says we should fear he who, can cast us into Gehenna after having been killed.

Chapter 3

Let us see some passages that prove that the body is different than the soul

If the soul leaves the body, then the body cannot be the soul

According to the doctrine that denies the existence of the soul, the human being is not a spiritual being that lives in a body of flesh, but rather for the human being, his body is his soul. This doctrine says that the flesh, plus the breath of life that God gives, is the soul in itself. It is to say that matter plus breathing is soul; therefore, animals are also souls.

Water can't spill from an empty bottle. In order to say with authority that water spilled from the bottle, such bottle has to have had water inside. "And it came to pass, as **her soul was in departing**, (for she died) that she called his name Benoni; but his father called him Benjamin". (Gn 35:18)

We see in this passage that Rachel's soul had departed. Therefore there was a soul inside of her. If Rachel herself, her body, had been a soul, it could not say that her soul was departing. You cannot say that the bottle spilled out of the bottle, rather something that was inside the bottle had to spill out.

In this passage we see once more how the soul inhabits a flesh body and leaves it at the time of death. In other words, the soul and the body are two different things: One is the person and the other its temporary abode. Therefore it is false that the soul is the union of the body and the breath of life. If the breathing body were the soul, we cannot say that Rachel's soul was departing, because a body cannot depart from a body. In this case it would have to be said that Rachel ceased being a soul.

*

If the soul returns to its body it is because they are two different things

The sects that do not believe in the existence of the soul insist that the body is the soul and that the human being is a living soul. However, Elijah, who knew much more than all theologians put together about the things of God, assures us that **the soul of the child had left the body**, and that is why he was asking God to **restore it back** to the body. If something or someone leaves a place it is obvious that he or it is not the place, but rather different that

the place. In other words, the soul is something different than the body and not the body. If the body were the soul, the soul could not leave the body.

"21 And he stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the LORD, and said: O LORD my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. 22 And the LORD heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived". (I K 17:21-22)

It can be assumed here that the personality and the conscious of the human being is in the soul, because when it came back to the boy's body, he regained consciousness. As long as the boy's body had no soul he was nobody, but when the soul returned to the body, the boy recovered his personality.

Not yet have the Russellists distorted this verse, it seems it escaped from them. Russellists, both in English and in Spanish, translated the same as in King James or Reina-Valera. Verse 22 repeats the idea that the soul returns to the body, implying that before it was not in the body, therefore demonstrating that the body and the soul are two different things.

If we listen carefully to the conversations of the biblical characters we will indirectly learn many things; because even if at any given moment they are not talking about a certain issue, we can know what they are thinking about that issue, by what they are saying.

Even in their counterfeit translation, Russellists still recognize the existence of the soul

 I am sure that Isaiah had better revelations and a more sound doctrine than the Russellist "Governing Body". Here, the prophet makes a clear differentiation between the soul and the flesh. However, Russellists affirm that the human body is a living soul, or, the body is the same as the soul. They say that Adam came to be a living soul, trying so to prove that both body and soul are the same thing. If body and soul were the same, Isaiah would not point to that difference here, **even so in the Russellist version**, which they have not realized to twist yet.

"And shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both <u>soul</u> and <u>body</u>, and they shall be as when a standardbearer fainteth". (Isa 10:18)

As we can see in this verse, a difference is made between body and soul. If the breathing body were at the same time the soul, Isaiah would not have said what he said.

The same is true in the Russellist translation of Lk 12:22. Here is the actual text:

"Then he said to his disciples: On this account I say to you, Quit being anxious about your souls as to what you will eat or about your bodies as to what you will wear".

(Lk 12:22 Russellist version)

As we can see, to their sadness, they have left a few passages without twisting them.

*

If Paul gives up flesh but not soul it is because they are two different things

 We know that the anti-soul doctrine affirms that the soul does not exist as a spiritual being apart from the body, but that they call the flesh "soul" when it has the breath of life. In other words, according to this heretic teaching the soul is composed of flesh plus breathing.

"To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the <u>flesh</u>, that the <u>spirit</u> may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus".

(I Co 5:5)

In this verse we clearly see that what Paul considered needed saving was the spirit, not the flesh. By saying this he shows that he was calling "spirit" to what in other instances he called "soul"; in other words, the real being that lives inside a flesh habitation.

If Paul had believed that the breathing body was the soul, and that the breathing flesh was most important, he would not have given the body over to Satan, but he would have tried for the flesh to be saved on the day of the Lord. He would not have thought of saying "for the spirit to be saved", for if the spirit were the air, the breathing, as this doctrine says, the air would not need saving.

The anti-soul hypothesis is counterintuitive, for if the soul were the breathing flesh, how could he give up the body to Satan and not the air it breathes and is in its lungs?

*

Let's take a look at some of the other characters of the Old Testament

 In this passage we see that Job differentiates between the flesh and the soul. Verse 21 says that if the person dies he will not know if his children are honored or humiliated. In other words, he recognizes that at the point of death the person passes on to another dimension different than that in which we live. Of the flesh he says that as long as a human being has his flesh, such flesh will suffer pain; but when speaking of sadness or mourning, which is a feeling, he attributes it to the soul.

"21 His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them. 22 But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn". (Job 14:21-22)

Here we see: first, that Job differentiates between flesh and soul; second, he considers that physical pain is of the flesh, but mourning or sadness is of the soul; and third, when speaking of the flesh he says, referring to the "SELF", the phrase "his flesh upon him", thus letting us know that in his mental structure "him" was the true person, and that upon that "him" was the flesh. Therefore, to Job, the flesh and the "him" were two different things.

Another Old Testament character, King David, in one of his prophecies, showed the difference between the soul and the body, by marking a difference between Jesus Christ, a spiritual being and his flesh abode, the body. Let's see.

"30 Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; 31 he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in Hell, neither his flesh did see corruption". (Acts 2:30-31)

 *

There is something else than the "body". That something else may be sanctified

It is a well-known fact that the anti-soul heresy negates the existence of the soul as a spiritual entity living in a flesh body; and then, to justify their error, they wallow in a bin of semantics manure in which, amongst others, the spirit is called "breath of life", something like, "life breathing" or "life vapor".

In reading this verse in the Russellist version, just as in reading from the King James, we can conclude that an unmarried woman must try, or may try being holy both **in body and spirit.** If the human being were only breathing flesh, then how a woman can be holy in spirit if such spirit is nothing but her "breath of life?"

"There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit, but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband". (I Co 7:34)

If we were to read the above verse giving the word "spirit" the value that the anti-souls give it, the verse would read as follows: "...that she may be holy both in body and in breath of life..."; or "that she may be holy both in body and in her breathing..." It is evident that this meaning that the anti-souls give to the word "spirit" is wrong. It is absolutely ridiculous to think that someone's breathing can be made holy; it would be like having good breath. It is clear that in this case the real meaning of the word "spirit" is "soul", in other words, the human being's true "self".

Only when we consider that the human being is a non-physical soul which lives in a physical body, do Paul's words make sense in this passage. Who has ever thought of making holy the air we breathe, or the breath of life, or whatever those who wallow themselves in their putrid bin of semantic manure decide to call the human soul?

*

Filthiness of the flesh and the breathing (or breath of life)?

From the Russellist version of this passage we can conclude the clear difference between flesh and spirit. Here it talks about the <u>filthiness of the flesh</u> and the <u>filthiness of the spirit</u>; therefore, both are different, and both can be contaminated.

"Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all <u>filthiness</u> of the <u>flesh</u> and <u>spirit</u>, perfecting holiness in the fear of God". (II Co 7:1)

As we can see Paul is talking about two things that can be contaminated, one is the flesh and the other the spirit, which is, in this case, the word he uses to refer to the soul. If the human being were only flesh, if the soul did not exist, Paul would not say here that it could be contaminated, because something that does not exist cannot be contaminated. Neither can they allege that the spirit is simply a breath of life, the air we breathe, because this air cannot become filthy with sin.

*

If one thing battles with another it is because both are <u>not</u> the same thing

Some arguments are so obvious that we should have no need to use them. It is enough to read what Peter says, to realize that he believed there was a spiritual entity, which we call "soul" or "spirit", living inside a body of flesh. But since those who maintain a religious error do not give up, it becomes necessary to mention and explain them.

"Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from <u>fleshly</u> lusts, which war against the <u>soul</u>". (I P 2:11)

If the fleshly lusts war against the soul, it is evident that the soul and the flesh are two different things. It is a mistake, therefore, to say that the soul is the union of the body and a breath of life, or breathing, as stated by those who deny the existence of the soul as a spiritual being with personality, living in a body of flesh. Although the Russellists try to alter in their translation of the

Bible anything that goes against their heresies, they have not totally twisted this passage.

In this case, the Russellist version reads this passage as follows: "... fleshly desires, which are the very ones that carry on a conflict against the soul ...". Even here, is the evidence that the flesh and the soul are two different things. Their hypothesis is that there is no such thing as the soul; and that when the Bible mentions the word "soul" it refers to the living body, the flesh plus the breathing.

If the soul and the breathing body were the same thing, then who wars against whom? The fleshly desires against the soul? But, is it not the soul the same as the breathing body? Should we say that the fleshly lusts war against the flesh? Does it make sense? If soul and body were the same thing, the flesh and the soul could not be at war. It would be like saying that the flesh is at war with the flesh.

*

The souls of the Great Tribulation martyrs were in Heaven, while their bodies were on Earth

Those who argue that the soul, as a bodiless being, does not exist, sometimes say that the soul is the blood, while other times they say it is the flesh plus the breathing; in other words, that the body, in general, is the soul. Thus they consider that all animals are souls; they consider a "soul" to be a human being, a horse, a rat, a toad, a worm, or a microbe.

"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". (Rev 6:9)

Rev 6:9 tells us that the souls of those that had been slain on Earth could be seen in Heaven. John could not have been looking at the blood, nor at the breathing flesh in Heaven, because those things remained on Earth. Besides, those souls were talking, and neither the blood, nor the breath, nor the dead bodies can talk.

If the soul did not exist, John, instead of using the word "soul", would have used the word "persons". He could have also said, "I saw those who were slain on Earth", and not, "...I saw the **souls of** those who were slain...". By saying "the souls of", he is implying that these souls had been in a body and had gone to Heaven at the time of death.

This unholy doctrine alleges that this passage is only a vision and does not reflect reality; but saying this does not help the defense of their heretic doctrine; for the Holy Spirit would not use words to confuse Christians in respect to a doctrine. The same can be said of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

According to Solomon the spirit separates from the body

The anti-soul doctrine continuously mentions two or three verses from Ecclesiastes, twisting their meaning, in order to negate the existence of the soul. However, they silence other words from Solomon that destroy such doctrine.

When Solomon says that he does not know if the spirit of a man goes upward, or if the spirit of an

animal goes downward, he also says that he did know that spirit and flesh are separate, and did one of two things: either go up or down. He shows us that he knew that spirit and flesh were two different things, and separated at death. If it were all just flesh, then nothing would separate from it, because nothing material separates from a dead body at death. In order to "prove" that the soul does not exist, some of the anti-souls say that the spirit is the air they breathe, while others say that the soul is the blood. In this passage we see that when using the word "spirit" he is referring to neither air nor blood.

"Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth? (Eccl 3:21)

It isn't as the anti-souls claim, that the soul of the person is the blood itself, for when a person dies, his blood does not leave the body; it rots right along with the flesh.

But that is not all. If we go to Eccl 12:7 we see that Solomon really did know where the spirit of a human being went; it says that the spirit returns to God who gave it, so it does not refer to the blood, since the spirit goes up, for God is up.

Therefore the blood and the soul are two different

Therefore the blood and the soul are two different things, for the blood stays in the tomb inside the body, and both rot, while the spirit returns to God.

Neither is Solomon applying to the word "spirit"

Neither is Solomon applying to the word "spirit" the meaning of "the air it breathes", for the breath, though separated from the dead body, does not go up or down, and does not go to God; it stays on Earth.

 "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it". (Eccl 12:7)

Since those who deny the existence of the soul say that the human being is no more than flesh and breath, it would be good if they explained what it is that returns to God who gave it, the flesh or the breath.

Also, in Eccl 8:8 Solomon shows us that no one can postpone his death. Effectively, by using the phrase, "to retain the spirit", he shows that he thought that upon death the spirit separated from the flesh, and could not be retained. Therefore it is evident that he believed there was something immaterial, something that was neither blood, nor flesh, nor air, and that's what was important.

"There is no man that hath power over the spirit to retain the spirit; neither hath he power in the day of death; and there is no discharge in that war; neither shall wickedness deliver those that are given to it". (Eccl 8:8)

*

The body is not buried naked and does not return to the mother's womb

In the following passage we see that the **human** being "goes as he came" and "as he came, so he shall go", which implies two things: a) that he was somewhere before he was born, and b) that he will leave the same way he came in.

 "15 As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked, shall he return to go as he came, and shall take nothing of his labour, which he may carry away in his hand. 16 And this also is a sore evil, that in all points as he came, so shall he go; and what profit hath he that hath laboured for the wind?" (Eccl 5:15-16)

If we were to think that the human being does not have a soul, and that Solomon was not referring to the soul, but to the body, then this statement would be false. It would be false because the human being comes out of his mother's womb, but cannot go back to it; rather it rots in the soil. And Solomon, knowing that, would not affirm such falsehood. So he could not be referring to the flesh, but to the soul, for only the soul could go back to

where it came from: the spiritual world, outside the

physical dimension in which we live.

We can equally see that when Solomon says that he who dies returns naked, he was referring to the soul and not the flesh. If he had been referring to the flesh and not the soul he would be lying because those who died did not leave naked, which is how they were when they were born. Nor could he be saying that they would go to the tomb naked, because the Jews buried their dead fully dressed. It is evident that by saying he left naked, he was referring to the soul, which was naked when stripped of the body.

So if there were no soul and Solomon was referring to the body, everything he said would be false. However, if we admit that he was referring to the soul, then what he said makes sense; because the soul returns to the spiritual realm where it previously lived, and in doing so it does not take

with it anything physical, but it returns naked, stripped of any physical matter. As we can see, the same passage the anti-souls use to deny the existence of the soul, actually implies its existence.

*

Summary of chapter 3. We can see how the soul and the body are two different things because if not, it would not say that Rachel's soul left her. You cannot say that the bottle spilled out of the bottle.

If Elijah asked God for the boy's soul to return to his body, it is because they are two different things.

Isaiah says that the soul and the flesh would be consumed, which is a signal that the prophet also considered them two different things.

If Paul turned over the flesh and not the soul, it is because he considered them two different things.

Job says that the flesh hurts and the soul mourns. David says, speaking of Christ, that his soul was not left in Hell, and his flesh saw no corruption.

Paul says there something more than "flesh" because that something can be made holy; he also speaks of the filth of the spirit and flesh; it says that the soul struggles with the flesh and vice versa; and it says that Euticus' soul was with him. All of this shows that he did not consider the soul and the body to be the same thing.

John saw that the souls of the Great Tribulation martyrs were in Heaven, and since their bodies were on Earth, they were two different things.

Solomon, in Ecclesiastes, we see that he thought that the spirit was separated from the body, going either up or down; and that those who died returned to where they were before, the spiritual realm.

Chapter 4

Him who <u>does</u> exist <u>cannot</u> meet with him who <u>does not</u> exist; but much less can he who <u>does not</u> exist meet with him who does not exist either

God himself says that David would reunite with his fathers

The religious sects that do not want to believe in the existence of the soul as a separate spiritual entity, that lives in a body of flesh and constitutes the real person, say that once the body is dead, the personality, the human being, ceases to exist. If that were true God would not tell David here that he would reunite with his fathers, for his fathers did not exist by this time. David himself was going to die, and according to anti-soul, would cease to exist, and someone who does not exist can't go anywhere.

"And it shall come to pass, when thy days be expired that **thou must go to be with thy fathers**, that I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish his kingdom". (I Chr 17:11)

If the soul did not exist, God would have said something like "...when you die..." or "...when you cease to exist..."; he would have no reason to say "...go to be with thy fathers...", for neither David nor his fathers would exist in that future that God refers to. That which does not exist cannot go be with something that does not exist either.

This is the same case with David that Paul refers to in Acts 13:36, where he mentions the promise to David.

In reading the next verse and others like it which are used by the proponents of the anti-soul doctrine, we can see the error sustained by this heresy. Such doctrine bases itself on this verse to "affirm" that dying is like sleeping; where there is no conscience of existence, and therefore the soul cannot exist. Because if it did there would be consciousness of existence, and they would not say they slept with their fathers.

"For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, <u>fell on sleep</u>, and was <u>laid unto</u> his fathers, and saw corruption". (Acts 13:36)

But it happens that this same verse -which they use to state their claim- says that David was laid unto (or was reunited with) his fathers. If the soul did not exist, David's fathers, because they died first, did not exist. And if his fathers did not exist, David could not be laid together with them, therefore concluding that the soul does exist and thus is said that David was laid unto his fathers.

A person can be united with another one only if both exist. If David died and did not exist, he could not have been united with his fathers, who did not exist. However, if the soul does exist, then any one person can be united with his ancestors, since any person who dies, good or bad, has both good and bad ancestors. So regardless of where a person goes when he dies, he will join some ancestor whether he is with those obedient to God, or those who rebelled.

It may be that someone would try to justify the phrase "laid unto his fathers" and say it means that the person who dies will be buried in the same tomb as his fathers. But that is not true. Both the biblical custom and language indicate that when a person is going to be buried in the same tomb as his fathers, it is so specified, as we see in the following verses:

"But I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their buryingplace. And he said: I will do as thou hast said". (Gn 47:30)

"And he charged them, and said unto them, <u>I</u> am to be gathered unto my people; bury me with my fathers in the cave that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite". (Gn 49:29)

"13 And Asa slept with his fathers, and died in the one and fortieth year of his reign. 14 And they buried him in his own sepulchres, which he had made for himself in the city of David...". (II Chr 16:13-14)

"And were carried over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem". (Acts 7:16)

As we can see in these four verses, when they wanted to say they wanted to be buried in the same tomb where their fathers were, or any other specific tomb, it was so stated. They did not say "laid unto his fathers".

On the contrary, on many occasions it says that a king or someone else "was laid with his fathers", and yet the context shows that he was not placed in the same tomb. In other words, we can see that "slept with his fathers" does not mean he was placed in the same tomb, but rather his soul went to the same place where some of his ancestors were. Let's see some of these instances.

1) Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people".

(Gn 25:8)

In this first case we see that Abraham was united with his people, even though he had left his land and was now in a place were his ancestors tombs were nowhere near. Besides, the fact that it says he was gathered to his people proves that both Abraham and his people existed, for two things that do not exist cannot be united. Let's see two more verses.

2) "1 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying: 2 Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites; afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people". (Nm 31:1-2)

"And die in the mount whither thou goest up, and be gathered unto thy people, as Aaron thy brother died in mount Hor, and was gathered unto his people". (Dt 32:50)

<u>In this second</u> case we have two verses. In the first we see that **God himself** tells Moses that he will be gathered unto his people, in spite of the fact

that his fathers' tombs were in Egypt, to where he would not return. Not only that, but Moses' tomb is unique and unknown; therefore he was not buried with his fathers. Something that **does not exist cannot** be gathered, **and especially**, cannot be united with something that does not exist. God teaches us here that upon his death, Moses would not be alone, he would join others.

We can reason as well with the second verse of this second case; only that here God adds the case of Aaron. If the soul did not exist God would not say they would be reunited with their peoples, because in such case, their peoples did not exist. If God tells them they will be reunited with their peoples, it is sufficient evidence that their peoples existed at that moment, which is only possible if the soul exists. Let's take a look at two other cases.

3) "And Manasseh slept with his fathers, and was buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza; and Amon his son reigned in his stead". (II K 21:18)

4) "So Manasseh slept with his fathers, and they buried him in his own house; and Amon his son reigned in his stead". (II Chr 33:20)

<u>In the third and fourth</u> verses we see that even though they both deal with the same person, King Manasseh, each verse has a different author. Yet they both use the same phrase slept with his fathers, even though they knew that this person was not buried in the same tomb as his ancestors. Let's see the case of Ahaz.

5) "And Ahaz slept with his fathers, and they buried him in the city, even in Jerusalem, but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel; and Hezekiah his son reigned in his stead". (II Chr 28:27)

<u>In this fifth</u> verse we see that Ahaz was <u>definitely</u> not placed in his ancestors' tomb, for it specifically says it. However, it does say that he slept with his fathers. Therefore we conclude that what slept with his fathers was his soul, not his body. Here is another case.

6) "18 Therefore thus saith the LORD concerning Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah: They shall not lament for him, saying, Ah my brother! or, Ah sister! They shall not lament for him, saying, Ah lord! or, Ah his glory! 19 He shall be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem".

(Jer 22:18-19)

7) "So Jehoiakim slept with his fathers, and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his stead".

(II K 24:6)

<u>In the sixth</u> and <u>seventh</u> passage, when compared with each other, they both give us the same message as the previous ones. In the sixth, Jeremiah says that Jehoiakim would not be buried with his fathers, but would be buried with the burial of an ass, and taken outside Jerusalem. In the seventh passage, the author says that he, Jehoiakim, "slept with his fathers". This is clear evidence that the phrase "slept with his fathers" does not mean

that his body went to the same tomb, but that his soul went with his ancestors, whether they had been good or bad.

If the phrase "slept with his fathers" does not mean they were placed in the same tomb, and yet the Bible authors still use it, it is clear that they knew the soul existed and that after the flesh was dead, that soul went somewhere, good or bad, where their ancestors were, and joined them.

>

God also told Moses that he would go to his fathers

We see in Dt 34:5-6 that Moses died; God himself buried his body, and no one knows where it is.

"5 So Moses, the servant of the LORD, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the LORD. 6 And He buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day". (Dt 34:5-6)

Since Moses' body was alone, and since it also rotted, his body did not go to his ancestors, whose bodies were rotten at the time of Moses' death. Therefore, the only thing that could have gone to his ancestors was his soul.

If in spite of that someone insists on denying the existence of the soul, then he has to conclude that what God said before in Nm 31:1-2 about going to his peoples was false, and that is blasphemy.

"1 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying: 2 Avenge the children of Israel of the

Midianites; afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people". (Nm 31:1-2)

1531

1532 1533

1534

1535

1536

1537

1538

1539

1540

1541

1542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

1549

1550

1551

1552

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557

1558

1559

1560

1561

1562

1563

1564

1565

1566

If there is no soul, and God is referring to the body, what He said does not make sense. The fact that God himself told Moses "you will be gathered unto your peoples", and then told Aaron in Dt 32:50 "...you will be gathered unto your peoples...", shows us that there is a soul, for if it was referring to the body, he could not say "...you will be gathered unto your peoples...", since the dead body is nothing. And since, according to this doctrine, when a person dies he ceases to exist, he cannot be gathered to anyone. What is more, this doctrine cannot even twist the meaning and say that this passage means that his body was going to gather with the bones of his fathers for two reasons: a) the others were buried in different places, like Egypt and Canaan, and b) they were not going to be buried in a cemetery where his ancestors were, because God was going to bury him in a place where none of his relatives had ever been buried, Moab.

However, if God was referring to the soul when he said "you will be gathered unto your peoples", then what he said does make sense. Then it could be said that Moses would go to his people. The same reasoning applies to Nm 20:26 where it says "and Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, and shall die there". And it is also true of Abraham in Gn 15:15, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age".

If it is said of Aaron that he would be gathered unto his peoples, it is evident that it is talking about the soul and not the body because the bodies of his relatives were decomposed in Egypt or Canaan, and could not be reunited with Aaron. The same is true of Abraham, for when it says "you will go to your fathers", it is evident that he could go to his fathers only if both he and his fathers had a soul. Otherwise it was not possible that a decomposed body could go anywhere, or reunites with another decomposed body hundreds of miles away. Let's remember that Abraham had already left his fathers' land and his body could not be reunited with those of his ancestors because it would not be possible. However, if it was referring to the soul it can be true, because Abraham's soul can reunite with the soul of Noah, Enoch, and all the other saints that went before him.

"And strip Aaron of his garments, and put them upon Eleazar his son; and Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, and shall die there". (Nm 20:26)

"And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age".

(Gn 15:15)

We also have in Gn 49:33 that as soon as Jacob died it says "...and he was gathered unto his peoples..". This was said while his body was still in Egypt, when his body had not yet been placed in a tomb with his fathers, yet they were already assuming he had "been gathered unto his people". This is a clear signal that they were referring to something other than the body, hence, the soul. We see that as in verse 29, Jacob had expressed his belief in the existence of the soul; the others did as well in verse 33.

"And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into the bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people". (Gn 49:33)

 In conclusion, we see that God himself tells Aaron, "...die on the mount to which you go up and be reunited with your peoples..." God himself assures him he would go to his peoples. Therefore, Aaron would not just vanish, disappear, or become nothing, cease to exist. And neither would Moses, as the anti-soul doctrine says that happens to the human being. If a man who dies becomes nothing, if he ceases to exist, he cannot be gathered unto anyone, and no one can be gathered unto him.

Besides, it is clear that if someone went to his peoples, he did not cease to exist, which is what this anti-soul doctrine claims.

*

One who does not exist cannot be resting

If someone asked about Snow White, who would say that Snow White, at this moment, is at work? If she does not exist, she can't be working. Who, in his right mind would dare say that at this moment, the seven dwarfs are resting? If someone does not exist, he cannot work or rest. It is too obvious to have to waste time trying to prove it.

The Bible says that the faithful who died are resting. If the soul did not exist, if when these brethren died they ceased to exist, the Bible would not say they are resting. This is clear, but not to a fanatic. That is why I say:

To clearly understand a Bible truth, it takes a child; to complicate it, darken it, and twist it, it takes a theologian.

*

Summary of chapter 4. If David ceased to exist when he died, he could not be reunited with anyone. The same can be said of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. However, of all of them it was said that they would go be reunited with their ancestors, and in many cases it was God himself who said it. Someone who does not exist cannot be reunited with someone who does exist, and much less with someone who does not exist.

This reunion could not refer to being buried in the same tomb, because all of them had left their fathers' tombs in the country where they came from. Besides in some of these cases it specifies that they were to reunite with their fathers, but be buried in a different tomb.

The Bible says that the faithful that die are resting. That means that the soul does exist, for it cannot be said of someone who does not exist that they are working or resting, as in the case of Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs.

Chapter 5

By their words the biblical characters show us they believe the soul exists

People talk according to what they have in mind

If a person is told that China is on the other side of the world, under us, and he says that can't be because if so the Chinese people would fall off, we would immediately realize that person believes that the earth is flat and does not know the force of gravity.

If a person says that human beings appeared two millions years ago and evolved thereafter, we know he believes in spontaneous generation and the evolution of the species.

One can tell by a person's words how that person thinks. Jesus said it himself: Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks.

This method of knowing what someone thinks by analyzing his words is what we will use in this chapter to know what the Bible characters thought about the existence of the soul as a spiritual entity, apart from the body.

*

The words that people use show us what is in their mind

Several years ago some politicians lined up with some people that discovered that in a certain region there were very precious minerals. So they tried to stay in the place. The area was inhabited by a certain tribe which spoke with a dialect very similar to that of other nearby tribes. In spite of the fact that these natives were very primitive, they certainly were not savages. They wore clothing, lived in huts, used knives, machetes and other tools, etc.

In order to isolate the region without raising concerns, they told the media that a totally uncivilized tribe had been discovered, that was still living in the Stone Age. After all the publicity they passed laws forbidding tourism to the place, under the pretense of preserving this supposed Stone Age tribe against outside contamination.

Knowing that the news media would still want to go, they had ordinances limiting such visits, allowing them only with permission, and entering the place only through a designated "door".

Mentioned politicians bribed the inhabitants with gifts and money to pose as cavemen. They asked them to leave their huts when the media came, and to come live in the caves in the region. When the news crews came they would have ample time to take off their clothes and walk around in loincloths.

Many journalists requested permission to go, including the anchor of a certain weekly program from the United States. All left speaking wonders about the new "Stone Age" tribe that had just been discovered.

However, in her conversation with the "cavemen" through an interpreter, the American reporter discovered a flaw in the "savages". When speaking some used a word that was equivalent to the word "ceiling", while others used a word similar to the word "roof". Since they were supposed to have lived in caverns all their lives, they had no reason to have in their vocabulary a word for "roof". It was logical to use the word "ceiling", but not the word "roof", because they should not have had any knowledge of a hut. Caverns don't have a roof, only what could be thought of as "ceiling".

Motivated by this lead, the TV anchor returned with her team, this time by surprise, and entered through the other side, surprising the "cave people". They were fully dressed, and leading a normal life, as a normal, primitive, but certainly not savage people.

The moral of the story is that through their words, and manner of speaking, one can know what persons have in their mind.

*

Which part of himself did Stephen commend to the Lord?

If, as the anti-soul doctrine says, there is nothing spiritual about the human being, there is nothing except matter, what was Stephen referring to when he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit?"

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit".

(Acts 7:59)

If man does not have a soul, if man is matter alone, if, as Stephen said, Jesus was in Heaven at the right hand of the Father (Acts 7:55-56), then which part of Stephen's matter could Jesus receive in Heaven? If man is nothing but flesh, if everything belongs to this dimension in which we live, then which part of Stephen could go on to the other dimension where God and Christ live? To the anti-soul proponents, which was the "spirit" that Stephen was asking Jesus to receive? Does that spirit that Stephen gave up think, feel, or express itself? Or is it merely the air he breathes? If what we call "spirit" is something that thinks, feels, and

communicates, then we are calling "spirit" to that which we also call "soul".

 If the spirit is the breath, as the anti-soul doctrine says, how is it that Stephen gave Christ his breath, and how could that breath go to Heaven to be received by Christ?

Breath and air is something that is good only if we have it in our lungs. So then, why would Stephen give his breath to Jesus? If he believed that there was no soul, and his lungs would rot in death, and he would not need that breath, why then would he give Jesus his breath? Besides, how important was his breath to give it to the Lord?

Likewise, we know that Christ existed in Heaven before he "clothed" himself in human flesh. Therefore, in the case of Christ, we cannot deny that there was a body and something other than matter living in that body. Well, in Lk 23:46 we see Jesus, at the time of his death, saying the same thing that Stephen said: "into thy hands I commend my spirit". Therefore, both Christ and Stephen were going through the same phenomenon: the fact that something other than matter was being separated from the flesh; or, what constitutes the actual person was being separated from its bodily clothing. In the case of Christ on the cross, why give God his breath? All this clearly shows that the soul does exist.

People talk according to how they think. By their words, the Bible characters show us they believed the soul existed.

*

If the soul is transported by the angels, it is because it exists

Those who invented the anti-soul doctrine are forced to come up with other lies in order to support the first one. That is why they have to say that what occurred in Jesus' story about the rich man and Lazarus really did not happen. It is logical for them to try to deny it because the story is clear in affirming the existence of the soul, and if they would admit it they would also have to admit that their "prophets and prophetesses" that deny the existence of the soul, are not from God.

Here Jesus Christ himself says that when Lazarus died the angels took him to certain place then called "Abraham's Bosom". Therefore, the soul exists.

"And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the <u>angels</u> into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried". (Lk 16:22)

Without being too specific about what Abraham's bosom is, we can categorically affirm that **certain angels took Lazarus to that place while his body remained in the grave.** If man were only flesh, the angels had nothing to carry anywhere, because the body remained in the grave. If man's "SELF" were only his brains, if his personality, his feelings, his intelligence, his memory, etc., lived in his brain, then the angels could not have taken Lazarus anywhere, because the brain was decomposing in the grave.

Now, Jesus would have never said that the angels had taken Lazarus anywhere for three reasons:

a) Because there was nothing to take to any place and Jesus would not have said anything that would confuse Christians. Effectively, if the only thing that existed was the flesh, and it was rotting in the grave, the angels had nothing to take.

- **b**) Because Jesus would not have involved the angels in a lie, saying they were doing something they really could not do.
- c) Because Jesus would not have fabricated a story that would confuse the faithful by telling them: 1) that a soul that did not exist, existed 2) that some angels were taking something that they really were not, 3) that a place that really did not exist, existed and 4) that tribulations that really did not exist, existed.

The anti-soul doctrine goes against the simplest elementary logic, but they keep it in order to keep their doctrinal errors. Since their respective "popes", Charles Taze Russell and Helen G. White, imposed on them this dogma, they keep it against all odds and dare not discuss it in public, and much less in front of their own members.

As we can see the inventors of the anti-soul doctrine seem to think that Jesus told the story of the rich man and Lazarus knowing that the majority would be confused, and would remain confused until around the 1800s when the prophets and prophetesses that would "illuminate" the "true" meaning of the story would appear. In other words, until the anti-soul "heroes" would "discover" that what Jesus said was not true.

People talk according to what is in their mind. Through their words, the Bible characters (in this case, Jesus) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

Someone who did not believe in the soul would not use the verbs "bring" and "carry"

The anti-soul doctrine affirms that the "soul" is the union of the material body and its breath. Therefore, according to their definition, the "soul" has always been on this planet, and it is destroyed upon death. This would mean that the human "self" was produced on the planet; it did not come to the planet, and upon its death it will not leave the planet.

"For we <u>brought</u> nothing into this world, and it is certain we can <u>carry nothing out</u>".

(I Tim 6:7)

If Paul did not believe in the existence of the soul, he would not say, "we brought nothing", because he would consider it obvious that our "self" was produced on Earth, that we were never outside the planet; and obviously, someone who has not been outside the planet cannot "bring" anything with him. So in this case, Paul would not even bring up the idea of bringing anything.

By the same token, if Paul did not believe in the existence of the soul, he would not say, "we can carry nothing out", because it would be obvious that someone that rots in the grave can't take anything out of the planet. He would not even mention the phrase "carry out", it would not be necessary, for it was obvious that no one leaves the planet. He would instead say that once dead we could not enjoy anything else.

It is evident, therefore, through the words used by the Apostle, that Paul believed in the existence of the soul, and that he knew that when a soul was sent to the Earth to inhabit a body of flesh, that soul did not bring anything material with him; and he knew that once dead, a soul leaves the surface of the Earth, and that soul could not take anything material with him.

By using the verbs "bring" and "carry", we see that Paul knew that the true "self" was not formed materially on the planet, rather it came from somewhere else and brought nothing with it, and when it went out, either to Heaven or to Hell, it could take nothing with it. Paul expresses the impossibility of the soul to use material things once outside the body.

Besides, if Paul did not believe in the existence of the soul, he would not speak of the possibility of "leaving", for the body always stays, and that was evident to all. Since he speaks of the impossibility of "carrying out" it is because he believes he can leave.

People speak according to what they think in their minds. Through their words, the people of the Bible (in this case, Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

If the soul did not exist a person could not be snatched out of the body

The doctrine that denies the existence of the soul as a spiritual entity that thinks and feels, that lives in a body of flesh, says that the human being does not have a soul, but rather is a soul. In other words, his flesh plus his breath constitutes the soul. For them the soul is the living body. If that were so, then where the body is so will the soul be, and

where the body goes so will the soul go; besides since there is nothing spiritual inside the body, no one can be snatched out of the body.

Paul knew more than those who deny the existence of the soul. According to his narration in II Cor 12:2-4, the person that Paul knew could have been caught up outside of himself, in this case, he could have been out of his body. If the body were not the house in which the soul lives, if the living body itself were the soul, as the heretic doctrine says, then Paul's friend could not have been caught up outside his own body because the body cannot be caught up outside the body. That should be enough to convince any sincere person, but there is more.

What was caught up outside of Paul's friend could still hear, understand, and remember, as we can see in verse 4. We can conclude from all of this that what was caught up outside Paul's friend was the man himself, with the ability to hear, think, remember, etc.. If he was indeed caught up outside his body, then it is evident that there is a soul with personality, reasoning, intelligence, will, etc., which lives inside the body.

If the soul did not exist a person could be taken from one place to another, but not outside itself because he is that person. You cannot take the bottle from inside the bottle, nor can you take the Capitol from inside the Capitol. You cannot become a juggler of words, you cannot play with words, in order to back up a heresy.

That is the case with II Co 12:2-4, because to say that a body was caught up outside the body is total foolishness, a ludicrous blunder. Can a stone be taken out of itself? Can the human body be taken out of itself and taken somewhere else while

it also remains in the first place? At most you can take the stone or the body from one place to another; but nothing of matter could be caught up outside of itself.

This is the absurdity to which the belief of a non-existing soul leads; the belief that the human being is not a soul "dressed" in flesh, but that everything in him is only flesh, only physical.

"2 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, God knoweth) such an one caught up to the third heaven. 3 And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth) 4 How that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter". (II Co 12:2-4)

The doctrine that denies the existence of the soul says that the human being is all physical, that all of him is nothing but matter and energy; there is nothing spiritual, nothing that is not physical in its composition. If that were true, how could a man be caught up in the third heaven, or paradise, and get to those places outside his body, outside of the only thing that made up his entire being?

If man did **not** have a soul, if his "self" were **not** a spiritual entity, but merely a physical entity, **why would Paul doubt about whether the man was taken in the body or outside the body? If man is only his body he cannot be taken anywhere if his body does not go; so why does Paul doubt? Well, I guess Paul had to wait until the 1800s for the**

"prophets and prophetesses" to teach him that there was no soul.

We can see that in Paul's mind was the idea that the human being has a soul that can leave the body in which it lives.

If man is flesh without a soul, what else but the body could be taken to the third heave, or paradise? If Paul would have believed that man was not a soul dressed in flesh he would have no doubt that the man was taken with his body and not outside of it; because then, there was nothing to take to paradise or the Third Heaven outside the body.

People talk according to what is in their mind. Through their words the Bible characters (in this case, Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

If there were no soul, what is the "inner man" that is renewed?

According to the anti-soul doctrine, man is not made up of soul and body as two separate things, rather the living man is a soul, in other words, the body is a soul as long as it was alive.

"21 I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. 22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. 23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members" (Ro 7:21-23)

Since according to this heretic doctrine the human being is only flesh, all matter, because the soul does not exist, they have no choice but to admit that the thoughts and the feelings are produced and stored in the flesh. If the soul did not exist then Paul would be saying in verse 21 that it is his flesh that wants to do good, but finds that evil is in his flesh. In other words, his flesh is opposed to his flesh, because one flesh wants to do good, and the other flesh wants to do evil. In verse 22 he would be saying that his interior flesh (inward man) rejoice in God, but (23) his exterior flesh (members) rebel against the interior flesh, and bring him captive to the sin that is in his flesh. This is the incoherent rigmarole that Paul would be saying if, in reality, the soul did not exist on one hand, with the body as the home for the soul in another.

Let's put this passage in a way that should read if the human being were only flesh, in other words, if there would be nothing but flesh; for that, we will substitute the words "I", "me", the "inner man", "my members", "my mind" and "my spirit", with the word "flesh", since that is what the human being is all about, according to this absurd heresy. Let's see.

"21 I find then a law, that, when my flesh would do good, evil is present with my flesh. 22 For my flesh delight in the law of God after the inward flesh. 23 But I see another law in my flesh (members), warring against the law of my flesh (brain), and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my flesh (members)"

(Ro 7:21-23 parody)

This doctrine needs to dwell and wallow in a semantic trash bin full of manure in order to defend its heresy.

As you can see, the supposition that the soul does not exist, and that the human being is merely matter is heresy, and it does not agree with itself; and it certainly does not agree with the Bible.

I'll give you another example. Paul says here that Paul, externally, was wasting away, but internally was being renewed. If the human being does not have a soul, but is only a body, and it is wasting away, then, what is being renewed inside Paul? Because, according to the anti-soul, everything is body, everything is flesh, and the body wastes away.

"For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day". (II Co 4:16)

If the "self", the personality, the intelligence, the feelings, are all in the body, and it wastes away, then, what is renewed daily? The reality is that Paul makes a difference between something internal (the soul) and something external (the flesh) in his own being. This is evidence that Paul had in mind the existence of the soul that is now denied by atheists, the believers in spontaneous generation, and anti-soul religious.

People talk according to what is in their mind. By their words, the Bible characters show us that they did believe in the existence of the soul.

*

If Peter would follow Jesus to Heaven it is because the soul exists

Forty days after the resurrection Christ ascended to Heaven. In this verse Jesus tells Peter that he (Peter) could not follow him now to the place where he (Jesus) is going (to Heaven), but that he would follow later. In other words, that after some time Peter would go to the same place where the Lord was going, Heaven. That could only happen if the soul were real, if the soul exists.

"Simon Peter said unto him: Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him: Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards". (John 13:36)

If the soul did not exist Peter could not follow Jesus to Heaven, because the dead remain on Earth. Some fanatic could try to justify such a lie, saying that Jesus was referring to the resurrection. But if that were so, the Lord would have told Peter that he would come for him, or that he would take him, but not that he would follow him.

Job knows he can go back to where he came from

If you have never been to China you cannot say that you are thinking of returning to China. If someone says they want to return to China it is because he has already been there. By saying this, Job shows us that he believed in the existence of the soul, since he uses the verb "return".

"And said: Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither. The LORD gave, and the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD". (Job 1:21)

When Job says, "naked I shall return thither (there)", he is implying he believed he would **return** to the place where he had **already been**. Since it is obvious he cannot be referring to returning to his mother's womb, we need to assume he is referring to a spiritual place.

Job considers that he **will return** to a place where he has already been. If not, he would not say, "I shall return"; since one can only return to a place where one has already been. The only place where Job could have been before his birth is the spiritual world, and in order to be there, or return there, he cannot do it in the flesh; it could only be in the spirit, therefore the soul exists.

He could not refer to the grave either for two reasons: because he had never been dead, and because they didn't bury naked bodies.

People talk according to what is in their mind. By their words the Bible characters (in this case, Job) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

The body of a king and the body of a baby don't get buried in the same tomb, but their souls can be in the same place

In this passage we see once again that Job believed in the existence of the soul. Verse 14 says that if he had died once he came out of his mother's womb he would be in the company of kings and counselors. If he did not believe there is a soul and that his "self" were merely his body, he could not say that he would have been with the kings of the earth when he died, because he would have been only an unimportant fetus that would have never been buried in the same grave as the kings.

The same can be said from verse 19, where he says that both small and great are "there". He can't be referring to the body because the corpses of those with no social status are never buried with the bodies of the famous. We can see he is talking about the soul. That is the only way in which the rich and the poor, the great and the small, can be together in what Job refers to as "there".

"11 Why died I not from the womb? Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly? 12 Why did the knees prevent me? Or why the breasts that I should suck? 13 For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept, then had I been at rest, 14 with kings and counsellors of the Earth, which built desolate places for themselves; 15 or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver; 16 or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been; as infants which never saw light. 17 There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. 18 There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. 19 The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master".

(Job 3:11-19)

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the Bible characters (in this case Job) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

If there are sins outside of the body it is because there is a soul. If when we are joined unto the Lord we are one spirit, then we are one spirit as well

In reading this passage we see in verse 17 that he who is joined with the Lord is one spirit with Him. This is in stark opposition to verse 16, where we read that whoever joins with a harlot becomes one body with her. From the comparison of these two verses we can concluded that Paul knew that a human being was both flesh and spirit. In other words, there was a body and a soul. Besides, if when we are joined with the Lord we become one in spirit with Him, it is because we are also spirit, because a piece of flesh cannot be joined in spirit with God.

"16 What? Know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, saith he, shall be one flesh. 17 But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. 18 Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. 19 What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? 20 For ye are bought with a price,

therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's".

(I Co 6:16-20)

As we continue reading we see that in verse 18 Paul considers that there are sins that are done outside the body. If the human being were all matter, if the soul did not exist, there could not be sins outside the body. Therefore, if Paul says there are sins that are outside the body it is because there is a soul. Later on in verse 20 Paul encourages us to glorify the Lord in our bodies and in our spirits. If the human being were only flesh, if what the Bible calls spirit is only the breath of life, if it were only something without intelligence or feelings, that thing could not glorify God because something that has no life in itself (breath), that does not think, cannot glorify God. Neither can breath alone (the spirit, according to this false doctrine) form one spirit with the Lord.

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the people of the Bible (in this case Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

The real Paul lived in a "house", therefore he believed in the existence of the soul

If someone were to tell you that if his house would be dissolved he would move to another house, you would never think that this person is in himself, a house.

This passage also shows us what Paul was thinking; it shows us what was on his mind and what he believed in regards to the soul.

In verse 1 he says that if our earthly "house" were dissolved we have one in heaven. By mentioning the word house he shows us how he believed that his "self", the true Paul, was living in a "house", and that once this house were dissolved, the true Paul, who was not dissolved, would live in another. It is clear that the Apostle did not believe that the real Paul was a house in himself, but that the real Paul lived in a "house". In other words, the Apostle thought that the real Paul was his soul, which now lived in a "house" that could be dissolved, but would be substituted by a better one. He even longed for that future body, to start enjoying it now, as we see in verse 2; and he did because that way he did not have to go through that intermediate stage of nakedness in which, having died, does not have an earthly body, and since it has not yet resurrected does not have a celestial body, as we see in verse 3.

2309

2310

2311

2312

2313

2315

2316

2317

2318

2319

2320

2321

2322

2323

2324

2325

2326

2327 2328

2329

2330

2331

2332

2333

2334

2335

2336

2337

2338

2339

2340 2341

2342

2343

2344

"1 For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. 2 For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. 3 If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. 4 For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life".

(II Co 5:1-4)

He repeats the same idea in verse 4, saying that those who were alive then, with an earthly body (tabernacle), groaned, because they would have wanted, instead of dying and their soul to remain without either an earthly body or a heavenly body, to have been transformed so that from the earthly body they could directly go to a heavenly body without an intermission (clothed), so not to feel naked by not having either terrestrial nor celestial body.

Paul talks about being "clothed". By using this word he shows us that he knew that his real "self" was not the clothing, in other words, was not the body, as anti-soul persons affirm, but that the real "self" would be clothed by another existing thing, in this case, the heavenly body. It is perfectly clear that the soul exists, that it is the "self" which is clothed in the body. If the body were the "self" then it would not be clothed in anything; it would be the soul.

From all this, anyone who in all honesty wants to reason, will understand that **Paul knew that the soul is real**, for he considered that his "self" could be in an intermediary state, with no body, and **even then**, he would still be able to think and feel; because he said that he would feel naked, by having a "self" with no body. The fact that he knew he would be able to think and feel in this intermediary state without a body shows us that he knew that there was a soul.

Paul knew that he was living in a "house" that could be dissolved without him being dissolved. That is evidence that he did not believe that his living body was his soul, his personality, his "self", rather he knew that his soul, which lived in that house, or tabernacle, was the true thinking "self", the true Paul.

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the Bible characters (in this case Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

If the soul did <u>not</u> exist, Paul could not be absent from the body

No one can be absent from the body unless the soul exists. The Russellist translation says, "...to be absent from the body and make our home with the Lord". But even that shows the existence of the soul. If the human being were only a body, if the "self", the personality, the ego, the intellect, the feelings, the memories, if it were all in the flesh, then no one could be absent from the body, as Paul says he wished. Who or what would be absent from the body? If the body were all in the human being, nothing could be absent from the body, because there would be nothing there that would not be matter, and as such not tied to the body. On the other hand, if the body remains on the earth and rots, or if it is eaten by a beast, who or what is going to be present with the Lord; or who or what is going to make his home with the Lord, as the Russellists version say?

"We a

"We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord". (II Co 5:8)

241024112412

2413

2414

2415

2381

2387

2388

2389

2390

2391

2392

2393

2394

2395

2396

2397

2398

2399

2400

2401

2402

2403

2404

2405

2406 2407

2408

2409

How could Paul prefer to be absent from the body when he was the body? Can someone be absent from himself and be at another place? The reasoning is so clear that only the stubbornness against God's truth can lead a man to not want to understand it.

 As I have always said, God's power and wisdom is such that even if we take the biased Bibles translated by the heretics as our basis, we can get to the truth, if we love that truth enough as to not be passionate in favor of a sectarian or traditional doctrine. On the day of the Final Judgment such reality could be alleged to those who excuse themselves by claiming that they did not have another Bible, except the one translated by the Russellists.

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the Bible characters (in this case Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

You can't be lord of something that <u>does not</u> <u>exist</u>

The anti-soul doctrine says that nothing remains of man upon his death. He simply ceases to exist. If that were true Paul would not have said that Jesus was also Lord of the dead, for nobody can be lord of someone that really does not exist. Therefore, if Jesus is also Lord of the dead it is because they continue to exist even after their bodies are dead, in other words, after the body is dirt, the soul continues to exist, where the true personality lives.

It is evident that when Paul mentions the word "dead" he is referring to their souls, which is the only thing that Jesus can be Lord of, since the body no longer exists. If nothing is left of the body after death, Jesus could not be Lord of the dead.

"For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living". (Ro 14:9)

This is in accordance with Jesus' words to the Sadducees about the resurrection, assuring them that the patriarchs lived: God is not the God of the dead but of the living, because it is impossible to be the God of something that does not exist. Therefore, if Paul says that Christ is Lord of the dead, it is because those who had died existed at the moment in which Paul was speaking.

By their words, the Bible characters show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

×

If the spirit has feelings opposite to the flesh it is because the soul exists

By his words in the next passage, the intentions of the flesh and the spirit are opposite to each other. According to the anti-soul doctrine, the spirit is the "breath of life" and thus, the personality of the human being is not in the spirit. This means that the spirit cannot harbor thoughts of feelings, because according to them, these things are in the brain.

"For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace". (Ro 8:6)

However, here it says that the intention of the spirit is life and peace. But, how can breath have good or bad intentions? This is how we can see that Paul is referring to the soul, living in a flesh body, and even with good intentions, because it

lives in a flesh body, tends to satisfy its primary instincts at any cost.

If the spirit were only the "breath of life" it would not have intentions or feelings; if the soul would only consist of the body while it is alive it could not be opposed to the flesh because the soul would be the flesh itself.

*

Grace be with your breath

Paul says in this passage, "Grace be with your spirit", not our flesh or our body. If the human being were merely his body, Paul had no reason to mention the spirit in this occasion. If the spirit of the human being were merely a puff of breath, or breath of life, as defined by those who refuse to believe in the existence of the soul, Paul would not say, "Grace be with your spirit, with your puff of breath, with your breath of life. This would be equivalent to saying, "grace be not with you, but with the air that blew in your nose".

"Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen".

(Ga 6:18)

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the people of the Bible show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

If Paul considered dying as gain it is because he knew he would go to Heaven

Living is better than ceasing to exist; better than rotting in the grave. Therefore, every normal person would rather live than cease to exist.

"21 For to me to live is Christ, and to die is 2529 gain. 22 But if I live in the flesh, this is the 2530 fruit of my labour, yet what I shall choose I wot not. 23 For I am in a strait betwixt two,

2523

2524

2525

2526

2527 2528

2531

2532

2533

2534

2535

2536 2537

2538

2539

2540

2541

2542

2543

2544

2545

2547

2548

2549

2550

2551

2552

2553

2554

2555

2556

2557

2558

having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better. 24 Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you".

(Phil 1: 21-24)

When Paul says that for him dying is gain, he says that he expects something good immediately after his death. This apostle was much too well balanced for suspecting in him to have the sickly thought that he would enjoy ceasing to exist or rot in a grave. Therefore, if he says that dying is gain it is because he knew that when he died he would be so much better off than rotting in a grave, or ceasing to exist, or even better than preaching the gospel.

All this becomes even clearer if we remember the zeal that Paul had for preaching and expanding the Gospel, which in all honesty, could not be possible if he died. Therefore if indeed the soul does not exist, as stated by those who do not believe in its existence, the soul of a Christian does not go to God upon death, but rather it disappears, it ceases to exist, it makes sense to think that Paul would want to be alive, not having the slightest doubt in expressing in which of both states he would want to be: if living, existing, preaching, or dead, nonexisting, and without being with God.

If at the time of death the soul of the Christian would not go be with the Lord, but ceased to exist, it would make no sense for Paul to say that to him death was gain. In other words, it makes no sense for Paul to think or say that his death would be gain. If the human being would cease to exist upon dying, there would be no gain for a Christian to die, especially a preacher like Paul. If Paul would change preaching the Gospel and teaching the brethren for dying, this is a sure sign that he knew that when he died he would go to God, not cease to exist.

If Paul hesitated between the two possibilities: **a**) living, preaching and helping the brethren; and **b**) dying, it is because he knew that behind death there was nothing like what the anti-soul advocates paint; but the awesome presence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the company of the brethren that preceded him.

Not only does this passage show us that Paul believed in the existence of the soul, but also that he knew that immediately after death he would go into the presence of Christ. If we read verse 23 we can see that Paul desired to "go and be with Christ". We see that in his mind was the idea that once gone, or once freed from the flesh, the true Paul would be with Christ. That he had in common with Stephen. If he believed the soul did not exist, he could not think that the flesh, once rotted, could be with Christ, since in that case the flesh was Paul, and without flesh there was no Paul, and without flesh Paul could not be with Christ; and much less he could be with Christ immediately after death, but instead thousands of years after, after the resurrection of the flesh.

If we go to verse 24 of the Russellist version it says, "I need to stay in the flesh..." In those words we see that Paul's "I", and his flesh were two different things, for the "I" could stay in the flesh, which leads us to conclude that the "I" could also leave the flesh.

 When in verses 22 and 24 Paul speaks of "staying in the flesh" is good for the brethren, he shows us that he believed in the existence of the soul as different from the body. If not, he would not use the preposition "in", which in this case indicates being inside of something.

People talk according to what is on their mind. By their words, the Bible characters (in this case, Paul) show us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

If Paul says that the time of his departure is near it is because he knew he was going to go and not stay behind

When someone says, "The train departs at three", he is saying that this train will leave the place where it is now, and going to another place. No one would even think to say that a train is leaving at three if it were going to stay in place. No one would say, "The Capitol departs tomorrow at three", because the Capitol stays in the same place, it does not go anywhere.

If Paul would have believed that the soul did not exist, that he was only a piece of breathing flesh, he would not have used the phrase, "the time of my departure", because he knew he was not going anywhere, he was going to rot in the grave.

"For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand".

(II Tim 4:6)

If Paul had believed that he was going to stay in the grave, he would not have said that he was going to depart, for one departs when one is going somewhere. From the moment that he speaks of departing it is because he considered he is going on a trip.

As we can see, by the words of the Bible characters, we can see what they believed.

×

If Peter says he is going to leave his "tabernacle" it is because he is leaving the body

A tabernacle is a tent, a temporal home. If I leave my tent, the tent stays but my person leaves. Here, Peter is talking about his imminent death, and says "...I must leave my tabernacle..." If Peter leaves his tabernacle it is because his tabernacle and Peter are two different things. Thus the reasoning for the existence of the soul, for the physical body where Peter lives stays, and the soul, which is the real Peter, goes. This passage shows that in Peter's mind was the knowledge of the existence of the soul. This mental attitude is the same we see in Paul's writings.

"13 Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; 14 knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me".

(II P 1:13-14)

When Peter says that he is in a tabernacle, a tent or temporal home, it tells us that Peter did not consider his body as his true "I", rather he considered the body as a temporal home he would later have to leave. If the human being were only body and breath, nothing that was still Peter's could leave the body.

This is further clarified in verse 14 where it says that Christ told him that he will soon leave his tabernacle. If Peter, the real Peter leaves his tabernacle, it is because Peter is not the tabernacle, which is the same as saying that the real Peter is not the body, but the real Peter lives in the body and soon will leave it. This is evidence that in Peter's mind was the conviction of the existence of the soul, and not the thought that this "soul" is made up of body and breath, as stated by those who do not believe in the existence of the soul.

Russellists change this passage, but even then it can be used to prove that the soul does exist. Verse 13 of their version says, "...while I am in this tabernacle...", where we see that the real Peter, which is the soul, considered himself to be trapped inside a tabernacle, which is the body.

He knows that Peter is not the tabernacle, but a home to live in, which is the same as saying that Peter was not the body. Later, in verse 14 of the same Russellist version, Peter says that he knows that "...soon my time will come to leave my tabernacle..." It is clear to say that "my tabernacle does not refer to himself, but to the place where he lived, in other words, his body, which will be discarded soon.

We see again that people talk according to what is on their mind. By their words the Bible characters (in this case Peter), we see that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

The Lord is God of the spirits and of all the flesh

We see in this passage that when Moses and Aaron pray to God, they refer to him as "God of the spirits of all flesh". In other words, according to this statement the flesh has a spirit, a soul, of which the Lord is God over. That spirit or soul is what relates to God, not the flesh. The flesh cannot worship God, but the spirit or soul that inhabits it. Moses uses the same phrase in Numbers 16:22 and 27:16.

"And they fell upon their faces, and said: O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin, and wilt thou be wroth with all the congregation?" (Nm 16:22)

"Let the LORD, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation".

(Nm 27:16)

If the human being were not a soul that inhabits a flesh body Moses would have not referred to this issue in the manner that he did. If the spirit were simply "breath of life", it would have nothing to do with its relationship with God; if the human being were merely a piece of flesh with breath, Moses would have said here, "God of all flesh", and not, "God of the spirits and of all the flesh". In other words, the soul that lives inside the body is what is important to God, because it is what relates to Him.

Those who do not believe in the existence of the soul say that the flesh plus the breath of life is what constitutes the soul, "breath of life" being understood as the breath that God gives them. They use this term very astutely, as a play of words a pun, to wrap the listener into believing that they (the anti-soul) do believe in the soul, while at the same time deny its existence. When they say that the soul does exist they refer to the body of a person who is alive and breathing, not to what the rest of humanity calls "soul". That is why when they talk they say, "You are a soul". They do so not to scare away the person they are trying to captivate. **They are not being sincere.**

 Something else to note in these two passages is that when Moses says that God is God of all spirits of all flesh, he shows us that he knew that there were two different things, the spirit and the body; and he knew that God related to the souls, not the flesh. If the human being were simply breathing flesh, as stated by those who do not believe in the existence of the soul, then God were really the God of all the flesh and not of all spirits and all the flesh, since according to them the spirit is nothing but the breath. All this proves that the human being is a soul living in a body of flesh.

When Moses said that God is the God of the <u>non-</u>carnal part of the human being he shows that a human being's personality is not in the flesh, but in something that is not flesh, in other words, the soul.

Once again we see that people talk according to what is on their mind. In this case it is Moses who, through his words, shows us that they believed in the existence of the soul.

Ж

David was going to where the dead boy was

The boy born to David and Bathsheba out of their adulterous relationship had died. David, **who was a prophet** and would certainly know if there was a soul, or if the human being were merely flesh and bones, declares here that leaves no doubt what his position was on the issue. David says what was in his mind in reference to the existence of the soul as a spiritual being different from the body of flesh.

"But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me".

(II Sam 12:23)

Referring to the dead boy, David says verbatim, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me". From the moment when David says that the boy would not come to him, he is implying that he could not see him, talk to him, be with him, etc., as long as he lived. So when he (David) says that in the future he will be where the boy is (now), he is saying that he will see him when he dies.

David does not say, "I will rot as he does", but rather, "I shall go to him", thus indicating that he thought that the baby was in a place where he (David) could later go to. If David were talking about the grave, the dust and the rottenness, he would not say, "I will go to him", but, "I will go to the grave, or the dust, or the tomb". David would not say, "I will go to the child", because **if the soul did not exist**, then the baby did not exist. Therefore, he could not go to the child because the child was nowhere.

At the same time, if David had believed that the soul did not exist, he would have known that upon his death he would totally cease to exist, and therefore not go anywhere. At most he would be carried to the grave. However, he says "I shall go", proof that he believed that he would continue to exist even after his body was dead.

*

The fathers of all flesh and the Father of all spirits

In the upcoming verse we see that Paul makes a difference between the flesh and the spirit, saying that the fathers of our flesh punished us, and that God, being the Father of spirits, has more reason to punish us. If Paul were not talking about our souls, he had no reason to first mention our flesh.

"Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?" (Heb 12:9)

Now, it may be that someone could say that when Paul says "Father of the spirits", he is talking about the angels and not the souls of human beings; but that is not so. If we go to verse 23 we will see that he is talking about the souls of the righteous men, not the angels; because he mentioned them in verse 22.

"22 But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, 23 to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect".

(Heb 12:22-23)

We also see that by talking about the spirits, he is not talking about the "breath of life", but about beings that have understanding. I say that because when he talks about them he talks about justice and perfection, which are attributes of thinking beings and not of the "breath of life", which is what those who do not believe in the soul mention when talking about the spirit of the human being.

If we were to believe those who say that our spirit is our breath, we would have to accept the blunder of thinking that Paul is calling God, "The Father of our breath". It is evident that he has to be talking about our soul, which he calls spirit, which is common when talking about the soul. In other words, it is evident that the soul exists.

In all of the aforementioned cases in this chapter we have seen that people talk according to what is on their mind. By their words the Bible characters show that they believed in the existence of the soul.

*

Summary of chapter 5. When people talk they reflect what is on their mind. That is why when they speak we know what the people of the Bible believed.

We see Stephen commend his spirit to Christ; if the spirit were only the breath of life, there would be no need to give it to the Lord. Christ would not have said that the soul of the beggar was taking by the angels to Abraham's bosom if the soul did not exist. That would confuse Christians.

Just like the alleged "cavemen" who carelessly mentioned the word "roof" instead of "ceiling", a man who does not believe in the soul could not use the words "bring" and "take out". Equally, Paul could not say that he was taken out of the body, because, if there is no soul the person cannot leave the body; neither could he have said that his inner man was renewed each day, because there would be no inner man.

When the Lord said that Peter would follow him later, he shows us that there is a soul, for Peter's body rotted in the grave.

If Job know that he is returning to the place he came from, and he know that a king and a baby go to the same place. This is evidence that there is a soul, for it is only in death that both of these can happen.

If Paul says that there are sins that are outside the body and that we are going to be one spirit with the Lord, it is evidence of the existence of the soul, because if there wasn't, all sins would be in the body, and if we were only the body, we could not be one spirit with the Lord.

Paul says that he lived in a house and that when he died he would receive another one; a sign that he considered himself a soul living inside a flesh body. He also talks about being absent from the body, which cannot happen if the human being is only a body.

It is impossible to be Lord over someone who does not exist. If there were no soul, the dead would not exist. But Paul says that Christ is Lord of the living and of the dead. Equally, if the spirit has feelings that are opposed to the flesh that is a sign

that the soul exists, because if the soul were the body, the body could not have feelings that are opposed to the body.

Those who do not believe in the soul say that the spirit that is mentioned in relationship with the body is merely the breath. It is absurd to think that when Paul said, "Grace be with your spirit", he would really be saying, "Grace be with your breath". It is clear that Paul is talking about the soul.

Paul was a realized preacher. If he had thought that the soul did not exist, that he would not go with the Lord at the time of his death, he would not have hesitated between dying and continuing his preaching. If he doubted and could not choose it is because he was certain that upon his death he would go with the Lord. Plus, when Paul says that the time of his parting was near, he shows us that he was talking about the soul, for if he had believed that he was only flesh, he would not have said that he was leaving, since his body would stay in the grave

Peter too says that he is leaving his tabernacle, which shows that he also knew that there was a soul that leaves the body.

Moses refers to God as the God of all the spirits of all the flesh. If he had believed that there was **no** soul, he would have called him the God all flesh.

David knew he was going to where his son was, a sign that he knew the soul existed, because if the human being were only flesh, the baby did not exist anymore once he died.

In Hebrews, Paul makes a difference between the flesh and the spirit when he says that we have our fathers of the flesh, who punished us, and therefore we should accept the punishment of the Father of our spirits.

Chapter 6

The "chemical" evil feelings and the resurrection

The anti-soul doctrine indirectly says that humans are not responsible for their sins

For those of us who believe in the existence of the soul, the following passage doesn't present a problem. We realize that the body is the house, or the tent where the soul lives, therefore, the transformation of which Paul talks about will only happen in our body.

This way those of us who will be alive at the moment of the Second Coming, will be living in a body which, after being transformed, will become a much better residence for our true self, the soul; but our soul will not be transformed. For those who do not believe in the existence of the soul, since the soul is the breathing body, when their body is transformed, so is their soul.

"51 Behold, I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, 52 In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed". (I Co 15:51-52)

For those who do not believe in the existence of the soul as a spiritual being that lives in a body of flesh, this passage presents great difficulty. The first thing we need to ask them is, where are the thoughts and feelings produced, and where are they stored. Since they don't believe the human soul is a spiritual being that lives in a body of **flesh,** but rather they affirm that the union of the body and the breath is indeed the soul, they think that the feelings and thoughts live in the brain. If this were true, then, according to them, when our body is transformed, so is our soul.

Since the body is made up of molecules and atoms, if there were no soul the feelings would be produced in the body by different groups of atoms and molecules, or by the aligning or grouping of such atoms and molecules in different forms for each thought or feeling.

This would mean that if someone had a bad sentiment or attitude, it would be because the atomic-molecular composition of his brain has been invaded by atoms of elements different than those of a man with good feelings. Or maybe it is not about different elements, but rather the atoms and molecules have aligned or grouped in a different way. And it could be the case not only of the brain but the kidneys, the heart, or whatever they want to say produces and stores the feelings in a human being. What is said about feelings can also be applied to the thoughts.

Perhaps we should ask, when the non-believers bodies are resurrected, will they resurrect with the same evil alignment of atoms and molecules, so that they can continue having the same bad feelings and thoughts, and then be punished? Who aligns or groups the atoms and molecules in order to form bad feelings? Is a human being merely the sad victim of chemistry? Those who hate God, do so because they had the misfortune of having a bad chemical composition? Anyone who analyzes this has to conclude that the human being is a soul that lives in a body made of flesh.

What fault is it of anyone who does not know chemistry, that the atoms and molecules in his brain align themselves to produce bad feelings? If someone who has evil thoughts because of the alignment of the atoms and molecules in his brain dies, why would God align them again that way at the time of the resurrection to judge and condemn him? This is the absurd conclusion to which the belief about the human being nothing but flesh and breath leads people.

*

Summary of Chapter 6. If the human being did not have a soul, if he were only matter, then bad feelings would be material issues, bad alignment of the chemical products that make the brain work. In that case, sin is a chemical problem and not

spiritual, for which man would not be at all liable.

Chapter 7

The soul and the Second Coming of Christ

If God brings with Christ those who slept in Jesus it is because the soul exists

Those who deny the existence of the soul **do not want** to acknowledge the large quantity of passages that teach that the soul exists as a separate entity. One of these is this one, which says that **at His**

Second Coming God will bring with Christ those who slept in the Lord. In this passage Paul considers the possibility of being alive and on Earth at the moment of the Second Coming. That is why by putting himself alive and on Earth he speaks of Christ as coming from Heaven and bringing with him those who died. If Paul says He will bring them it is because he knows they were with Christ.

Since the bodies of the Christians that die before the Second Coming of the Lord would be on Earth, and since resurrection happens **after** God brings back with Jesus, those who died in Jesus, therefore, the only thing that can come with Jesus during his Second Coming, are the souls of those who died in Christ. It is clear that the soul has to exist as an entity separate from the body.

"14 For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. 15 For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. 16 For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first".

If God <u>brings</u> with Christ, in his Second Coming, those Christians who died, it is because they are not on Earth; otherwise he would not use the verb, "bring". When Paul said "bring" he was on Earth. If he uses the term "bring" while still on Earth, it is because in his mind he had the idea that these

(I Tes 4:14-16)

dead brothers were <u>outside</u> the Earth. If not, he would not use the verb "bring". If Paul had believed the soul did not exist, and since he knew that the bodies were in the Earth, he would have said, "come for", but never "bring". If the soul did not exist, and since Jesus is coming from the Heavens, he could not "bring" with him people who were in the Earth. If the soul didn't exist, the only thing left of these dead Christians was on Earth.

Besides, since according to the anti-soul the human being, once dead, does not exist, it could not be possible for Jesus to bring with him those who do not exist. Those people would not exist until Jesus, once on Earth, could revive them. Therefore, if there were no soul, we could not say that God would bring along with Him those who slept in Jesus.

The stories of Stephen and that of the fifth seal reaffirm our idea that the souls of the dead Christians are in Heaven. Stephen could not be so irrational, to ask Jesus to receive his soul if he did believe that it did not exist. Nor would the souls of the martyrs for Christ be shown to John if those souls did not exist.

In summary. It says here that: a) The Lord brings with him in his Second Coming those who slept in Christ. In other words, the Christians that died; b) those Christians who are living will see Christ come; c) after this the bodies of those dead Christians will rise again. Therefore, those who came with Christ were **not** the bodies of those Christians, but rather, their souls.

*

In reading Rev 6:9-11 one learns that the souls exist and how they go about in Heaven

From this passage one concludes not only that the soul exists as a spiritual entity separate from the body, but also information about the state of the souls that have been saved by Jesus, and have died throughout the ages.

This passage speaks so clearly of the existence of the soul that it would be absurd to suppose that the Holy Spirit inspired John these things if they were not true. The Lord would not allow something to be written, which would confuse the faithful into error. Nowhere in Scripture does it say that the soul does not exist. However, plenty of passages clearly show that it does exist.

Nevertheless, even though in the following passage it only speaks of the souls of the martyrs, I suppose that equally, the souls of all dead believers would be in the same state. Let's see.

The souls mentioned:

3129

3130

3131

3132

3133

3134

3135

3136

3137

3138

3139

3140

3141

3142

3143

3144

3145

3146

3147 3148

3149

3150

3151

3152

3153

3154

3155

3156

3157

3158

3159

3160

3161

3162

3163

3164

- a) Could cry out, ask for justice, and speak.
- **b)** They could think, for they could realize what was happening, as well as that which had not yet happened.
- c) They remembered what had happened to them on Earth, so they did not lose their memory.
- d) They longed for justice and were anxious, knowing their assassins were still unpunished. So they feel.
- e) They were aware of what was happening on Earth, at least in general.
- f) They had understanding, for they knew what they were being told: rest, etc..
- g) They were already at rest, as they were told,

"that they should rest yet for a little

season..."

In general, their state seems to be similar to our present state, except that they did not have that which is of the flesh.

"9 And when he had opened the fifth seal, <u>I saw</u> under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. 10 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? 11 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 6:9-11)

There are those who think that when Christians die and go to Heaven they lose their memory, because according to them, they could not be happy, remembering their loved ones left behind, and "seeing" all their afflictions on Earth.

First of all, the souls in Heaven have no contact with Earth, let alone "see" their loved ones. They may have a general awareness of what happens down here, from what the other souls tell them, but they can't "see" their family members from Heaven as the spiritualists and Catholics believe. And much less they can hear them or help them, as if when they died they had acquired divine characteristics. The dead continue to be human; their souls were human since their creation. They do not become angels or divine beings. Therefore, these souls don't have different qualities than those they had while on

Earth.

We also need to keep in mind that when a Christian is in Heaven, he fully realizes how divine protection works, therefore, the anxieties, doubts and fears he had here, he does not have there. There he sees the evil of the damned, he sees and feels the reality, and understands God's justice. Remember that, there, they <u>do</u> understand all that God has done for them. And they understand the reality of Jesus' statement, when he said that he who loved mother or father more than Him is not worthy of Him.

Besides, as long as they are on Earth, many people lose loved ones, or moves from one country to another, losing contact, and yet continue being happy in life. They get used to their new situation without necessarily losing their memory. If that happens to those on Earth, with all their difficulties and problems, how much more it would be for those who go to Heaven, where nothing evil exists.

Besides, if those who died would lose their memory, then those who are in Hell would not know the reason they are there, and they would consider it an injustice.

God would not allow this passage to be written, in which so many things are said about the soul which were not true, if in fact the soul does not exist. Besides, reading this passage would drive many sincere people into believing a heresy.

*

Summary of chapter 7. According to Paul, on His Second Coming, those who slept in Christ will

has not happened yet, it is logical to think that it is their souls that come with Christ. Since the anti-soul say that the soul is the breathing body, and since resurrection has not happened at that moment, the evidence points to the souls, which will now receive their new body. These souls that Paul mentions cannot be resurrected bodies, or bodies that went to Heaven.

God would not allow a passage that speaks of the soul to be written if it did not exist. And much less would He allow for it to say that these souls speak, thought, felt, heard, understood, remembered, etc., if none of it were true. To do so would make sincere people believe a heresy. God is not a god of confusion. It is a case similar to that of the rich ruler and Lazarus.

Chapter 8

If there are souls in Hell it is because they exist

If those in Hell speak, the soul exists

In this passage we see that those that are in Hell are human beings, who are conscious and can speak. They can speak because they exist. We can also see that they are not angelic beings. They are human beings, for it says they were **slain by the sword**, as we can se in verse 21. If they were slain by the sword, then what is in Hell is their soul, because their body is in the grave.

We see something similar in verse 22, this time in reference to Asshur, and Elam in verse 24. But this time it says that they descended to the deepest places of the Earth. They can't be talking about the grave, which is only 6 feet deep; in other words, not on the surface, but in Hell itself.

"21 The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of Hell with them that help him; they are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, slain by the sword. 22 Asshur is there and all her company; his graves are about him; all of them slain, fallen by the sword; 23 whose graves are set in the sides of the pit, and her company is round about her grave; all of them slain, fallen by the sword, which caused terror in the land of the living. 24 There is Elam and all her multitude round about her grave, all of them slain, fallen by sword, which are gone uncircumcised into the nether parts of the earth, which caused their terror in the land of the living; yet have they borne their shame with them that go down to the pit".

(Ezk 32:21-24)

In the passage we just read, we see that it refers to human beings, because it refers to them as uncircumcised slain by the sword. Both their uncircumcision and their death by the sword identify them as human beings. An angel cannot die by the sword, and it cannot be classified as uncircumcised. Therefore, if it refers to human beings, whose bodies are in the grave, it is evident that what is in Hell is their soul; thus concluding that the soul exists. They deny the existence of

Hell, because they admitted it they had to admit also that soul does exist.

*

Summary of chapter 8. In reading this passage from Ezekiel we see that he speaks of people in Hell. He speaks of them as slain by the sword and uncircumcised; which leads to conclude that they are human beings. If, as human beings, they are in Hell, while their bodies are in the grave, this is inescapable evidence that the soul does exist.

Chapter 9

If Christ preached to the spirits in prison it is because the soul exists

The fairytale of the demons that made up their own bodies

Peter is very clear about it. While Jesus' body was in the grave, he went to preach to the "spirits in prison".

"18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. 19 By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; 20 which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited

in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water". (IP 3:18-20)

If a soul whose body has been rotting in the grave for a few centuries could understand Jesus' preaching, it is because the soul exists and has understanding, memory, free will, and other faculties that characterize the human personality.

In support of what Peter says here, we see that in Eph 4:8-11, Paul, speaking of the Lord, says that Christ descended to the deepest parts of the Earth, which is in agreement with what Peter says about Christ preaching to the souls in prison. In Ephesians we see that he is talking about human souls, because he says he gave gifts unto men.

"8 Wherefore he saith: When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. 9 Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the Earth? 10 He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. 11 And he gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some, pastors and teachers". (Eph 4:8-11)

Such mention of his preaching right after his death by crucifixion, shows that when Jesus was crucified his body went to the grave, but he went to preach both to Paradise, as he told the thief (Lk 23:43) as well as to another place or places.

In support of what he had previously said in I P 3:18-20, he once again shows that Jesus preached to

those who died before his crucifixion, and he says it categorically. Let's see.

"For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are <u>dead</u>, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live

according to God in the spirit". (IP 4:6)

It is evident that if he preached to the dead it is because the soul exists, since a rotten body cannot preach to anyone.

During the three days while his body was in the grave, Jesus fulfilled, in spirit, at least one mission of preaching to people already dead. In I P 4:6 we saw that **Peter repeats emphatically that the Gospel has been preached to the dead,** and in this case is less restrictive than the previous passage, because now he is not referring only to people from the Flood age, but "to them that are dead", and even though he does not make it clear that he is also referring to non Flood people, it is so implied. That is why I believe that it could be extended to all those who died before Christ, in general.

All this implies the knowledge that the Gospel has been deeply extended. In the case we are studying, not only did these spirits hear the Gospel, they heard it right from the mouth of the author.

Before the Gospel had yet been shown, no one could do that job; that is why Jesus had to do it himself, in those who died before the crucifixion. However, once the Gospel was revealed, any angel can do a similar job; be it because the Gospel has not reached that person, or because they want to give him one last opportunity before death that leaves no place for doubt.

The Gospel has also been preached to the dead, as Peter so clearly and emphatically states. Whether to those from the Flood, those who died before Christ, or those who died up to when and after Peter says this. How it happens, we don't know. That unquestionably happens to all, we cannot be sure. But that it is possible and reasonable that it could be so, we can affirm.

 In order to save themselves from the situation Peter puts them in, some who don't believe in the existence of the soul, allege that what that means is that the Gospel was preached to those who were dead while they were still alive. That is false, for no one knew what the gospel was until after the crucifixion when the Holy Spirit came down. So, none of those who died before Christ could have heard the Gospel while they were alive.

Still others, more boldly try to get out by fabricating a fairy tale. In this tale they claim that certain angels, in the pre-Flood era, incarnated and married some women, and it is those "spirits" (angels) to whom Peter is referring. This is yet a bigger farce for two reasons. First, because it is illogical to call the demons "dead", and we can't attribute them the faculty of creating their own bodies, nor convince God to do so. Second, because in II P 2:4, the angels that rebelled were thrown into Hell, and were reserved for judgment, not to preach them the Gospel; therefore there was no need to go preach to them.

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be

reserved unto judgment". (II P 2:4)

Besides, it is illogical to think that those demons-who according to the anti-soul proponents were incarnated--would be told they would be judged in the flesh, and yet live as spirits according to God, as says in I P 4:6.

 The spirits that disobeyed "when God's patience was waiting during the days of Noah", have to be those of the humans that were disobedient at that time, because the demons were disobedient much earlier, and not only during the days of Noah. Besides, it is not logical to think that Jesus would go preach to the demons so they would convert, much less would he take them on to Heaven, as stated in Eph 4:8-11. This clearly refers to the souls of those who died during that time, to whom Jesus went to preach.

*

Summary of chapter 9. If the spirits in bondage since the time of Noah were preached to, it is because the soul does exist. If it did not, it is impossible to preach to people whose bodies are already decomposed. If, as the "anti-souls" proclaim, a person ceases to exist when he dies, no one can preach to people who do not exist.

On the other hand, it cannot be incarnate demons, which is the fairy tale invented by some, because no one who is not divine can create a body, and God would not lend Himself to make a different creation for demons, a special creation, after the creation of Adam, and a creation made specifically for sin.

Chapter 10

Refuting some of the passages alleged by the anti-soul

The anti-soul twist the concept of Paradise in order to make it match their heresy

We all remember that the Tree of Life was in the Garden of Eden. To avoid for humanity to eat from it, God ordered a flaming sword that turned every way. He also placed cherubim, presumably to stop any one not authorized to enter.

"So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life".

(Gn 3:24)

If we remember what Jesus Christ said in Rev 2:7 in respect to the Tree of Life being in the middle of Paradise, we can assume without forcing logic, that Paradise is the Garden of Eden.

"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God". (Rev 2:7)

So if Paradise is the Garden of Eden, then we need to conclude that Paradise was preserved through the Flood, something which was not hard for God at all, who also kept the waters of the Red Sea from swallowing His people, and those of the Jordan River; and we also have to conclude that it is now in some unexplored region on the surface of the planet, where the cherubim that guard it and the sword that turns keep out any one trying to enter. Why conclude that it was preserved through the Flood? Because during Jesus' time it still existed.

Many confuse Paradise with the place where God is currently on His throne, with Christ at His right hand and all the celestial court around Him. These are two different places. This confusion is born of the teachers that either out of malice or out of ignorance teach that Paradise in Heaven.

Paradise is here on Earth, today, for it is not mentioned anywhere in the Bible, that it was destroyed, or that it was taken from Earth. Let's analyze.

It existed during the time of the crucifixion, for it is to Paradise, and <u>not to the presence of God</u>, where Jesus promised the thief He would take him.

"39 And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying: If thou be Christ, save thyself and us. 40 But the other answering rebuked him, saying: Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? 41 And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss. 42 And he said unto Jesus: Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. 43 And Jesus said unto him: Verily I say unto thee: <u>Today shalt thou be with me in paradise</u>".

(Lk 23:39-43)

It is clear that Christ's promise was <u>not</u> to take the thief to God's presence that same day, but rather to Paradise, which is the place where our first fathers lived, and which was forbidden to mortals after the fall.

But the existence of Paradise is not documented only during the time of crucifixion. Years later, as Paul wrote II Cor 12:1-4, Paradise existed. Paul says that certain individual had been both in the Third Heaven as well as in Paradise. In other words, he talks about two different places, one is Paradise, the other one the Third Heaven. I suppose the first heaven would be the Earth's atmosphere, where birds fly; the second, the interplanetary space or astronomic space; and the third, where God's throne is.

"1 It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. 2 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: God knoweth), such an one caught up to the Third Heaven. 3 And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth), 4 how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter". (II Co 12:1-4)

This passage indicates that without a doubt, **Paradise existed** yet 14 years before Paul wrote to the Corinthians, and **in such a way that a human being could actually be transported there**. What's more, it even makes a difference between what Paul

calls the Third Heaven and Paradise, clearly two different things.

 During the time the book of Revelation was written (the last Bible book written,) Paradise existed. If we go to Rev 2:7 we see that the one who spoke to John, Jesus himself, took the existence of Paradise for granted as He spoke.

"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God". (Rev 2:7)

As we can see, Jesus, (who knows more than all the world's theologians), spoke of Paradise as existing just as He spoke to John, since He uses the present tense of the verb "to be". He says, it "is", not it "was".

In John 20:17 we can find one truth exposing fact that Jesus was not referring to the Father's presence when He was talking to the thief about Paradise. There He declares that He had not yet gone to the Father. This happened the day after his crucifixion, which is when the thief was to go to Paradise. Therefore, if the Lord had not yet gone to the Father, but had already been to Paradise that same day, it is evident that it is a different place than that where God's throne is.

"Jesus saith unto her: Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them: I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God". (John 20:17)

This same reasoning we used in the preceding verse, can be used with Acts 1:2-11 where we clearly see that before going to the Father, Jesus spent forty days on Earth.

"2 Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen. 3 To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God..... 9 And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight". (Acts 1:2-9 Abbreviated)

We already proved that Paradise cannot be confused with the place where the Celestial Court is. We also know for sure that **the last "official" notice we have that Paradise still existed,** dates back to the times of II Corinthians and Revelation, much later than Christ's resurrection. If all that is true, I don't see why Paradise can't still exist, and I don't see any reason to imagine that it was destroyed after Paul or John mentioned it in their books.

Now then, what is Paradise's function? We can say that it is a place outside the evil influence of this world, where there are beings that can say things that can be heard as we saw in II Co 12:14. For now, we can say that souls can go to Paradise after leaving the body in the tomb, as was the case with Jesus and the thief.

It is very probable that Enoch and Elijah, who still have not died, can logically be in Paradise, waiting for their time to act; at least in Elijah's case.

Let's summarize:

- a) Paradise existed through the time of the apostles and there is no reason to think that it doesn't exist now;
- b) Paradise could house <u>real beings of flesh</u> and <u>blood</u>, as were our first parents Adam and Eve, as well as <u>non-flesh beings</u>, such as the thief's soul.

In short, Paradise was on Earth during the time of Adam and Eve, and there is not a verse in the entire Bible that tells us it was taken to Heaven. Therefore, when Christ told the thief that he would be with Him in Paradise, He was not saying he would be with Him in front of God's throne, but rather somewhere here on Earth. So that twisted argument presented by the anti-souls, that the soul does not exist because the thief could not go to Paradise the same day of the crucifixion because Christ had not gone to the Father, totally lacks reason and logic.

To that respect the anti-souls allege, twisting Scripture, that in Lk 23:43 where it says "Surely I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise", what should say is "Surely I tell you today, you will be with me in Paradise". In other words, according to this doctrine, what Christ is saying is not that today would be in Paradise, but rather he is saying today that he will some day be in Paradise with Him.

It is ridiculous, to say the least, for Christ to have to be specific to the thief that he was saying that "today", for the thief knew he was saying it "today;" he was not such a fool. He was not going to think that what he was telling him "today" was actually "yesterday" or "tomorrow".

The Adventist and Russellist sects impugn this verse. They say the translators put a comma in the wrong place and have transposed the word "today". The purpose of twisting this verse is crucial for the existence of both sects, because without it they would have to accept the existence of the soul; something they absolutely deny, since their "prophets" Charles Taze Russell and Ellen G. White "prophesized" to them that the soul did not exist. If these "prophets" are shattered, the sects themselves will collapse; thus their effort to keep this lie. Here is how the verse reads:

"And Jesus said unto him: Verily I say unto thee, <u>Today shalt thou</u> be with me in Paradise". (Lk 23:43 KJV)

Both sects twist this verse alleging that it should read as follows:

"And Jesus said unto him: Verily I say unto thee **today**, **shalt thou be with me in Paradise**". (Lk 23:43 Adventist twist)

"And he said to him: Truly <u>I tell you today</u>, you will be with me in Paradise".

(Lk 23:43 Russellist twist)

Christ had no reason to tell the thief that he was speaking to him "today" for the thief was listening to Him and knew it. Besides, no where in the Bible is the phrase "I tell you today" used. They invented it to deny the undeniable.

In addition, at the time when the early scholars translated the Bible the placement of the comma or the word "today" was not a conflict, therefore, the translators had no reason to transpose it, as antisoul allege.

During the 19 centuries when the Bible was translated no one denied the existence of the soul, and there was no argument about this verse. This started at about 1850 when these two sects mentioned before surfaced. However, after the emergence of these sects and their heretic doctrine about the non-existence of the soul, both Adventists and Russellists have a reason to twist the verse in order to make it match their heresy.

If up until the 19th Century there was no sectarian interest in twisting this verse, it was illogical for them to do so, and it was especially illogical that <u>all</u> translators would twist it in <u>all</u> versions of the Bible. Since the year 1850 up until today, when there is a sectarian interest in denying the existence of the soul, we can suspect that the Russellists and Adventists would want to twist the verse.

Up until the 19th Century there were a multitude of translations, and all agree with the original King James in English and Reina-Valera in Spanish. If, in fact, the originals say "Truly I say to you today", all translators, or at least the majority of them, would have translated it as such, **since there was no sectarian reason to hide it.** If they translated "Truly I say to you today", that wouldn't deny the existence of the soul. Therefore there was no reason why <u>all</u> translators of the antiquity, who believed in the existence of the soul, wanted to enter in a conspiracy to change the order of the words. To use the phrase "I say to you today" did not go against

the belief of the existence of the soul; therefore why to-change it?

Until the year 1850 it would not have been harmful to translate "Truly I tell you today". Therefore, if that is what the originals said, the translators would have translated it as such during the first 19 centuries until the appearance of the heresy that denies the existence of the soul.

Other more problematic and evident things than the issue of whether or not Jesus said today or if the thief went to Paradise have not been altered in the Bible. For example, the verses that deal with idol worshiping were never altered in the Bible, in spite of the fact that those who would be most affected by it were the ones who were in total control during the Middle Ages, in other words, the Vatican. If the Bible has not been altered for more important issues, why would they alter a simple word such as "today" that is so insignificant in the light of the entire doctrine?

*

Lazarus did not go to Paradise or Heaven, but someone else did, and returned

Those who deny the existence of the soul allege that it is not logical for Lazarus to be in Heaven and then be called out by Jesus and brought back to Earth. I don't know where they get that it is not logical, because Paul says it is. Besides, Lazarus was not in Heaven. Let's see.

Lazarus was not in Heaven. First of all, **before** the resurrection of Christ no one went to Heaven. Therefore, Lazarus was not in Heaven and

Jesus did not pull him out to bring him back to Earth. There is the first lie.

Besides, we don't know if Lazarus' was a special case in which the soul did not leave the body. I say it could be considered a special case because of what Jesus said in the next passage, for Lazarus, death was not an ordinary death. It was a "death" that would serve to show the glory of the Son of God, but not really to die. It is similar to the death of Euticus, who even though Paul declared him dead, it says that his soul did not leave him.

"1 Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. 2 (It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.) 3 Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying: Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick. 4 When Jesus heard that, he said: This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby". (John 11:1-4)

As we can see, according to Jesus himself, Lazarus' illness was not for death; and if it was not for death, then we have to conclude that he did not die a definitive death as the ordinary human beings. And if he did not die in the ordinary way that the human being dies, his soul could have stayed in his body until Jesus came and raised him up. He did not have to go to either Heaven or Paradise, or any other place. If Lazarus' case was an exception, it should not be taken as an argument to say that the soul does not exist.

The mere fact that according to the anti-soul thinking, Jesus would not pull Lazarus out of Heaven is not a good argument, since Lazarus did not have to be pulled out. He had never been there to begin with.

But that is not all; there is more. Even if Lazarus had gone to Paradise or Heaven, this would still not stop the Lord form bringing him back if, in his sovereignty, he wanted to do so. It would not have been the only case; Paul tells us of another very similar story. In other words, those who deny the existence of the soul tear their clothing when they think that Lazarus could have been brought back from Heaven or Paradise, without realizing that in II Co 12:2-4, Paul says that it was precisely what happened to a friend of his.

"2 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, God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third Heaven. 3 And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth;) 4 How that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter".

(II Co 12:2-4)

As we can see, when those who deny the existence of the soul try to laugh at the possibility that Lazarus could have been brought back to Earth after being in Paradise or Heaven, forget that it is precisely what happened to the aforementioned Christian, he was taken to Paradise, he was taken to Heaven, and then he was brought back to Earth.

But there is something that those who deny the existence of the soul are not aware of, when they argue this. They are blaspheming when they say Lazarus could not have been brought back from Heaven, because God was not going to be so cruel as to take him to Heaven and then bring him back. First of all, this thinking is daring, because if such a thing would have happened, they would be calling God cruel. They think they are the real authority on cruelty, and based on their poor discernment they dictate that to do such thing would be cruel. Since we already saw that going to Heaven and Paradise, and then coming back really happened, we find that those who adhere to such argument are insulting God by calling him cruel.

*

The anti-souls claim that the thief on the cross did not die that day

In order to defend a lie it is necessary to make up other lies. That is the case of those who have invented the doctrine that denies the existence of the soul. After inventing such a doctrine, they had to twist the Bible, and later, maliciously invent that the thief could not have been with Jesus in Paradise that day because he did not die that day. To say such thing they use Jn 19:31-34, where it says, not that the thief did not die, but that they broke his legs so that he would die.

"31 The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be

broken, and that they might be taken away. 32 Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. 33 But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. 34 But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water".

(Jn 19:31-34)

It is absurd to say that the thief did not die that day. Not only did he lose blood while hanging from the cross, but to be sure he died, they broke his legs, probably slashing them with a sword which was the easiest way to do it when a man was hanging from the cross. This way he would lose the rest of his blood in a matter of minutes. His legs were broken so he would die soon. Besides, the demand of the Jewish magistrates was that they had to die that day because Passover was that evening.

When the soldiers saw that Jesus was dead, to be sure he really was, they pierced his side. They could not afford that a man condemned to die could escape alive. So more so, the two thieves had to be killed before their bodies could be taken away. It is not logical that the hardened Roman soldiers would let the two thieves get away from them alive.

In order to sustain a lie, another lie has to be made up. That is what the anti-souls have had to do in order to maintain the foolishness that the thief did not die that day.

*

The anti-soul doctrine says that the spirit is the air we breathe. The word "spirit" is not used in such a way in the Bible

Those who maintain a false or questionable doctrine usually base their affirmations on this or that Hebrew or Greek word, because since the current translation denies their doctrine, they have to claim that such and such Hebrew or Greek word backs up their false doctrine. Those who deny the existence of the soul as a spiritual being independent of the body, say that when the Bible talks about these issues, the word "spirit" means "air", "breath", because it comes from the Greek word "pneuma", which means "air".

I have noticed that anytime someone invents a new interpretation of a passage, and especially when it comes to heresy, they have to rely on words from the Hebrew or from the Greek, to which they apply the meaning they need. This is how many twist the Scriptures, for the common man does not know these languages. But the reality is that anyone can refute these inventions by just using the Bible and a little bit of common sense.

The fact that the word "pneuma" means "air" does not mean it cannot mean "spirit" or "soul" as well. In English, the word "arm" means "the upper limb", and also means "weapon".

Well then, if the word "spirit" means only "air" in the Bible, which is what they would have us believe, the phrase "vexation of spirit", which is mentioned in several passages, would not make sense. It would mean "vexation of air", and air has no feeling; it cannot suffer or be afflicted. Therefore, the Greek word "pneuma" has to refer to the soul. We can see this also in the other passages in Ecclesiastes that mention the phrase "vexation of

spirit", as in 1:14; 1:17; 2:11; 2:17; 2:26; 4:4; 4:6 and 4:16. We can see in the same book of Ecclesiastes, which they use to deny the existence of the soul, that "spirit" means soul, not air, not breath. Let's see:

"I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit". (Eccl 1:14)

"And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly; I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit". (Eccl 1:17)

"Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and on the labour that I had laboured to do, and behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun". (Eccl 2:11)

"Therefore, I hated life, because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me; for all is vanity and vexation of spirit".

(Eccl 2:17)

"For God giveth to a man that is good in his sight wisdom, and knowledge, and joy, but to the sinner he giveth travail, to gather and to heap up, that he may give to him that is good before God. This also is vanity and vexation of spirit". (Eccl 2: 26)

"Again, I considered all travail, and every right work, that for this a man is envied of his neighbour. This is also vanity and vexation of spirit". (Eccl 4:4)

"Better is an handful with quietness, than both the hands full with travail and vexation of spirit". (Eccl 4:6)

"There is no end of all the people, even of all that have been before them; they also that come after shall not rejoice in him. Surely this also is vanity and <u>vexation of spirit</u>". (Eccl 4:16)

As we can see, the same book they use to deny the existence of the soul, proves to them that the spirit is not the air we breathe, but the soul that lives in a body of flesh.

*

Death is the same event for humans and animals

Russellists and Adventists cite the following verse to say that we do not have a soul, and we are similar to the animals.

"For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them. As the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast, for all is vanity". (Eccl 3:19)

The first thing we need to see is that it **doesn't** say here that we don't have a soul, but that the **event of death** is the same for both animals and humans. That is made clear when it says that death is the same for both humans and animals, nobody is arguing that. But the fact that death is the same process for humans and animals does not mean that

humans don't have a soul. Then it says that we have the same breath, as to emphasize that we both depend on the air; that does not mean we don't have a soul either.

However, the statement that the animals' breath is the same as humans' is not totally true, for breathing is different for fish and insects. So we can't even use this verse as a "revelation" with respect to animals and humans. We can't even say that fish received the breath of life in their nostrils because they breathe through the gills.

What Solomon says here is a simple observation of how both types of bodies, animals and humans, have a similar life process. But as we can see, it is not a revelation that we don't have a soul, or that we are just like the animals, for fish don't breathe like we do, and neither do the microbes.

If Solomon's statement about the breath for animals and humans is not totally true, then it is not a revelation, and therefore we cannot use it to form a doctrine about the non-existence of the soul, which is so contrary to **so many** other passages of Scripture.

As a matter of fact, just a little bit further down, in verse 21, Solomon himself says that the spirit separates from the body. In other words, Solomon, whom the anti-souls use to back up their heresy, shows us that the flesh and the spirit are two different things. First, he states that there is a spirit; and second, that they separate. I say that because, according to him, the body decomposes and stays in the grave, while the spirit goes either upward or downward. So they can't say that the spirit is either the air or the breath, because it is evident that air and breath do not go downward below the earth, as Solomon says the spirit could do.

"Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" (Eccl 3:21)

Besides, if we were to take this passage as a revelation that teaches that the process of animals and humans is the same in everything, we would have to reach the stupid conclusion that animals will resurrect, since humans, Christians or not, will resurrect.

*

The phrase "the dead know not anything" speaks of the present age, not of them ceasing to exist

The Sadducees had a similar doctrine to those today that deny the existence of the soul. Today's anti-soul think that the human being is nothing but a body, breathing matter. They cite the following passage in order to support this heretic idea, alleging that if it says that the dead know not anything it is because their soul does not exist, for when the matter dies so does "the whole" of the human being. When someone that thinks the opposite asks them how then can there be resurrection, Russellists respond that the person "is kept in the memory of God".

"5 For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. 6 Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for

ever in any thing that is done under the sun". (Eccl 9:5-6)

But ironically, this same verse, which they use to support such foolishness, also says that "...the memory of them is forgotten". In other words, if we are to be honest and suppose that this verse is talking about the actual state of the dead, and not the apparent one, and if we are to think that Solomon is talking about the spiritual dimension and not the present age, we would have to conclude that the memory of the dead is forgotten, and not "kept in God's memory", as stated by the Russellists.

Besides, on reading verse 6 it is evident that Solomon is not talking about the other dimension; he is talking about what we see "currently", "under the sun". So, when Solomon said that the dead know not anything, he is talking about the present age, or under the sun, not about their souls having disappeared or been dissolved, or reduced to nothing.

If this passage were making reference to the other dimension, to the spiritual realm, then "the memory of them is forgotten" would evidently be referring to that spiritual dimension. In such case, according to their own hypothesis, God would forget about them and they could not resurrect.

A similar idea is found in Eccl 2:16, where Solomon reassures us that both the wise and the fool will be forgotten. So if the memory of the dead is forgotten, that means that God does not remember them either. Besides, where in the Bible does it say, or on which passage do they rely to say that God keeps them in His memory in order to resurrect them? As we can see, the same verse

they use to support their heresy holds its contradiction.

"For there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool for ever; seeing that which now is, in the days to come shall all be forgotten. And how dieth the wise man? As the fool". (Eccl 2:16)

Besides, who says that because someone remembers someone else, that someone else "exists" in the memory of the first? In such case all humans would have the gift of multi-presence because we would "exist" in the memory of all who remember us.

Anyone who wants to understand this verse will also understand that Solomon is talking about the apparent state of the dead, as seen by the living. He is talking about the lack of communication between us and them, and about the fact that the memory of the dead is forgotten by the living. It does not make sense to think that God forgets anyone, or that Solomon would refer, in one part of the verse, about the real state of the dead, and in another, their apparent state in respect to the living.

These anti-soul proponents also say that when this verse says "the dead know not anything" it is implied that they stay dead, sleeping, unconscious, because there is no soul; if there were, they say, it could not be said that "they know not anything". It would be like saying that **Snow White "doesn't know anything"**. Since Snow White does not exist the only thing that can be said is that she does not exist, not that "she doesn't know anything". However, of those who died it is said that they

know not anything, because they do exist, but know nothing about what we do or think here on Earth.

If there were no soul and the only thing that existed were the body, since it decomposes and becomes dust, it could not be said that the dead "know not anything" of what happens here. They would have to say that the dead do not exist. To say that "the dead know not anything" would be the same platitude as saying that "dust knows not anything", or that a stone "knows not anything". Solomon would not say that.

It cannot be said that the dead know not anything, because even ignoring, not knowing, implies existence. It can't be said that the dead are as sleeping, because that would imply existence. And it can't be said that they are unconscious because that too implies existence. If sleeping were like death, when someone is sleeping and someone else asks about him, the anti-soul should respond, "He does not exist now, but will exist in a couple of hours".

Another very important fact to consider is that if the soul did not exist, the mind, the personality, the memories, the feelings, the bad intentions, everything typical of the human being would disappear "into a nothing". If that were so, how then can that person resurrect and be as he was before? In order to save themselves from such mud hole they have invented the idea that everything that was a particular human being is preserved in God's memory who will form him just as he was before. Besides asking them where in the Bible they find such a thing, and after they confess that nowhere in the Bible does it say such a thing, we can reason the following.

As we can see in Eccl 7:29, God created man righteous, but they deviated from the way God created them, by becoming sinners, acquiring bad feelings, developing ill attitudes, adopting lusts and diverse forms of evil. If the soul did not exist, then all those bad things live in the flesh, and when the unbeliever dies, they disappear, because they rot with his flesh. When the Second Resurrection comes, when the not-saved will be judged, God will have to resurrect them.

If the soul exists, the only thing God will do is give a body to a rebellious and evil soul that kept its lust, evil acts, bad feelings, etc., and never repented. In other words, God puts flesh again on the same being that was there before; He does not have to remake it, just clothe it with flesh again. Now, since that soul never disappeared, it conserved its personality and its evil, and therefore it is condemned to Hell.

But if the soul does not exist, since the unsaved man has been dissolved, it has become dust, it ceased to exist, God would have to create him again, but this time instead of making him righteous, He would have to make him full of evil and unrighteousness, bad feelings, ill attitudes, hatred, etc.. In other words, according to this heretic doctrine, God will create a wicked, perverse, and corrupt mind, with all its sins, corruption and wickedness this human being had and that, according to them, God has kept in His memory.

It is illogical to think that if all that was bad about the human being was in his body, and upon dying it ceased to exist along with all its evil and wickedness, God would remanufacture that evil and wickedness, creating for him a brain in which the chemical and molecular strands would form themselves in a way that constitutes rebellion, wickedness, and evil.

Since according to this heresy the human being does not have a soul, everything in him is matter, his thoughts, his feelings, his wickedness, his evil, etc., are chains or associations of atoms and molecules which upon death and decomposition disintegrated. So in order to resuscitate this man, those evil chains of atoms and molecules would have to be remanufactured. A series of biochemical units would have to be made in the brain of that man in order to make him have all the same corrupted ideas and attitudes he had before. Absurd!

One more thing to notice is that they do not take into consideration other passages from Scripture, as in Rev. 6:9, which clearly shows the existence of the soul. Solomon in Ecclesiastes spoke, having as his observation point what the common man in his natural habitat can see with respect to death. On the contrary, John, who was much more anointed than the common man, spoke of what he was looking at personally, having been taken to Heaven in the spirit. There he saw the souls of the martyrs of the Great Tribulation, something Solomon could not see.

Besides, Solomon was talking before the resurrection of Christ, when souls still did not go to Heaven; while John was speaking after the resurrection of the Lord.

Another foolish argument brandished by those who deny the existence of the soul and of Hell is to say that, according to them, it would be unfair on God's part to hold in Hell those who died before Noah, longer than those closer to the Second Coming of Christ. First of all, everything God does

is fair, but if we are going to think like that, it would also be unfair that those sinners who lived before the Flood enjoyed a life of 900+ years and then died; while sinners now enjoy only 70-80 years of life and also die. They would also have to consider unfair the fact that someone with a few sins would die at 20 and be destroyed in Hell, while someone else who lived in sin for 90 or 900 years is also destroyed in Hell. The one who sinned little receives the same sentence as the one who sinned much.

Solomon is not the only one to deny that the dead are in someone's memory. If we go to Psalms 88:5 we see that it says that God forgets the slain that are in the grave. So if they are going to claim that the dead are in God's memory, we can show them this verse that also contradicts their heretic hypotheses.

If they would claim that this can only be applied to the slain, we can answer then that the Russellists that have been murdered don't enjoy the resurrection, because God says here that God has forgotten them.

"Free among the dead, like the slain that lie in the grave, whom thou rememberest no more, and they are cut off from thy hand".

(Ps 88:5)

The foolishness of basing a doctrine on just one verse or book of the Bible

Those who deny the existence of the soul and of Hell use isolated verses from Ecclesiastes to enforce their heretic hypotheses. We are going to expose their lack of common sense, showing them a few isolated verses from Ecclesiastes, from which we can come to the most ridiculous and stupid conclusions, if used by themselves.

4346 4347

4342

4343

4344

4345

"What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?" (Eccl 1:3)

4348 4349 4350

4351

From this verse we can come to the stupid conclusion that working is of no value, and the wisdom is in being lazy.

4352 4353 4354

4355

"The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose".

(Eccl 1:5)

4357 4358

4359

4360

4361

4362

4363

4364

4365

4366

It says here that the sun "returns to the place it came from to rise again". Therefore we should admit that the sun rotates around the earth and not the other way around. It is obvious that Solomon is not talking about how things really are, but rather how they are perceived by humans. He does not say what is really happening, but what is apparently happening. It is the same as when he says that the dead know not anything.

4367 4368

----0----

4369 4370

4371

"All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again". (Eccl 1:7)

4372 4373 4374

4375

4376

4377

While this is generally true, it is not true that absolutely all rivers end up in sea; some end up in lakes. In other words, they don't all empty out into that sea where other rivers do. The Jordan River ends up in the Dead Sea, which is nothing more than a lake. Therefore, we cannot take everything Solomon says as some revelation, for many times he spoke of how things are perceived

----0----

"9 The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun. 10 Is there any thing whereof it may be said: See, this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was before us".

(Eccl 1:9-10)

If we were to take Solomon's words literally, without using our common sense, as do those who deny the existence of the soul based on isolated verses, we would reach erroneous conclusions. For example, since there is nothing new under the sun, my refrigerator, which I thought was new, had already existed before, and I didn't know. Today's newspaper is not new, because there is nothing new under the sun. Since whatever has been done is the same that will be done, we need to conclude that Alexander the Great will conquer Asia once more, and Adolph Hitler will take over Europe.

----0-----

"There is no remembrance of former things; neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come with those that shall come after". (Eccl 1:11)

If this were true then why do we study history, for it seems that there is no memory of former things. In this case the dead would not be in God's memory, as told by those that do not believe in the soul.

----0-----

"I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit". (Eccl 1:14)

Reasoning as those that rely on one verse to deny the existence of the soul, since all things done under the sun is nothing but vanity, the preaching of the Gospel must be vanity and vexation of spirit, rather than joy to soul.

----0-----

"That which is crooked cannot be made straight, and that which is wanting cannot be numbered". (Eccl 1:15)

If, in fact, that which is crooked cannot be made straight, why do they preach the Gospel to straighten people? And, if that which is crooked cannot be made straight, how could I straighten the piece of wire I am holding in my hand?

----0----

"I said of laughter: It is mad; and of mirth, What doeth it?" (Eccl 2:2)

Psychiatrists should perhaps interpret this verse as a sign that what causes mental disease is laughter. Maybe laughing in public should be prohibited.

-----0----

"That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past". (Eccl 3:15)

If we were to believe this verse without common sense, we would have to think that reincarnation is true, for he which will be born, has already been.

----0-----

"Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better". (Eccl 7:3)

From now on we should go around sad, and never laugh; if we are to isolate these verses and use them as a guide for our lives, as do those who deny the existence of the soul and of Hell.

----O-----

"The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth". (Eccl 7:4)

Those who take a verse and isolate it in order to deny the existence of the soul are fools when they attend a wedding, for according to this verse it is foolish to go where there is pleasure. They should go to as many funerals as possible, even when they do not know the deceased or the family, and they will be wise.

-----0-----

4486 -----O-

"Be not righteous over much; neither make thyself over wise, why shouldest thou destroy thyself?" (Eccl 7:16)

I imagine that they interpret this verse to say that it is all right to be a bit mischievous and stupid, to not be destroyed, since that is what this verse says when isolated.

-----O------

"26 And I find more bitter than death the woman, whose heart is snares and nets, and her hands as bands. Whoso pleaseth God shall escape from her, but the sinner shall be taken by her. 27 Behold, this have I found, saith the preacher, counting one by one, to find out the account, 28 which yet my soul seeketh, but I find not: one man among a thousand have I found, but a woman among all those have I not found". (Eccl 7:26-28)

Those who rely on isolated verses to form doctrine must conclude, on applying this passage, that women are worse than death itself, that they are not good for anything, and that it is best to remain single.

----O-----

"For the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten". (Eccl 9:5)

If the memory of the deceased is forgotten, then it is not true that the dead are in God's memory. By "reasoning" as we have in these past verses, is that the anti-souls have concluded that the soul does not exist.

----0-----

"7 Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works. 8 Let thy garments be always white; and let thy head lack no ointment". (Eccl 9:7-8)

If we follow this isolated verse, all believers should dress in white, drink wine, and put ointment on their head.

----O-----

"Curse not the king, no not in thy thought; and curse not the rich in thy bedchamber, for a bird of the air shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter".

(Eccl 10:20)

If we were to "reason" as those who rely on one isolated verse "reason" to form doctrine, we would have to conclude that the kings and the rich speak to the birds, and seem to have telepathic powers, because we could not even entertain bad thoughts about them without them knowing.

----O-----

As we can see, taking one verse without considering the context, and especially that of the integrity of the Bible teachings, leads to an infinite realm of stupidity and heresy. That is what those who take a few verses from Ecclesiastes do, and thus expect to "prove" that the soul does not exist.

*

Let's examine four more passages that the antisouls use to "prove" that the soul does not exist

One of these verses is in Psalms 6:5, where it says that the tomb cannot praise God.

"For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks". (Sal 6:5)

Here we see that the speaker (in this case David), expresses his thoughts as one who lives contemplates death. We who live cannot see what happens on the other side of death. What he says is true, nobody praises God in death, and no one praises God from the grave; if it were not so there would be a constant concert of praise in the cemeteries, by all the Christians buried there. But that does not mean that the soul does not exist.

Another passage they use is Psalm 146:3-4, where it speaks of not trusting men:

"3 Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. 4 His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish".

(Ps 146:3-4)

As we can see, here it is not talking about whether or not the human being has a soul; what we are being told here is that as believers we should not put our trust on other humans, because they can die at any moment, and their plans and thoughts will die with them. In fact, all the intentions this prince had to help us will die when he dies, since the dead can't do anything for the living from the other side. But that doesn't mean the soul does not exist. It is a verse used to confuse, for they use only verse four and not three, which explains the meaning of four.

As "proof" that the soul does not exist they also use the fact that death sometimes is compared euphemistically with sleep, as in the case of Jn 11:1, 5, 11-14. The fact that it is compared to sleep does not mean that the soul does not exist, because a person asleep is still alive. So if we were going to take sleep as a comparison to the real death, we would have to conclude that people would continue to live, for they are alive during sleep.

Using Acts 2:29 and 34-35 they also want to "prove" that the soul does not exist.

"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day". (Acts 2:29)

"34 For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself: The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, 35 until I make thy foes thy footstool".

(Acts 2:34-35)

The only thing that the first passage says is that David's sepulcher was still with them. The second one says only that after this David had not ascended to heaven. It is true, David could not have ascended to heaven after his death because he had to wait, as everyone else, for Jesus to be crucified, redeem them, and get them from Abraham's bosom to take them to heaven.

This does not mean that the soul does not exist. I don't know why they take it as a "powerful argument".

If the anti-souls were honest they would isolate and take the following verses literally

Those who do not believe in the existence of the soul refer to certain isolated passages from Job and Ecclesiastes, which say things like "...the dead have no knowledge...", and from there on they fabricate heresy and false doctrines. If they were honest, then they would have to isolate and take literally the following passages from Job, 7:9-10; 10:20-21 and 16:22, from which we would have to conclude that resurrection does not exist.

"9 As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more. 10 He shall return no more to his house, neither shall his place know him any more". (Job 7:9-10)

"20 Are not my days few? Cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, 21 before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death".

(Job 10:20-21)

"When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence <u>I shall not return</u>". (Job 16:22)

If we were to only depend on isolated verses, as do those who deny the existence of the soul, we would have to conclude that resurrection does not exist. We see another similarity in Job 9:22 where if we were to depend on only one verse, as they do, we would have to admit that God doesn't forgive, that doesn't turn back his wrath. And from Job 9:22 we had to get to the conclusion that no one would get saved, that God consumes everyone, bad or good.

"This is one thing, therefore I said it, <u>He</u> <u>destroyeth</u> the perfect and the wicked". (Job 9:22)

As we can see, if we were to cling to isolated passages, without considering the entire Bible, we would reach false conclusions, and fabricate heresies and stupid false doctrines.

*

Summary of chapter 10. The anti-soul have invented the story that Paradise was taken to Heaven, in order to deny that the thief on the cross went to Paradise the day he was crucified. During the times of Jesus and Paul, Paradise still existed. Nowhere in the Bible does it say that it was taken out of the planet. That is why the thief could go to Paradise that same day with Jesus, even when Jesus did not go to the Father for 40 days.

It was not necessary for Jesus to tell the thief that what he was telling him he was telling him "today", because the thief was listening. It is a twisting of the Scriptures that they have to use in order to strengthen their false doctrine. Nowhere in the Bible is the phrase "today I tell you" used.

The anti-souls dare say that it would be cruel of God to take Lazarus to Paradise only to bring him back to Earth. The Bible does not say that Lazarus went to Paradise; however, it **does** say that a friend of Paul's did go and come back, in which case the cruelty accusation of these daring fools is sustained.

Something else that the anti-souls make up is that the thief did not die that day. The Bible says no such thing. Common sense tells us that if he bled out on the cross, and then his legs were broken, he had to have died. Besides, if Christ's side was pierced even after dead, it is logical that they would do the same to the thieves to make sure they die.

Another lie that they affirm is that in the Greek language the word "spirit" simply means air, or breath. We presented eight examples of passages that denied such a thing, right from the book of Ecclesiastes, which they so like to use to say that the soul does not exist.

In order to show that the soul does not exist, they say that when Solomon said that the breath of humans and animals are the same, he is giving us a "revelation" in order to say that we are like the animals, that we don't have a soul. The truth is that, not only that passage does not say such a thing, but it can't be taken as a revelation, but as an observation of Solomon, from the point of view of the human being. The breath of the fish, the bugs and insects in general is not the same as man's. Besides, in Eccl 3:21 Solomon himself admits that

both the human spirit and that of the animals separates from their body.

The next absurdity they invented is that the dead are saved in God's memory to be resurrected. But in Eccl 9:5, which is what they use to say that the dead are not aware of anything, it says that their memory is erased. Besides, if the human being ceased to exist at death, it can't be said that the dead don't know, just like no one would say that Snow White doesn't know anything.

To deny that the soul exists is to say that bad feelings are the result of bad molecular combinations in the chemical composition of the brain, in which case the human being would not be accountable for his actions. In that case, in order to resuscitate an evil person, God would have to regroup those molecules same as before, before condemning him and sending him to Hell.

In order to show that we cannot take isolated verses to form doctrines that go against the rest of the Bible, I cited 16 verses from the same book of Ecclesiastes, which, taken in isolated form, would lead to the most stupid doctrines. I then presented eight more verses with the same purpose, but from other books of the Bible.

Chapter 11

"Original sin" is a myth

The human being has a soul. What he inherits from his parents is the flesh, not the soul

There is an erroneous concept spread around Christianity. It is called "original sin." According to this false hypothesis, the human being is a sinner since birth, and is condemned to hell, since Adam and Eve sinned and transmitted that sin to us. This, they call "original sin". The truth is that we become sinners; the blame is on us, not Adam and Eve.

Adam and Eve's sin did affect all of nature; in other words, the Earth, the climate, people's bodies, but not their soul. We will only speak of how it affected the human being. The sin that Adam and Eve committed, which they call, "original sin," affected the soul of our first parents, since they directly committed the sin. But it also affected their bodies, since that is how death entered the human physiological system. However, that sin only affected the bodies, the physical aspect of their descendants, to whom they passed on the sickliness, the mortality of their bodies, but did not affect their soul.

Their descendants' soul was not born condemned; they were condemned to death physically, not spiritually. This last one was a condemnation that they would get for themselves with their own behavior, after being able to understand right from wrong at a certain age, which I can't say when it is.

My foundation to say that humans are born without condemnation, and they lose that condition one by one, is on the fact that, as shown

in the verse below, Jesus says, referring to children that "theirs is the Kingdom of God." Therefore, children are not condemned since birth. I would rather say that the human being is born with an innate right to the Kingdom of God, and then loses it through his bad behavior. If children can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, this means that they have no sin at birth, because no one with sin can enter the Kingdom of God. Thus we can easily conclude that there is no such thing as an "original sin" that condemns us to Hell from birth.

"But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them: Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God."

(Mr 10:14)

As holy as a person can be, corporal death will reach him eventually because, **the cause of death is congenital, hereditary;** but regardless of how evil a father is, the soul of his child is not lost. Therefore, there **cannot** be an "original sin" transmitted from soul to soul through the generations. To think that a father "produces" the soul of the child and passes on his genetic character is to think (as do the Russellists, Adventists, etc.) that body and soul are one and the same.

There are some who believe in the existence of a sin that is passed on to subsequent generations. This is what they call "original sin." According to this hypothesis, due to the sin of Adam and Eve, our first parents, all of humanity is lost from before birth; all are condemned to Hell since birth. Parents can pass on corporal imperfections and illness to their children, but they cannot pass on the evil

tendencies of the soul, because the parents do not fabricate the soul.

There is no logic to such a thing. What the human being passes on to the following generations is the physical characteristics, not the kindness or evilness of his soul. The soul's characteristics are not transmitted. This is proven by the well-known fact, both in everyday life and in the Bible, that parents, saved or lost can have children lost or saved.

To admit that our parents pass on the soul and its characteristics, we would have to think that the soul is physical, biological. The elements that come into the formation of an offspring are only physical, for only matter comes into the formation of a fetus. If through this biological matter the soul is transmitted, then we would have to think that soul and body are one and the same, which is the thesis of the atheist scientists, the Adventists and the Russellists.

Besides, we would have to think that a little piece of the soul of the father (or the mother) is torn off, and goes into each of the male or female sex cells, both those that enter the formation of the fetus, and those that are lost or are misused. At this rate, the soul of an over sexually active man would be left rather damaged, since he would be constantly losing "microscopic pieces of his soul."

The other alternative would be to think that the soul is not damaged, because it restores itself, or renews itself, or replenish itself or whichever you want to call it. In that case we would have to ask what it uses to restore itself, **is it daily food?** So if someone suffers from prolonged hunger, is the soul diminished then?

On the other hand, if the father or mother passes on, in their reproductive cells a microscopic fraction of their own soul, then we would have to reach several conclusions, also absurd:

- a) The soul increases in volume as the fetus increases in size while receiving its nurture in the womb; or the "volume" of the soul of a person is but a small fraction of that of his father's, which was small fraction of that of the grandfather, etc, and so on and so forth, back to Adam and Eve;
- **b)** The soul of the first cell of the embryo duplicates itself as that first cell duplicates, thus making two souls (or more), one for each cell; or the "volume" of the soul duplicates; otherwise the microscopic fraction transmitted by the parents would be what rules the body of the adult;
- c) If the soul "grows" in the fetus, "how does it?" Is it with the physical food? Is the soul something physical, of this dimension in which we live? Besides, how much does it grow? Until birth, as his body grows, how long? Is the soul of a child or a midget "smaller" than that of an adult?
- d) If the soul of the parents is transmitted to their descendants in some form that we don't seem to understand, then we would all have Adam and Eve's souls; why then do we all think and feel differently from each other, and we understand we are different people? Besides, who do we get our soul from, Adam or Eve? From whom do we get our soul, our father, our mother, or both?
- e) And if they insist that the soul is something hereditary, but each personality is different, then please someone tell me, what is the soul? What is the "self" or the personality of each person, and how are they different? And above all, who sins?

My soul, my "self", my body, or what? Where do the thoughts and the feelings live?

As we can see, then, the faithful believe errors such as that of original sin, because it was taught by religiously prestigious people, and it never occurred to them to question it; but once we do, we understand that either common sense has to be grossly ran over, or we have to be superstitiously dogmatic, to accept such heretic hypothesis.

What lies closest to the Scripture teachings is that the human being passes on to his descendants the body characteristics, which is called genotype. But the soul of each person is placed by God or his angels, in his body, any moment after conception, perhaps during pregnancy, during birth, or at some indefinite time afterward. It is even possible that for some it happens at one time and for others at another time.

If we inherited our soul and its characteristics from our parents, then no one would be guilty for sinning, since it is inherited. It would be like to inherit an illness, it is not our fault. It would be like an Indian or an African inheriting the body characteristics of his ancestors. Why condemn to Hell someone because he is Indian or Chinese? What fault is it of theirs to have inherited such characteristics? By the same token, why condemn someone just because his ancestors passed on to him his sinful attitude? This is not what the Bible teaches. Solomon said that God created man upright, but he created many ways to stray from this path.

"Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Ecl 7:29)

As we can see, when the souls left God's hands they were upright. It was later, that those souls were contaminated. Notice that Solomon says "they", referring to many, and not just to Adam. Therefore, according to Solomon, the problem was not Adam's sin, but the sin in each one of us. **If God made men upright, they are not sinners by birth.** Then there is no such thing as "original sin" weighing over every person born. We are not dragging the weight of a sentence that doesn't belong to us but to our parents. On the contrary, the sentence we carry is our own, not that of our ancestors.

Jesus taught the opposite of what the heretic doctrine of "original sin" proclaims. He never said anything that could be misinterpreted to imply that the soul of a human being is condemned because of Adam's sin. On the contrary, his words teach us that we are born without sin and without condemnation.

"But Jesus said: Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Mt 19:14)

If children can enter the Kingdom of Heaven, it is clearly evident that they are without sin, because no one can enter the Kingdom of Heaven with sin. This easily implies that there is no such thing as original sin, passed on from parents to children, since Adam. Otherwise, children would be sinners from birth and could not enter the Kingdom of Heaven until they converted. Besides, if a parent could pass on his sinful nature to his offspring, then there would never be a Christian generation from a sinful patriarch, which is not true.

Ezekiel the prophet also affirms the doctrine that children do not carry the guilt of the deeds, thoughts or feelings of their parents. Contrary to what the original sin doctrine teaches, which condemns everyone to Hell because of Adam's sin, Ezekiel, inspired by the Holy Spirit, says that the children are not condemned by the sins of their ancestors.

"1 The word of the LORD came unto me again, saying: 2 What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying: The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? 3 As I live, saith the Lord GOD, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. 4 Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

(Ez 18:1-4)

"14 Now, lo, if he beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like......17 That hath taken off his hand from the poor, that hath not received usury nor increase, hath executed my judgments, hath walked in my statutes; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live.....20 The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezk 18:14-20 abbrev)

In Dt 24:16, Moses teaches us that we should not punish the children for the sins of their parents. If that is what God teaches us, how can we even think He is going to turn around and do the opposite Himself? I don't see in Scripture anything that backs up this heretic doctrine of "original sin". If God says that children should not be condemned by the deeds of their parents, let alone God will send someone to Hell for the sin of Adam.

"The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." (Dt 24:16)

In Ex 32:31-33 we also see that man is born without sin. In a personal conversation with God, Moses asked the Lord to erase his name from the Book of Life if He would not forgive the people. The Lord replied that He would erase those who sinned against Him. From God's words we can conclude that the name of every human being is written on the Book of Life, and it isn't until a person sins and does not repent that it is erased. Consequently, all human beings are born without sin, otherwise, there would be no name written on the Book of Life, but if they are written on that book it is because they were born sinless. This excludes the possibility of the existence of "original sin." It makes sense to think that God writes the name of the human being on the Book of Life when he is born, because if He did so only after conversion, then He didn't have to erase anyone. If He erases some, it is because He had them written in from birth.

"31 And Moses returned unto the LORD, and said: Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. 32 Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. 33 And the LORD said unto Moses: Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book."

(Ex 32:31-33)

As you can see, in order to believe in "original, sin", we have to trample upon common sense, destroy logic, affront intelligence, and take refuge in superstition and dogma. Christian doctrines come from Scriptures, and not from the teachings and dogmas of different sects. "Original sin" is the banner doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church in order to scare parents into "baptizing" newborns as soon as possible. They instill fear in them telling them that if a child dies without being "baptized", it is going to Hell or Limbo. By the way, recently Vatican declared that Limbo is suppressed. They seem to have authority to make or destroy that which is on the other side of the tomb.

*

Summary of chapter 11. Adam's sin affected all of nature, including the body of his descendants, but it did not affect the soul of his children. His descendants were born afterward vulnerable to diseases, and subject to the death of the body, but not condemned to Hell just because of being born. The proof is that Jesus considered that the Kingdom of Heaven belonged to children.

In order to believe that sin is passed on from parents to children, we would have to believe that the soul is something physical that is found in the chromosomes of the fetus. A father could pass on physical conditions to his children if he had syphilis, AIDS, or if he was a drunk, or a drug addict, etc., but he could never pass on the evilness or kindness of the soul.

If we inherited sin at birth, then no one would be guilty of sin, because it would be something like inheriting a disease. On the contrary, the Bible says that **God made man upright, but <u>they</u> sought many inventions.** And by saying "they" he is referring to the human race, not only Adam.

The teachings of Moses and Ezekiel also show us that children do not inherit, nor are they to be punished for the sins of their fathers.

Chapter 12

The difference between soul and spirit

The difference between humans and animals

The word "spirit" is often used in the Bible in place of the word "soul", with the same meaning. In many passages both words are used indistinctively of each other, but there is a difference, and we are going to find it in this chapter. There is also the use of the word "spirit" and the word "animal", to name some beings that are not of this dimension, but of

the spiritual dimension, as the visions of Ezekiel and Revelation.

The <u>soul</u> is a spiritual entity, created by God to live on Earth, in a human body made of flesh. It is the soul that houses the characteristics found in human beings. These characteristics are those of being conscious of his own existence, loving, hating, understanding, praising God, or be against God, etc..

This soul lives in a body made of flesh, and has an energy that keeps it alive. When that energy ceases and the flesh dies, the soul abandons the body. Of all the living creatures that populate the world, only the humans have a soul living inside that flesh. Animals do not have a soul.

Every living creature has that energy called "spirit" that keeps it alive. Bulls, elephants, earthworms, microbes, cells, whales, fish, the human body, all alike have this spirit. These animals have flesh and spirit, and that is why they are alive. But the human being has the flesh, the spirit to keep the flesh alive, and a soul that lives inside that flesh.

Animals and other living things in general only have a body and spirit. They are like living computers to whom God has given the necessary "software" for their survival and reproduction. This software, or instincts dominate the lives of animals and plants; they lack intelligence. Their "hard drive" comes already programmed almost hundred per cent, with very little section programmable to learn, so that they remember where the water is, where there is food, where their burrow is, etc..

On the other hand, the human being comes with very little programming; almost everything he has to "program" himself throughout his life. When he comes he knows how to cry, how to suck, and a few other things. Everything else he needs to learn. So he learns to walk, read, type, drive, etc.. Not only that, but he invents, creates, puts two ideas together to come to a third one, things that an animal can never do.

Bees manufacture hexagon cells which can resist the most pressure, while saving space. Circular cells would hold more pressure, but take up too much space. At first, one would think bees are incredibly intelligent. Then we see that even though the harvester "steals" their honey, we find they are not intelligent enough to move somewhere else where they are not "robbed". They have a "program" that makes them act the right way, making their hexagon cells, accumulating honey, etc., toward that for which they were created.

Hens hide to make their nest. It looks as if they are intelligent enough to realize that their eggs are going to be stolen. But after making the nest, they stay there even though the farmer "steals" the eggs; they don't think of going elsewhere. I could <u>literally</u> quote hundreds of examples, but that is not the objective of this book.

Animals don't accumulate the knowledge of their parents, humans do. Animals don't progress, humans do. An animal, left alone in the jungle can live, because its "programs" guide it. A man left in the jungle may suffer greatly to survive, if he survives at all. They don't have "programs", all has to be previously learned. Animals know what they can and cannot eat, even if they didn't learn it from their parents. Humans don't.

What I want to emphasize is, animals live like walking plants, they don't have a spiritual being inside, the soul that humans have.

If I were to define the soul, I would say that it is the real "I" of the human being, and only of the human beings, with his feelings, his intelligence, memory, reasoning, concept of self existence, and other faculties. This "I" lives in, or is clothed with a body of flesh and bones. This flesh and bones body has a spirit that gives life to the flesh for merely animal functions. That spirit has no reasoning, or concept of self existence, it is only energy. The soul lives in that human body of flesh.

The space of the animal brain comes occupied with a series of "software" that help him attend to his vital functions. On the other hand, the human brain comes with very little "software" that helps him attend to those functions, but it does have a lot of programmable space.

Animals cannot deprogram themselves; humans can. That is why animals have to yield to their instincts; humans can refrain from their instincts, and even go against them, like a mother who abandons her child or even aborts it.

In summary, there is a difference between soul and spirit. Animals have "flesh" and spirit; human beings, in addition to having flesh and spirit to live, is a spiritual being that lives in that living body. This differentiation between soul and spirit that we can make by way of observation is noted in several places in the Bible. Let's see.

*

Isaiah makes a difference between soul and spirit

In this verse we can see how it speaks of both the soul and the spirit. On occasion these two words are used indistinctively, but here, they seem to indicate two different things. The human being is made of flesh and spirit, which is what gives life to the flesh, but he also has a soul, which is the true human being, since the flesh with spirit is nothing but its dwelling.

Animals also have flesh and spirit, but they don't have a spiritual being living within them. The human being is like an animal, in the sense that he has flesh as well as a spirit that keeps that flesh alive and working. But human is different from animals in that God has put in that body a spiritual being, the true human being, with intelligence, personality, feelings, etc., which is what characterizes him as a human being.

That is why even though man has instincts, as animals do, he can shape them to his will, if he wishes, while animals cannot modify their instincts.

"For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

(Isa 57:16)

As we can see, Isaiah is quoting something that God had said, he talks about spirit and soul; the first he uses in singular, the latter in plural.

*

Paul also makes a difference between spirit, soul, and body

The members of the Russellist Governing Body deny that the soul is a non-physical entity. They have no way of explaining this verse, nor are they interested in doing so, because they know that their followers, afraid to be thrown out of the cult, are not going to dare ask, much less refute the answers they give them.

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

(I Thes 5:23)

We can see in this verse that Paul knew that men had a physical body, just as animals did, a **spirit,**

which is what gives life to the body, and a soul, which is the true personality of the human being which animals don't have

which animals don't have.

Animals are like living computers, they do not reason, have no conscious, are programmed to be what they are. Humans, in addition to his physical body, had a soul that lives in that body. The best of this passage is that Russellists have not altered it yet. The Russellist version reads: "may the spirit, and soul and body of you brothers be preserved..."

Apparently, they recognize that within the human being there is spirit, and apart from that there is a soul, and independently from that there is a body.

*

According to Paul's words we realize that he knew of the existence of three things: soul, spirit and body

In this verse the Apostle mentions three components of the human being. They are the soul, the spirit and the body.

"For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword,

piercing even to the dividing asunder of <u>soul</u> and <u>spirit</u> and of the <u>joints and marrow</u>, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb 4:12)

Most importantly in this verse is that **Paul** differentiates between the soul and the spirit. In many occasions the soul is referred to as the "spirit" in the Bible. Paul makes a difference between them besides mentioning the body. We all know what the body is and there is no need to define it. As for the spirit, we already saw it was that "something" that keeps the flesh alive and functioning, but it does not think or reason, and has no personality. That is the case with animals, from the elephant to the ant, and from the microbes to the plants cells. They are alive, because of the spirit that dwells in the flesh, in the matter, but it has no personality, it merely obeys a program.

Human beings, however, besides having flesh, this flesh has a spirit so it can live, but inside that flesh with spirit is the soul, with concept of self-existence, knowledge, feelings, personality, etc.. In other words, it is the true "self", which has good and bad feelings; the true "self" which will be judged by God. Animals are not going to be judged. Animals die and nothing from them remains; but with humans, the soul remains even after death.

Summary of chapter 12. The soul is the spiritual being that God created to live in a flesh body in this planet and in this dimension. It is characterized by having consciousness of its existence, feelings, thoughts, intelligence, etc..

The spirit, in humans, refers to the energy that keeps the flesh (or the body where the soul lives) alive and functioning. The human being has soul, spirit and body.

5339

5340

5341

5342

5343

5345

5346

5347

5348

5349

5350

5351

5352

5353

5354 5355

5361

5362

5363 5364

5365

5366

5367

5368

5369

5370

5371

5372

Animals only have spirit and flesh. They have "software" in their brains that make them live and realize the chores for which they were created, without even be aware of their own existence, or having other knowledge, or show any intelligence that with which different than they were programmed. The case of the bees and the hens, are only two of hundreds that could be mentioned.

By the words of Isaiah and Paul we can see that they differentiated between the soul, the spirit and the body, even though in other places the word "spirit" is used with other meanings.

Chapter 13

The theory of a soul warehouse before birth

The soul "warehouse" and predestination

A clearly revealed biblical truth is different than a theory that can be implied in its reading. However, any theory extracted from the Bible must be in harmony with the entire Bible, and not be refuted by any passage. It even needs to be in harmony with proven knowledge. Such a theory must be subject to debate, and it should be debated in order to discard it, improve it, or consolidate it. Let's see what this "soul warehouse" theory is all about.

From my integral reading of the Bible, as well as my own reasoning, I have concluded that God made a set number of souls, and He keeps them somewhere, where even though they exist, they neither feel nor suffer, because they have no flesh, which is what puts a soul in contact with the physical world. Since they have no feeling of any kind they can't be aware of their own existence; and because they never had it before, they can't remember, so they can't be aware of either through memory.

It is as the fetus in the mother's womb. In reality these souls would be more isolated than a fetus, without the least sensation of being. However, these souls do exist; God knows them; He knows how they are and how they will develop, what they will do, etc.. This place is what I call, "the warehouse of created souls". This **existence without awareness**, is what I think is referred to in verses such as this verse that follows, and even more in other verses such as Ecc 6:10.

"2 Wherefore, I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive. 3 Yea, better is he than both they, which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun."

(Ecc 4:2-3)

"Whatever one is, he has been named already, for it is known that he is man; and he cannot contend with Him who is mightier than he." (Ecc 6:10 NKJ)

The first passage says that he held the ones who had not yet been, as better-off than both: the dead and the living. In other words, those who had not yet been sent to a body of flesh. He can't be talking about those who have not yet been created, because someone who does not exist cannot be better or worse than one who does exist. Therefore, we have to think that he is referring to someone who exists, but has not yet been born in the flesh. In other words, a created soul that has never had a conscious existence, like a fetus in his mother's womb; a soul that will come to live among us for the first and only time, and that later will go live where God determines, be it Heaven or Hell.

The second verse declares that he who is, has already been named. In other words, that he who has been born, has been known from before, both in name and qualities. In a certain way this agrees with what can be implied from the prophecies of Josiah, and about Cyrus, King of Persia, both of which were made centuries before the birth of the persons they named.

"1 And, behold, there came a man of God out of Judah by the word of the LORD unto Bethel; and Jeroboam stood by the altar to burn incense. 2 And he cried against the altar in the word of the LORD, and said: O altar, altar, thus saith the LORD: Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee." (I K 13:1-2)

"44:28 That saith of Cyrus: He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem: Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple: Thy foundation shall be laid. 45:1 Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." (Isa 44: 28 to 45: 1)

So, as we have seen in these four passages, we get the feeling that the souls were created all at once; but not all at once were they sent to be clothed in flesh, but they are being sent progressively as per the divine plans. But suppose that this theory of mine is wrong; let's analyze the alternatives.

If we cannot admit the theory that **God created** all human souls at once, and they will continue being born to the end, and that He keeps them somewhere, we at least have to admit one of these two alternatives: a) either God has not finished his creative work since its beginning about 6,000 years ago; or b) God did stop creating, but the soul creates itself, automatically, from the male and female gametes, just as the bone structure, the muscles, the nerves, etc. of the fetus create themselves.

Accepting alternative "a" would contradict Gen 2:1-3, Heb 4:4 and 10, just as the rest of the Bible, that teaches that God's creation lasted six days and then He rested on the seventh; and that from there on, all matters functions on its own, reproducing automatically, changing form, etc., according to the laws He established; which matter cannot stop fulfilling.

In other words, we would have to discard this healthy teaching and think that God, since creation, continued to create souls on a daily basis, each hour, each minute and each second, to put them in the bodies of thousands and thousands of babies that are born in the world. Absurd!

"1 Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and all the host of them. 2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. 3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." (Gn 2:1-3)

"For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise: And God did rest the seventh day from all his works."

(Heb 4:4)

"For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." (Heb 4:10)

Accepting theory "b" would take us to something even more illogical: thinking that something spiritual, as the soul, can be produced by something physical, as the body, and that this not-physical thing that is the soul, multiplies itself in the sexual cells of the human being, in order to grow with nourishment. This aligns itself with the Russellist theory that says that the soul, like something non-physical, it doesn't exist, and

therefore it is completely absurd, as I already proved in former chapters.

So, we either accept that there is a "warehouse of souls" or we fall into the absurd. I don't think there is another alternative, but if someone sees it, please write to me and explain it clearly, as I have done; I will be most thankful. Likewise the reader could write if he does not see another alternative, but rather sees a lack of internal or external logic harmony to this theory of a warehouse of souls that I explain; or if he sees errors in the chain of reasoning used to reach such conclusion.

Well then, the existence of a "warehouse of souls" would perfectly explain predestination. God does not force some to be saved, and others to be condemned, rather, since He knows them ahead of time, sin He "sees" how they are while in the "warehouse", he sends some to be born in a certain epoch, family, race, or nation, and others in another.

It is the same differentiation that a sculptor would do as he looks at the different materials or the different styles of marble he can use for his statue; he would know what the statue would look like, since he is looking at the material he will use, and has the proper knowledge and experience to do so.

The soul of the Pharaoh that would not let the Israelites leave Egypt, was sent to be born in the body being developed in the womb of the wife of the previous pharaoh; so that this evil soul came to the world to the place, time and family that were convenient to the plans of God. In that sense, God predestined it, but He did not predestine it to be evil, but rather to be in the right place at the right time so it could fulfill with his evil inclinations, God's plans.

The same can be said of Judas. If his soul would have been sent to the world 100 years before, or 100 years after, he could not have betrayed Jesus. If that soul would have been sent to the world during Jesus' time, but instead of sending it to Palestine it would have been sent to the womb of an American Indian, he could not have betrayed Jesus. He would have betrayed the tribe chief, or his father, but not the Lord.

 But God predestined him to come at the time and amid the circumstances that he needed to betray Jesus; because God knew he was a traitor, but God did not predestine him to be a traitor. But even if all these circumstances were in place, if Jesus would not have elected him, he could not have betrayed him; he could not have carried out that tendency for treason which had been developed in him without God making him that way. Therefore, God predestined him so he could betray Jesus, but not to be a traitor. God knew he would develop that evil tendency and put him in the place where he could use it on Christ, but He did not predestine him to develop the tendency, or be a traitor.

It doesn't make sense that God would make someone bad, and then be angry against him because he is bad, punishing him and sending him to Hell. Such is not God's justice as taught in Bible. We, in order to know right from wrong, have to follow what God teaches us in the Bible. That is not the predestination that Paul talks about. Such thinking borderlines blasphemy.

*

God knew Jeremiah before he was formed in his mother's womb

According to this verse we can see that God knew the quality of Jeremiah's soul before his body existed; before he was formed in his mother's womb. That could prove that there is a "warehouse of souls", where they are kept since their creation and until the time when they are to be born in a body. Before that time it would not be called birth, but creation. This would explain that God could send a bad soul to be born of a father He wants to punish; or to one good father that would be a living testimony for that bad soul that, having been created already, is going to be born now.

"Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." (Jer 1:5)

Paul makes a similar comment about is own calling:

"But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace." (Gal 1:15)

From the womb is not the same as before the womb. Paul's case is the latter (from the womb). Jeremiah's case is the first, from before the womb. In both cases we see the probability that it refers to the knowledge of the soul that had already been created, but was not born yet.

The punishments and blessings God gives in children, and the warehouse of souls

In Dt 4:40 we see God has promised that those who obey Him will have blessings in their children that come after themselves. In contrast we see in Dt 5:9 and 29 that those who do not obey Him, but oppose Him, are warned that they will be punished in their children. It makes us want to ask, how can God exercise his justice in both cases: the promise and the menace? How is God to achieve that obedient fathers bear good children, or disobedient fathers bear evil children?

"Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments, which I command thee this day, that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days upon the earth, which the LORD thy God giveth thee, for ever." (Dt 4:40)

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them, for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me."

(Dt 5:9)

"O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever!"

(Dt 5:29)

If I am right, and God created all souls at once, and sends them to Earth, to the bodies of babies

some time before or after birth, He can send a soul that He knows is evil or problematic to the body of a baby whose father He wants to punish. And vice versa, He can send a soul that He knows will be faithful, to the body of a baby to be born of a person He wants to bless.

And there's more. He can send to that family just one good soul, or several, or none. Or He can send a bad soul, to make them suffer by having it as a son or daughter. Even the degree of evil can be predetermined: Agrippina was well served by a son like Nero, who murdered her. It was not enough to send her a sinner for a son; for she did not care that he was a sinner. She had killed her own husband as well as others; sin for her was nothing. But her own life and her position of regent over her son and the Roman Empire was important for her.

That is why it's not only probable to decide if the soul sent to the body of a baby of a given person will be good or bad, it is also probable to decide how bad or how good that soul will be. This way parents can be blessed or punished in their children, and even in their descendant, without injustice being done nevertheless.

Perhaps God sends to the bodies of our babies souls that act with us, totally, partially, temporally, sporadically, or continuously, just as we act with God, in order to teach us or punish us. On the other hand, perhaps God sends a specially twisted soul to righteous parents, in order to show that he who wants to be bad will be bad regardless of what he is taught or how he is treated. There is less justification for he who does wrong having been taught right, than he who was taught wrong and did wrong, or he who was taught wrong and did right.

It may not look logical to us that a person we consider good goes through bad things or has evil children; but we need to take into consideration that we do not see everything that goes on inside the soul of a human being, nor we could judge, even if we did see it, what that human being deserves, or what God has determined for him, in order to show his patience and acceptance of the divine determinations.

Let's examine the example of King David, to whom God sent two sons (Amon and Absalom). At the appropriate time these two sons acted as punishment for what he did to Uriah the Hittite. David was a man of God, yet God, knowing he was going to sin, prepared the way (I believe) by sending him the sons he sent him. Anyone who knew David in a superficial way, and did not know the vile and great wrong he did to Uriah would be appalled at what happened to his sons.

This is a complex issue that only God can process correctly. There are parents who care so little about their children that they don't care how they turn out, and don't even know if they eat or not; some don't even know them. Parents like that (even though because of special circumstances they keep their children at home), don't care about their children, so it is no punishment for them how they turn out. That is why I say once more, it is a complex matter, but **God has everything under control.**

If we read Dt 24:16 we'll see that God does not punish the parents for the sins of the children or the children for the sins of the fathers. The same can be said of Ezekiel 18. Therefore, it is logical to think that God would not punish a man by making his children be sinners even if those children don't want to be, nor making the children suffer when they

don't deserve it. We also need to remember that some times there are human beings that suffer, not because of their deeds, but because of some plan of God, like the blind man, of whom Jesus said that neither he nor his parents had sinned, but that would serve to make manifest the works of God.

"The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." (Deut 24:16)

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezk 18:20)

Summary of chapter 13. I call it "warehouse of souls" a probable place where God keeps souls He already created all at once, and who will be sent to Earth according to the divine plans. Two easily recognizable cases are those of Josiah and Cyrus, King of Persia.

If we did not admit that God created all souls at once, we would have to think that he never ceased from his creative work, since He has to create the souls of all the babies that continue to be born all around the world every day, every hour every minute and every second. The other alternative would be to suppose that the soul does not exist and the human being is nothing but matter; that it

manufactures itself, automatically, thanks to the laws that God set in this world, including plants.

By accepting the theory of the warehouse of souls, predestination is clear, as in the cases of Pharaoh, and the betrayal of Judas; and in the case of a man who is punished in the person of his son, as in the case of Agrippina and Nero.

There are some verses in which those who talk express themselves as if they had knowledge that there is a warehouse of souls.

*

*******5776 ******