

A Critique of the Doctrine of Soul Incarnation at Birth

By: David A. Sargent

1. UNBORN nature
2. UNREGENERATED nature
3. REGENERATED nature

This sounds Calvinistic in "nature" the catch word is "unregenerated" as being the nature outside of the womb and before spiritual birth. So to get this more accurate the question comes up then: Does the unregenerated nature of a new born kill their spirit; are they born dead in trespasses and sin? Is this why they must be born again? Does this therefore place at the death of a 3 month old baby that physically dies in hell fire and damnation? They are after all "unregenerated" that word means the opposite of regenerated. If regenerated means to be made alive; then unregenerated means dead! That is what Calvin taught.

But a baby is not born dead! Only the sentence of death was in ourselves: 2 Corinthians 1:9, "But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead:" we did not get Adam's dead spirit. We did not get Adam's SIN.

Babies are born alive with body, soul & spirit because that is how we are procreated after our kind. We are tripartite in our nature all the way back to Adam. He was body, soul & spirit at creation and his children were procreated in his likeness.

If you make this dual procreation where the soul is created 37 weeks after the body (give or take a few days or even a few weeks) where is the verse that actually says this?

The argument is made: "Just as physical conception, with natural seed, generates physical life, a spiritual conception, with spiritual seed (I Peter 1:23), generates spiritual life." According to Jesus, if there is no natural life without a natural birth, there will be no spiritual life, without a spiritual birth. (See note below.) So, the question still remains, what determines when a man becomes a living soul? Jesus answered that in the next verse of our main text... "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." (John 3:8) Jesus likened spiritual birth to wind - blowing air. If "every one that is born of the Spirit" breathes spiritually for the first time at their new birth, then it stands to reason, that everyone who breathes naturally for the first time, does so at their physical birth."

Yet none of these passages say anything like these things in the argument. The day that Adam sinned he died. What died? He did not die physically; and his soul did not die. What died? The same questions can be asked about Paul:

Romans 7:7-13, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful."

In verse 9, "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." what died?

In verse 11, "For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." what was slain?

1 Peter 1:23-24, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." does NOT say that we do not have a soul or spirit at conception! You cannot make that say that unless you really want to make God a liar.

The statement "...if there is no natural life without a natural birth, there will be no spiritual life, without a spiritual birth." Is an assumed statement from John 3:8! Is there a living spirit in a new born child? When does that child's spirit die and what is the cause? Why must the spirit of a person DIE?

However this is NOT a statement about this assumption at all. It is a comparative statement of the view of an adult way after birth. John 3:8, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." You cannot be born again without having an understanding. You will never reach a new born for Christ! This looks like this genders to the teaching that babies go to hell with they die.

The issue with John 3 is that there was no spiritual understanding. Not because they were not regenerated; because the Lord told Nicodemus that he should have known these things.

John 3:10, "Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?" The Lord was NOT telling Nicodemus about heavenly things; but earthly things. It is a parallelism to teach something with the physical that relates to the spiritual. The physical birth is only similar to the second birth. But the second birth is not second because the physical birth is first. The second birth is second because the spirit WAS alive once and when the law came it died. The spirit of man needs a second birth: to be born again. Born again is the phrase used and is the nature of the spirit of man. Not the body and spirit. It is the spirit that requires a new birth. It is NOT the soul either.

What it looks like is this teaching is NOT that the soul comes in the body at birth; but that there is NO spirit until the new birth.

The proof texts: 1 Kings 17:17, "And it came to pass after these things, that the son of the woman, the mistress of the house, fell sick; and his sickness was so sore, that there was no breath left in him." and 1 Kings 17:21, "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." All this says is "...there was no breath left in him." There is no reference to air coming into him that brought back his soul. No one breathed on him! AND this is NOT his birth! If the breath here is the likened to the spirit; yet the soul is what was brought back then there is no reference to the spirit coming back to him. It is assumed that it did. But that is NOT what the Bible SAYS!

Next proof text: Job 27:2-3, "As God liveth, who hath taken away my judgment; and the Almighty, who hath vexed my soul; All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils;" So we are to take this as the spirit of God is the same as the breath in Job's nostrils? We are to take this as a doctrinal statement about BIRTH? If you do take this as a critical literal and not as a phraseological literal then you will have to do that in the context. Job is NOT speaking in a critical literal way; he is using similitudes to express his anguish: Job 27:1, "Moreover Job continued his parable, and said," The context calls this a parable. You take that as a critical literal then you are missing what it is saying. And you are making it say what it does NOT say. This is a parable. This is showing the likeness of things; NOT that of the SAME things. Notice also that the spirit of God in the passage is NOT the Spirit of God. This is not saying that the breath in Job is the spirit of God in his nostrils! But if you want to take this as a critical literal, then by all means place the spirit of God ONLY in your nostrils and nowhere else! There is no Baby being born and no infants in any wombs here.

Next proof text: Job 33:4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." It is assumed that this is talking about birth. But that is NOT what it says. Even if it is saying this it would mean that it is NOT at birth; because an infant in the womb has life. Assuming that means life after birth is again only an assumption. You would have to teach the critical literal here to mean that he was born physically DEAD or like Adam on the ground without physical life until God breathed into his nostrils... But then if Adam got it all at the same time; then everyone must get it all at the same time. Why take the Creation of Adam and not take it all? If the breath of life is YOU breathing on your own; then you just removed Adam from the argument. He did NOT breathe on his own first. The breath of life is GOD breathing on something. Babies do NOT get this; they breathe on their own because they already have life and so the breath of life is already IN THEM. Or they would be DEAD!

In this passage Elihu is confronting Job and the three. Job 32:2-3, "Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the kindred of Ram: against Job was his wrath kindled, because he justified himself rather than God. Also against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job." Job 33 is a continuation of this.

Job 32:8, "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." So here there is a spirit in man that is "unregenerated" and the inspiration of the Almighty gives them understanding. How can a supposed "unregenerated" spirit get anything from God?

Admittedly Elihu is giving his own opinion: Job 32:17, "I said, I will answer also my part, I also will shew mine opinion."

Elihu admits that he is formed out of clay: Job 33:6, "Behold, I am according to thy wish in God's stead: I also am formed out of the clay." so was his body formed out of clay; or his spirit that he was talking about in Job 32:8? Let's do the classical error of taking everything as a critical literal. If he was formed out of CLAY; then who put that CLAY in his mother's womb? That is the critical literal view of the passage. It is WRONG! You cannot take what this is saying without understanding that he is inferring the Adamic creation. IF HE the person speaking (a soul) says this then he is saying that his procreation was LIE Adam's creation! A simultaneous tripartite creation produces in the procreation a simultaneous tripartite nature.

Elihu has an astonishing testimony: Job 33:9, "I am clean without transgression, I am innocent; neither is there iniquity in me." If you take this as a critical literal it will make Elihu GOD! But it is obvious that Elihu is very young and in innocence of sorts. He is still young enough to have retained an alive spirit.

Elihu in telling his story says: Job 33:22, "Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers." Do souls go into the grave? NO! Why not? If you take this as a critical literal you must take it that way. Why only one part of what he is saying and not all of it? The trouble with the Bible in many places is that it looks like you should take a passage literal; but not the critical literal. Other passages look like they should be figurative and yet they are not only literal but critically literal. This passage is NOT the critical literal and it is NOT figurative. It is comparative literal. The usages of phraseologies are not figurative but are not literal. That is why you are supposed to Study and Rightly Divide the truth.

Elihu continues to tell his story: Job 33:25, "His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth:" the critical literalist must assume that you can go back in time to "...return to the days of his youth..." Yet, you cannot do that! This is NOT doctrinal; there are no doctrinal statements being made about the birth of a child and the soul entering at birth and there is nothing here about going back in time!

Next proof text: Ezekiel 37:8-11, "And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above: but there was no breath in them. Then said he unto me, Prophesy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts." Here this is likened to John 3:8, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Context: Ezekiel 37:12-14, "Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken it, and performed it, saith the LORD." Has nothing to do with John 3. This is what happened in Matthew 27:52-53, "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." They were not born again; they were born from the dead. These were NOT born again of the Spirit. They were physically raised up from the graves and out of the underworld from Abraham's Bosom. This passage has nothing to do with the new birth

in John 3. This has nothing to do with a baby being born physically. This is not a proof of anything pertaining to the subject. This is an obvious RESURRECTION from the dead.

The Argument: "Like a man's spirit and soul leave a man at death (which leaves a FULLY DEVELOPED BODY), so too, at this stage (see first chart below - "Begins Birth") you have a FULLY DEVELOPED BODY THAT IS LIVING (totally dependent on its mother for life), in anticipation of birth where it receives a spirit, and becomes a living soul. Therefore... PHYSICAL LIFE is generated at CONCEPTION, and completed at BIRTH - where man becomes a LIVING SOUL* that breathes on his own, for the first time ever. And, SPIRITUAL LIFE begins at CONCEPTION** and completed at BIRTH - The NEW BIRTH - where a living soul has been regenerated into a SAVED SOUL that is breathing spiritually, for the first time ever."

The argument is only an argument of logic and reason and conclusion is also neither have Bible to back them up. This similitude produced is NOT found in the Bible. This is presumption and Biblically baseless. At death the "fully developed body is what? DIED! It is NOT functional. It is NOT LIKE a baby before birth at all or after birth. The phrases used for this proof is NOT found anywhere in the Bible. These things are all assumed.

The "Therefore" is a conclusion of this proof: ONLY "physical life is generated at conception" BIBLE? None! "and completed at birth" BIBLE? None! Now here is the error (as if those were not): "The new birth - where a living soul has been regenerated into a saved soul that is breathing spiritually, for the first time ever." The Bible NEVER says this anywhere. The soul is NOT dead and is NOT regenerated. This comes from not paying attention to words. I have trouble with this because I am dyslectic. But my disability is a great strength in me when dealing with words as it has forced me to actually READ!

Let's see what this word means. The only times this word shows up it is neither of the words used: "regenerated" nor "unregenerated" The word is regeneration in the Bible: Matthew 19:28, "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Which is used in a very different way than in this argument and has no bearing on this subject. Then there is Titus 3:5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" But here the "saved us" is NOT the regeneration; it is the renewing of the Holy Ghost that is the regeneration. Furthermore the new birth has to do with the spirit of man, not the soul of man. These are not insignificant issues with this teaching. The

trouble I see in most people is that they tend to strain at gnats and swallow camels. These little gnats seem insignificant but the camel will follow.

John 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Notice that, "...that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." NOT SOUL! Further proof of this is found in 1 Corinthians 6:17, "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." Notice "one spirit" NOT SOUL! It looks like one mistake in explicit doctrine is compounded by the domino effect.

The argument actually continues: "* When God created man, He created him as a COMPLETE being. God, as a triune being, made man in His own image. In that sense, man looked like God, with a "spirit and soul and body." (I Thessalonians 5:23) ** See, I PETER 1:23 and Mark 4:8a, 20a - The seed of the word of God implanted in "good ground." ** When God created man, He created him as a COMPLETE being. Note: Spiritually speaking, a man might conceive the seed of the word of God, but he is not breathing (spiritually), according to the Lord Jesus, UNTIL he is born again. It is no different in the physical realm. A woman receives corruptible seed that produces a corruptible body that has to grow to maturity, in order to be born and breath on his own."

Now another error in the argument: the making God like man; and not making man like God. God is NOT three parts of one. Man is! God's image when man was made was LIGHT: 1 John 1:5, "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." God being a Spirit; He can be invisible and visible; but what would you see when God was visible? LIGHT! God has the shape of how we look. But God is NOT a man. In the above argument the statement is not accurate using that verse. That is NOT about the creation of Adam. 1 Thessalonians 5:23, "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." This is someone that is already born of God. This is not a blanket statement about birth, or the original creation. It does however show the nature of man as having three parts: ergo, tripartite. But God is NOT tripartite; God' nature is the Godhead and as such a Trinity. Man is NOT a Trinity. To make this identically the same is to make a god after your own image.

When God created man, God did not have a body or a soul. Those are attributes of humans. When the Word was incarnated God made a body and soul and placed His Spirit in Him. This happened at procreation: The incarnation is the putting someone IN the FLESH. The Word became FLESH: the Word is a PERSON! That is the SOUL in the Lord Jesus Christ. The flesh and soul are stuck together and He was no exception to this. When sin was placed on Him at the cross; it affected His soul and His soul became

an offering for sin. If the Word became FLESH there had to be a soul there at that moment else the Word is NOT a person in the Lord Jesus Christ until birth or water baptism or some other time; and lost His godhood at the cross when God forsook him; RIGHT? NO, that is NOT right! The Lord Jesus Christ is God from the beginning; the Word was God; so WHO was that FLESH? Did that flesh have a SOUL that was the PERSON inside that body? Ignore this or teach the wrong thing. If you mess with these things you will reject the incarnation of the Lord in this. Be very careful here!

Next the issue of 1 Peter 1:23-25, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Does not show anything but an antitype between the physical birth and the spiritual birth. The antitype gives opposites not similitudes as typology. These are vastly different in just about EVERY way. The only thing that shows as similar is the word "birth" but they are not even the same. Notice that it says "Being born again" not getting born again or a time between seeding and birth. Making this similitude is assumed; The passage does NOT say that. The context shows the differences between being born again of incorruptible seed by the word of God and the flesh birth of corruptible seed.

These are in complete opposition the one to the other. In the order of physical birth you are in the womb right at conception and at birth you are considered a live birth. Does that mean that you were physically DEAD before you were born? The spirit is what is born again; and it IS dead before being born again. The births are NOT the same. When you are born physically you have been in the womb for about 37 weeks from conception. When you are spiritually born you are NOT conceived you received the word of God and have received the Lord Jesus Christ as your savior. You took no part in your physical birth! You took part in your spiritual birth, even though it was by proxy. You did what God told you to do. Making things the same or even identical is very dangerous when the Bible told you that when you study to rightly DIVIDE the word of God.

The next issue is of Mark 4:8a, 20a: Mark 4:8a, "And other fell on good ground..." and Mark 4:20a, "And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive it..." So these are not only been sown which all of them were; but they hear the word and the key is that they received it: John 1:12-13, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." And accordingly there is no gestation time in the spiritual birth between receiving the Lord Jesus Christ and being born of God. You do NOT have to mature in

the Lord to be saved. This is borderline the teaching of Lordship salvation without saying it.

Now the argument: "Spiritually speaking, a man might conceive the seed of the word of God, but he is not breathing (spiritually), according to the Lord Jesus, UNTIL he is born again. It is no different in the physical realm. A woman receives corruptible seed that produces a corruptible body that has to grow to maturity, in order to be born and breath on his own."

This argument is lacking any actual Bible. It is assuming many things: the terms "conceive" is misused for the word "receive" the phrase "the seed of the word of God" is NOT what the Bible says! It says the seed IS the word of God! To say "the seed of the word of God" is to imply that some of the word of God is NOT seed. There is no according to the Lord Jesus where the Lord says: "...until he is born again." There is no passage in the Bible that tells you "...It is no different in the physical realm." As a matter of fact it is vastly different. Now here we have the argument for Lordship salvation: "A woman receives corruptible seed that produces a corruptible body that has to grow to maturity, in order to be born and breath on his own." There is no passage that says you must grow to maturity and then be spiritually born! You do NOT grow up to Christ before you are IN HIM.

Now notice this verse: 1 Peter 2:2-3, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious." And now let's see this in the ESV: 1 Peter 2:2-3, "Like newborn infants, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up into salvation if indeed you have tasted that the Lord is good." English Standard Version (ESV). This is the classic Lordship Salvation perversion of that verse. You do NOT grow up into salvation.

When you receive the word of God you have believed what God said and received the Lord Jesus Christ by faith. Your faith at that moment is counted for righteousness and God imputes His righteousness to you and imputes your sin to the Lord Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit comes inside you and gives your spirit the new birth, goes into your soul and gives you the adoption, and then by cutting your body from your soul in the spiritual circumcision made without hands cutting your flesh away making your soul safe: ergo, saved. This path of these events happens so fast you do not see them happening. They are not instant; but are close enough to take place in a moment. We are born again; and as new born babes now we must grow to maturity. There is no womb where the seed is planted and we must wait for 37 weeks till we pop out and are born again. We are full grown and able to understand the gospel. No baby in the womb does this to be physically born. None of this even remotely proves that a child is not conceived as a

body, soul, and spirit. The child tells his parents he wants to be born and they give him his birth certificate and is conceived! There is no evidence to make any assumption that procreation is any different than the creation in this: that all three parts were created together and given life together. That creation (of Adam) is a foreshadowing of procreation and is why it is called pro-CREATION. The creation of the soul and spirit at a different time would make more than ONE procreative event. Adam did NOT have more than one creative event! Nothing is being created or procreated at the birth of the baby.

Charts: Post Embryonic, Premature Fetus & Mature Fetus are evolutionary terms to make you think these are animals and not humans. Look! This "Fetus" has a tail so it must be an animal and not a human; now it lost it tail; so it must be going through the stages of evolution. This is NOT the Bible. Calling the baby a Fetus is the same thing they call a baby cow in the womb! This is just science trying to trump the Bible. Where is the "fetus" in the Bible?

Now for the Bible verse that says: "...at the babies first breath he becomes a soul..." No? Oh ok, then if you have no verse then this is an assumed statement and NOT found in the Bible. Now this is quite embarrassing, because when someone is proved to be in error and rejects that proof when it is this blatant. That person is in danger of God giving them a reprobate mind. I am not trying to cause any bad feelings here. That is NOT my aim or motive. I am after the truth.

The small article titled "I will end this article with medical proof that for a fetus everything changes dramatically at the FIRST BREATH." Has not Bible; and deals with ONLY the physical attributes of the baby from inside the womb and after birth to the outside of the womb. There is no proof here that a soul enters the body is one of those things. This is just non-sense and has nothing whatsoever to do with what the Bible SAYS!

The link at the bottom of the page has another problem. This writer writes: "'In the next verse it tells us that if a man causes a woman to miscarriage he is to be fined according to what the husband decides. This proves that the fetus is not considered a living soul because the man does not get death, only a fine. The death of a soul in the Old Testament is punished by death, unlike this case below." Exodus 21:22-25, "If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman's husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine. And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe." He continues: "So according to the

above verse, killing a fetus is not equal to killing a man with a soul. Take in consideration that every sperm has potential for life, but only one makes it, the rest are aborted. The below verse is commonly used to prove that a fetus has a soul since it has blood, but keep in mind that animals have blood, but no soul. Notice carefully about what the verse says, the life of the FLESH is in the blood, not the soul. A fetus is living tissue, but it does not have a soul according to the Bible. Leviticus 17:11 "For the life of the flesh is in the blood..."

This write uses the evolutionary term for a baby calling it a "fetus" and says that this is NOT considered a living soul! But look at the passage he quotes. Find for me the phrase: "...not a living soul..."! Then after this passage above he says: "...killing a fetus is not equal to killing a man with a soul." Based on that verse! Yet can you find this in the passage? NO! That is NOT what the Bible actually SAYS. This is therefore an assumed idea. But it is NOT the truth. This seems ignorant in the light of the context of this passage that says: "...if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life..." That is the death penalty for taking a LIFE! It is also at the discretion of the husband what punishment is demanded. If death is ONE of those possible outcomes; how is this NOT the same as anyone killing anyone else? The mischief follow is vague; so that is still at the discretion of the husband. It is a total assumed idea that there is no soul in the LIFE of a baby in the womb.

Another post in this page says of: Job 31:15 "Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb?" "There are several other verses like this one, but notice that is always a reference to a person that God FOREKNOWS will be born and have the breath of life." This foreknowledge is again assumed here. God foreknows all things. This is saying nothing. There is no account of a soul entering into anyone at their birth. The only references for God's foreknowledge is Acts 2:23, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:" Not about a baby before birth. Romans 8:29, "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." Not about a baby before birth. Romans 11:2, "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying," Not about a baby before birth. 1 Peter 1:2, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied." Not about a baby before birth. So it looks like there is not one verse that says this is about foreknowledge. This again is assumed and does not prove anything.

This same argument is continued with Jeremiah 1:5 "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." And the writer says: "Once again, God knew this man would be born and breathe. You will not find one verse like this applied to someone that was aborted, making this a weak argument." No, this is not an argument of any soul popping into a body at birth. God knew him before he was formed in the belly would be prior to conception. This foreknowledge has nothing to do with birth or the soul popping into the body at birth. The fact that the person is spoken of as a person before he comes out of the womb and was sanctified thee and ordained thee would make HIM a PERSON in the womb. This is NOT the foreknowledge before the womb. That is a person IN the womb. Not just a body but a soul. Ignoring the facts makes people ignorant.

The next argument given is from: Luke 1:44 "For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." He writes: "Jeremiah, David and John the Baptist were all fetuses that never got aborted. They all were born, breathed and grew up to be men and God knew this already. The same goes for all the verses where the Bible says a woman is with child. Before you give me any verses to prove that the soul begins at conception, please think about the foreknowledge of God." Notice the usage of NON-Bible words like "fetuses" and "aborted" and then assumes that they had to breathe at birth to get the spirit and soul to pop! This is the issue of trying to prove your argument with your premise! It is the "I believe this so therefore the Bible should say, BLAH, Blah, blah!

The rest of the junk on this page is just medical physiology that proves nothing. The Bible is our authority in this matter. These guys have to go outside the Bible to grab at straws to build their case in dealing with a Bible issue! All this talk about oxygen or air or wind is ridiculous because those are NOT SPIRIT! The trouble here is making things that are NOT the same equal; while making the things that are the same opposites!

Now a note about the charts used: one of the main charts comes from Clarence Larkin and from the rightdivision.com web site this is what Larkin wrote: "There are two natures in a Christian, the old nature you are conceived with and the new nature you receive when you become a Christian. Psalms 51:5 KJV "5 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ephesians 1:13; 4:30 KJV "1:13 In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, 4:30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." God created man with a three-fold nature. These are the Body, Soul and

Spirit. When you are conceived in your mother's womb..." By posting his art work on their site they are somewhat saying that Larkin agrees with them. But he did not!

The original article started with "When Does Life Begin? Life begins at procreation. The most obvious implication is NOT what happens at birth. Life starts at conception. That is the end of procreation; there is no later creative event at birth. To assume this; now let's just tell it like it is: it is ASSUMED! With NO Bible proof!

The trouble with the doctrine of Soul Incarnation at Birth is too close to the Hindu ideology of avatarianism that leads to the idea of reincarnation. There is only ONE incarnation in the Bible. There is only ONE person that has preeminence. Colossians 1:18. The idea that the soul comes later seems to also hold to the idea that it is detached from the body not attached. Yet there is still no verse that actually SAYS that the soul enters the body at birth or is created at birth. The idea of the breath of life only happened with Adam at creation. The reason for my use of that example is because that is the only place where it is used for the start of a human being. NO one in the Bible at birth has this statement made. The issue is NOT addressed any more than Peter shot his mother-in-law with a shot-gun. Well the Bible doesn't say that he didn't so he must have!!! This is an argument of non-existent proof to prove the preconceived fallacy.

There is only one way to understand this idea of the soul's issue coming later and not at the same time together body, soul and spirit. That is a secondary procreation; but who produces this? What IS the soul? If it is NOT the person, then who is it? Now if you think about this in light of the actual incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ; you must deal with who was the soul in that body; and when did that soul get in that body. If it was NOT at the incarnation; they you must teach a double or triple incarnation. Was the Lord Jesus Christ God Almighty? WHEN did that start?

Ecclesiastes 12:5-7, "Also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets: Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

1 Corinthians 6:20, "For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."

1 Thessalonians 5:23, "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."

This one: James 2:26a, “For as the body without the spirit is dead...”

If you are not a living spirit you are not a living soul and not a living body. The death of the spirit at the age of accountability is not the sort of death we think of it because we are not dealing with a mortal body here. The spirit does not go away or cease to function. The death is in fact a disconnection with heaven and with God. This has to happen because of your own personal sin that you are responsible for.

Or God would not have the right to cast a lot soul in hell.

There is no preexistence of the soul; and the soul is created with the body and spirit at procreation. There is no incarnation of the soul or spirit after the body is procreated.

Take time to read and study the passages in this and take the time to arrive at a conclusion that fits with these scriptures without altering any of them to suit what you already believe. Allow God to change your mind in agreement with what God has said. That is the way in which we all are to grow spiritually.

I do hope this helps in your understanding and dispenses with this error.

The End