THE FUTURE STATES

THEIR EVIDENCES AND NATURE CONSIDERED ON PRINCIPLES PHYSICAL MORAL AND SCRIPTURAL

WITH THE DESIGN OF SHOWING THE VALUE OF THE GOSPEL REVELATION

BY THE

REV. REGINALD COURTENAY M.A.

RECTOR OF THORNTON WATLASS YORKSHIRE

LONDON

WILLIAM PICKERING

1843

Digitized by Google

C. WHITTINGHAM, CHISWICK.

Digitized by Google

TO THE MOST REVEREND

RICHARD WHATELY, D. D.

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

My Lord,

I HAVE much satisfaction in at length availing myself of the permission granted me, to dedicate this work to Your Grace.

I am glad to bring my protracted labours to a close, and for the present dismiss a subject which has often occupied my thoughts for ten years past, and my pen for more than seven. I am glad also to have this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for the kindness and encouragement to which, under Divine providence, I in great measure owe my ordination to the ministry; and which has continued to attend me since. And I may be permitted here to thank Your Grace also for having so kindly consented to inspect some of the earlier parts of my book, before I had it in contemplation to enter into holy orders. The measure of approbation which it then received induces me to hope that it will, upon the whole, be approved of now that it is completed; although on some material points I am ignorant of Your Grace's sentiments, and have, as I am well aware, gone beyond them upon others.

I have chiefly endeavoured to maintain the

Digitized by Google

three important and connected truths,—that the Future Existence of man, in happiness or misery, is not discoverable by human reason, but is known only by revelation;—that it is not the mere natural continuance of the present life, but is wholly effected by the mediation of Christ;—and that it will be entered upon at, and not before, the resurrection of the dead.

I cannot venture to hope that, in very variously discussing a subject so extensive and profound, I have always avoided error; neither do I expect, even where not in error, to escape the censure of those who have a wider and easier creed, and are naturally unwilling that the way of life should be thus narrowed. But I know the strength of my position; and I am at least confident of having, in Your Grace, one impartial, yet, as I hope, favourable, judge; and one who will ever be disposed to welcome any well-directed attempt to vindicate Scriptural truth.

That Your Grace may long continue to be successful in such attempts, and to promote them, by precept and example, in your archdiocese and in the Church, is, My Lord, the sincere desire and prayer of

Your Grace's most obliged

and obedient Servant

REGINALD COURTENAY.

Thornton Watlass.
August 10, 1843.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

BOOK I.

THE PHYSICAL EVIDENCES OF A FUTURE LIFE.

Chap.

I. On the Dependence of the Human Mind on the Body; and on Sleep 22
II. The Dependence of the Mind upon the Brain 38
III. The Body no Impediment to the Mind 51
IV. The Utility of the Body in Mental Processes 72
V. The Argument from the Indivisibility of Mind 75
VI. The Argument from Man's physical Superiority 97
VII. Conclusion and Recapitulation 105

Note. In the work, Chapters IV. V. VI. VII. are numbered V. VI. VII. VIII.

BOOK II.

THE MORAL EVIDENCES OF A FUTURE LIFE.

I. Introductory 116
II. Sentiments of the Heathen on Natural Religion 131
III. On the Arguments for Immortality founded upon the Sufferance of Evil 153
IV. The Argument for Immortality, from the Greatness of human Desires 188
V. The Argument from the Perfectibility of the Species 209
VI. The Argument from Moral Derangement 216

BOOK III.

THE FUTURE STATES AS REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE.

I. Introductory 225
II. Immortality begun in Spiritual Life 231

Digitized by Google

Chap.		Page
III.	On the Intermediate State	239
IV.	The Intermediate State, continued	259
V.	The Intermediate State, continued	291
VI.	The Intermediate State, concluded	332
VII.	The Day of Judgement	341
VIII.	The Future State of Punishment	348
IX.	The New Heavens and Earth	360
X.	General Conclusion	385

APPENDIX 393

ERRATA.

Page 23, line 1, for *as* read *is*.

117, line 2 from bottom, for *any other counteracting* read *any counteracting effect*.

346, line 3 from bottom, for *become lost* read *beware lest*.

Digitized by Google

THE FUTURE STATES,

THEIR EVIDENCES AND NATURE.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

WE are commanded, in one brief sentence of Scripture, to "try all things," and "to hold fast to that which is good;" and experience has shown, upon a very extensive scale, at once the practical difficulty and the importance of reconciling the two precepts. It has been found, that minds habituated to a free range of speculation sometimes acquire a fatal indifferency in religious matters; and are inconstant even to approved objects of belief. They are anxious to hear what can be *said* on all sides of all subjects, but indifferent about *conclusions*. Others are anxious for a conclusion, indifferent about its *premises:* clinging too eagerly and blindly to what they imagine to be true, without a sufficiently candid examination of other things, they become incapable of expanded views, and are attached to error more frequently than to truth. In the eastern world, from China to the shores of the Caspian, are to be found nations which have from century to century, with little vacillation, held each to its own particular form of error; while

Digitized by Google

on the opposite side of the globe, beyond the Atlantic, men hold fast to no forms of doctrine whatever, and may sometimes be seen to exchange, without compunction, a creed nearly apostolic for some extravagant invention of a presumptuous philosophy, — because, perhaps, the arguments and the eloquence of the controversial preachers whom they have followed were at length exhausted, or they happened, for some trivial reason, to change their place of worship.

Thus, through frequent changing, do many minds become, in process of time, incapable of a really firm faith. No doctrine can be so fully expounded to them, and enforced by such a weight of moral evidence, but that they will soon be ready to ask, Can any one show us a doctrine *more* probable than this? They are never more highly interested, than when an effort is made to shake the foundations of their belief, and propose to their view opinions new, startling, incongruous. The Church history of Europe furnishes similar instances, though the extreme opinions are not so far apart, to those of Asia and North America. The Romanists have failed to escape from those errors of doctrine to which every church is liable through the corruption of human nature, in consequence of their neglecting the command to try all things, while they professed to hold fast to that which was good; and Protestants have fallen into error, even into fatal heresies, in consequence of their neglecting to hold fast the truth, while they sought to try all things.

Digitized by Google

And even within the Anglican Church are two parties, which charge each other with neglecting the one or the other branch of the twofold apostolic precept.

But the difficulty of reconciling a sufficiently impartial exercise of reason, with an entire readiness to adopt as an article of faith whatever appears to be, in fact, declared by the infallible word of God, would be much diminished, if men would remember that every point of doctrine which the mind has once tried, and found to bear the impress of Scriptural truth,* is to be adopted and held fast *before* it is tried again; that though speculation is not forbidden, it must not be allowed to loosen the hold of truth which the mind has taken, upon a fair examination of testimony.

If such a doctrine as that of the future states be first cordially believed in and embraced on the authority of the Scriptures, which expressly declare their existence, and partially reveal their

* The writer would not be understood to say, that each mind must rely solely on its own powers; for this, even in temporal matters, would often be a presumptuous and a dangerous course; but that the ultimate reference should be to Scripture only: that aid should be sought, from every available quarter, though authority should be appealed to in none, in determining whether Scripture does, or does not, unequivocally lay down the doctrine in question. Many will dissent from this position; but happily those truths respecting a future life, in which Christians are most interested, are laid down in the Bible in general terms, so plainly that he who runs may read and understand; and there is *no need* to appeal to another authority, if such there be.

Digitized by Google

nature, many speculations on this profoundly interesting topic become not only safe, but serviceable to the cause of truth, which, had they been entered upon before the mind had taken a firm hold of the Gospel, might have tended to keep the truth back. One who from childhood to middle age had been accustomed to travel from country to country, without a permanent home to be the object of hope or regret,—who had been early familiarized to barbarous as well as to more civilized society, would probably become incapable of strong attachment to a particular spot; and if towards the close of his days he settled at all, would be not unlikely to prefer a semi-barbarous people, and a mode of life of which enlightened men cannot approve. But if he had been educated in a home in which he became accustomed to the refined pleasures of civilized life, it is probable that no subsequent wanderings would endanger his well grounded attachment to his native country and his birthplace. It is well that men should be prejudiced, to a certain degree, in favour of these; and should not *lightly* change their place of abode, and transfer their feelings of patriotism to another country; but it is also well that they should entertain no *blind* attachment, and there may be circumstances in which a change would be both expedient and truly philosophic. And so it is in religion, with this only difference, affecting the relative duties of holding fast and of trying, that the Creator would have men be all of one

Digitized by Google

religion, though not all of one country. It is well for a man to be attached to the creed of his forefathers, and not desert it merely because the creeds on the face of the earth are many; but well also that he should be open to conviction of error. And the same observation applies to creeds in general; and also to those smaller matters of belief which are contained in the creeds, but are not essential parts of them.

These remarks may assist in showing that reason, when employed in the trial of opinions on any matter connected with Revelation, is better employed in illustrating truths previously admitted on that authority, than in recommending or introducing Revelation as of its own authority. We know the Revelation to be true;—this book is not designed for those who would call it in question,—and philosophy undertakes a dangerous task, when it voluntarily loosens its hold of that which has been tried and approved to be good, for the purpose of showing some new principle upon which it may be embraced. Men's minds may be unsettled by such endeavours to convince them, and they may be induced either to doubt of the truths revealed, or take up inaccurate notions concerning them, and such as Scripture would never have suggested.

Thus does religion suffer from an indiscreet use of philosophy. And if religion does not suffer any detriment, it will be often found that philosophy is brought into disrepute. It is true that there are many and strong analogies be-

Digitized by Google

tween the system of Nature and that of Revelation; but religion teaches us that the Works of God, and among them the mind and heart of man, are not as at first, very good, and like the Word that created them, and "answering His great idea;" but that the earth was cursed for man's sake when he fell, and that the system of Christian theology is *remedial;* and we should not, therefore, wonder if there be things on earth *not* analogous to things in heaven; and if human philosophy should on some questions prove either utterly inefficient to determine any thing; or, if a conclusion be extorted from it, adverse to the Word of God.*

In the opinion of the writer, no part of Revelation has suffered more from the indiscretions of philosophy, than that which declares the future states of happiness and misery. There is a very strong tendency in many modern writings on theological subjects, to convert or at least endeavour to convert every fact which observation can discover, whether in the physical or in the moral world, into an Evidence of Religion. And it is probable that this might be done with success, if men, in seeking to reconcile reason with Scrip-

* Reason is decidedly adverse, for instance, to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Much confusion is created in some minds by contrasting *Reason* and *Revelation*. When we speak of any Revelation being opposed to Reason, we must mean, to the conclusion to which our Reason would have come, had that Revelation never been made to us. Once made, the Revelation should be the basis of all subsequent reasoning.

Digitized by Google

ture, would remember that DISCORD has been introduced into the world—that the unregenerate is the natural state of man—and that Scripture contains *threats* as well as promises. For hence we might be led to expect that the constitution of the natural man would contain indications rather of his future condition *without*, than with, salvation by Christ. Natural theology is not necessarily, nor is it in fact, concordant with Christian theology: and there are many truths discoverable by reason, which prove only that man is in a state of degradation and corruption, and has, as it were, strayed away into the gloomy dominions of an evil power, and become an alien and an enemy of God. But these melancholy truths have been too often overlooked in philosophical writings; and endeavours have been made to show that the world inhabited by fallen man, and cursed for his sake, does, in fact, contain nothing of death,—that its sting may be taken away without a knowledge of Christ,—that the whole universe testifies to a blissful immortality reserved for the human race. That such an immortality is reserved for the followers of Christ, is indeed a glorious truth, and one to which *some* testimony is afforded even by things in this fallen world: but in Scripture *another* state also is revealed, of perpetual death, if not of perpetual misery also, of which many things in this world afford a previously intelligible indication, or at least a strong confirmation. "Natural Religion," it has been finely observed by Dr. Chalmers, "has

Digitized by Google

been called the basis of Christianity. It would better accord with our own views of the place which it occupies, and of the high purpose which it undoubtedly serves—if it were called the basis of Christianization. * * As a prompter to inquiry it is of inestimable service, but as an informer little to be trusted. * * Christianity rests on its own proper evidence; and, if instead of this, she be made to rest on an antecedent natural religion, she becomes weak throughout, because weak radically."

Accordingly we should endeavour to trace the consistency of Revelation *not* with that view of nature which we might have been inclined to take beforehand; but with that view which the Revelation itself points out to be the most just and true. Whoever will enter on the contemplation of nature with the Bible in his hand, will obtain a key to the solution of difficulties which else would have been altogether insurmountable. A firm faith in the Word of God will enable him to discern in His Works relations before unobserved, and harmonies before unsuspected. Any one who was proceeding to examine the construction of a complicated piece of machinery, would find his examination greatly facilitated by his being previously informed of the purpose for which the machine was made.

But philosophy is too often employed, and with pernicious effect, not in recommending, nor in illustrating, but in seeking to *establish* revelation;—to show that the fundamental doc-

Digitized by Google

trines of Scripture are all highly probable and reasonable, and such as we should, beforehand, naturally expect to find them. The ambition of modern theologians, and their desire to avoid all imputations of illiberality, in assuming, on the authority of the Bible, whatever they could not show to be antecedently probable, has often induced them to take up this untenable position: and it seems to have been tacitly assumed by both parties, in many a theological controversy, that the leading truths of religion were to be supported, as on their strongest and broadest basis, by modern physical discoveries. But, whoever seeks to prevail against any stronghold of infidelity, and to plant there the banner of Revelation, must arm himself for the conflict in the whole armour of God; or notwithstanding the goodness of his cause, he will have no security against defeat.

Dr. Butler has devoted a considerable part of the first chapter of his Analogy of Religion—one of the earliest, and unquestionably the greatest of the works which show the extent of relation between the visible world and the world known to us by reason, or by faith—to the proving that the phenomena of death furnish no reasonable presumption against the doctrine of a future life. And in so far as he has confined himself to such arguments as tend to show that the continuance of life and consciousness is by no means impossible, he has done some service to the cause of truth. But when he ventures further than this,

Digitized by Google

endeavouring to establish the doctrine of immortality on grounds independent of Revelation, and to "*prove it to a very considerable degree of probability*," he takes up a position which, if the principles maintained in the first two books of this work are not incorrect, is altogether untenable. A numerous train of minor theologians have since taken the same path, each confidently advancing his favourite philosophical demonstration of an eternity of happiness reserved for the human race, and addressing himself to readers who were too well satisfied with his conclusion to be much concerned about the method by which it was, ostensibly, made out. But this is an abuse of philosophy, which is calculated to bring into disrepute truths of infinitely higher value than any which philosophy can make known. When the theologian, not content with establishing out of the Bible the certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed, quits his impregnable fortress, to be defeated, as surely he *may* be, on the neutral ground of human philosophy, the sceptic, giving him credit for greater prudence than he has actually exercised, may imagine that one of the strongest positions whence to defend the truth has proved unserviceable. "My adversary," he may argue, "would not have abandoned his texts for weapons of man's forging, had he not been sensible that the contest, after all, must mainly depend upon their aid."

There is perhaps no doctrine of the Christian religion, not even the fundamental doctrine of the

Digitized by Google

unity of the Godhead, of which reason can find a demonstration, capable of effecting that complete conviction, which the records of Revelation produce in a philosophically humble mind.* The doctrine of man's immortality, in particular, as it is laid down in Scripture, is utterly beyond the reach of unassisted reason. This, it is hoped, that the following pages will fully prove. Neither the certainty of a future and everlasting life, nor the resurrection of the body which is essential to it, nor the conditions requisite for its attainment, are discoverable by the powers of man. Scripture declares that the future life will be a life of soul and body. And strange indeed it is, that any natural theologians should suppose themselves to be rendering an important service to the cause of revealed truth, in arguing in favour of the survival, after the dissolution of the body, of a disembodied soul. By such ill directed endeavours to support the cause of truth, endeavours as unsuccessful, if the present writer is not deceived, in their immediate object, as in their ulterior purpose, they have given to the question of the probability or possibility of a separate consciousness an importance which did not properly belong to it; and have rendered it well worth while to re-examine arguments much in vogue, and which to many minds *appear* to affect the truth of Revelation. In fact, such arguments are beside the purpose; they can have no influence upon the mind of a

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

sceptic, whether in themselves conclusive or not. His main objection to this part of the scheme of Revelation attaches to the doctrine of a corporeal resurrection; nor is he brought one step nearer to a belief in this, by any however plausible demonstration of the natural immortality of mind. And whoever, on the other hand has, by the word of God, been brought to believe in a resurrection, will have no apprehension lest mind should be mortal: for resurrection itself implies a renewal of consciousness. "The doctrine concerning what is called the immateriality of the soul," says the author of "The Physical Theory of another Life," "should ever be treated as a merely philosophical speculation, and as unimportant to our Christian profession."*

But the probability of a future state may be rested upon *moral* grounds, without any reference to the nature of the soul. The question then will be, whether from what we know, without Revelation, of the character of the Deity, of the constitution and condition of man, and of the ends for which each individual was called into being;† there is a probability that his Creator will place him in another world, upon his departure from the present. This question is not, like

---

* Physical Theory. Chap. I.

† Each individual: for it is plain that, perhaps those generations only need live again, in whom the scheme of terrestrial progress is brought to perfection; and for whom, as we may suppose, a higher sphere of existence is prepared.

Digitized by Google

the former, one upon which the Atheist and the Christian might come to the same conclusion;—it involves an admission of *all* the main doctrines of Natural Religion; and is, therefore, on its own account, well worth examination.

Though Natural Religion has been, to a considerable extent, superseded by the Revealed,* so that the most certain, although the most circuitous path, by which to arrive at a conviction of the Being, and a true knowledge of the attributes of God, and the moral condition of man, is that which traverses the writings of the apostles and prophets, under the guidance of the celestial light which is given to all who ask, and with the aid of sacramental rites and Church services, the light of nature still shines, like the moon in the day time, faithfully though feebly reflecting the rays of the Sun of Righteousness. This secondary light has appeared to many moral writers so clear and strong, that even under the glorious noon of the Gospel they profess to be able to walk by it. And it is much to be apprehended, that they have in many instances mistaken the source of their knowledge; or have been misled through wilfully shutting their eyes to the "greater light" which is to rule the Christian world; sometimes erroneously asserting that they could demonstrate by the help of mere reason truths which are to be found in Scripture, and in Scripture only; and sometimes confidently advancing, for the purpose, as they

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

imagine, of vindicating Scripture, things which may or may not be plausible conclusions for the imperfectly illuminated mind of man to arrive at, but which are inconsistent with the word of God. Thus does one of the most eloquent and ingenious of modern philosophical writers take for granted, that "human nature in its present form is only the rudiment of a *more extended and desirable mode of existence*," and that for man,—that is, it would seem, *all* men, for no exception is made—"is destined a future spiritual structure, imperishable, and endued with higher powers, and many *desirable* prerogatives." In the same manner also does Dr. Thomas Brown, to take one instance more out of multitudes, boast that "there is within us an immortal spirit," which after death is to ascend to heaven, and enter into *communion with the Deity*. And the chief ground of his confidence appears to be, that mind is immaterial. But if the immateriality of mind does prove its immortality, it surely cannot prove its happy immortality.

"There is," says Bishop Butler in allusion to the scepticism so fashionable in his day, "a certain fearlessness with regard to what may be hereafter under the government of God, which nothing but a universally acknowledged demonstration on the side of atheism can justify." Nowhere is this strange indifference to the terrors of a judgment to come more strikingly displayed than in the pages of Christian writers, who promise to all men indiscriminately, as owners of

Digitized by Google

imperishable souls, an eternal, exalted, and desirable life. Whereas the founder of Christianity has declared, on the contrary, "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto LIFE, and few there be that find it; and wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to DESTRUCTION, and many there be which go in thereat." The language of men does not contain stronger expressions than have been employed by the inspired writers to mark the difference between the two future states reserved for men.* Some shall have "everlasting life," others shall "utterly perish in their own corruption." And since, without the mediation of Christ, all men are liable to condemnation, and shall surely DIE, whatever be the nature of the punishment denounced in those mysterious words—does not Revelation make it probable beforehand, if we would submit to judge of nature by the light of Revelation, as well as of Revelation by the light of nature, that the "natural man," the lineal descendant of fallen Adam, would be found to contain in his constitution only the seeds of mortality; that in the administration of the world beyond Paradise, should be found indications rather of prevailing evil and unsparing justice, than of remedial love, and intervening mercy; and that the clouds which hang over the boundary of human life, should portend only a future day of storms, or an everlasting night? It is not Natural

* This is treated of at length in the Third Book.

Digitized by Google

Theology, it is CHRISTIANITY ALONE that can give us assurance amid the mystery of evil, and inscribe words of hope over the dark gates of death. It does not indeed explain away that mystery in any degree, but gives us assurance; like a guiding star in heaven, which is sufficient for our footsteps, though it does not dispel the night, nor perceptibly illuminate the earth.

It is a mere enthusiasm, an attractive but fallacious fervour, that induces religious men to speak of the human soul as a thing in its own nature pure, excellent, inexhaustibly energetic, essentially immortal, waiting only for release from the chains and darkness and defilements of its earthly prison-house, to put forth its before latent powers, to go on from strength to strength and from glory to glory, and to assume the image and somewhat of the attributes of Divinity. Such a view is at once utterly inconsistent with all sound philosophy, and with that Revelation which declares that the children of Adam have no life in them, except by a second birth from above. *In the regenerate* there truly is somewhat of a godlike nature, which is militant now, and will at length be triumphant; but *in them* ONLY.

This world is like an hieroglyphic scroll, bearing testimony, when rightly interpreted, to the same truths as are plainly written in the Book of God: but bearing, nevertheless, a partial testimony; and in particular telling us little concerning the doctrine of immortal life;

Digitized by Google

while it tends strongly to confirm the more terrible and penal parts of the scheme disclosed by Revelation. Yet it is not, like the hieroglyphics of Egypt, altogether unintelligible to those who have not the right key. To them it speaks an indistinct language, and may with *equal* plausibility, be made to afford many different meanings more or less widely at variance with the truth.

Many of those arguments, originating in an overweening reliance on human reason, which have led to open and glaring errors, especially perhaps in the case of the Universalists and of the Unitarians; and which existing in a more latent form in the minds of a far more numerous class, have prevented a distinct perception and cordial acknowledgment of revealed truth, are not in themselves less plausible, than some of the arguments used by orthodox writers, who with a mistaken zeal and misplaced confidence seek to confirm the most glorious truths of Christian Theology, without any aid from Scripture.

The two witnesses, the Works and Word of God, when examined together, confirm each other's testimony. But it does not therefore follow that the evidence of the former, taken by itself, declares the same truths as are laid down by the latter.

Under these impressions the more prevalent of the moral and physical arguments for a future state of existence have been examined, with the view to show how inadequate they are to do more (in favour of that flattering view of man's

Digitized by Google

destiny which their advocates invariably adopt), than establish *a slender hope* that the most virtuous of men may hereafter enter into a state of perpetual happiness: all the conjectures in which any thing more comprehensive, or more definite is aimed at, being weak in themselves, and having little resemblance to the truth.

It is therefore necessary to test the soundness of the conjectures of human reason, by comparing them with what is revealed. These comparisons, which are occasionally introduced in earlier parts of the work, form the principal subject of the third book. And no apology need be offered, if in the third book the nature and aspect of the worlds future and invisible have been somewhat more fully enquired into than was necessary for the institution of these comparisons. We are not forbidden reverently to approach those regions of lofty contemplation, over which Scripture has thrown a partial light, and which human reason, ambitious as it is, has never attempted to pourtray. "It is strange," says Foster, the Essayist, "that any one holding the belief of a life to come, should not have both the intellectual faculties and the imagination strained to the uttermost in the trial, however unavailing, to give some outlines of definite form to the unseen realities." Such outlines we may attempt to draw, delineating what the vast and indistinct scene *appears* actually to contain; but not trusting to reason, inventing nothing.

In the first book the nature of mind has been

Digitized by Google

considered without any systematic reference to the doctrines of natural religion, except in the last chapter. In the second the Deity has been regarded as a moral governor, and man as a responsible being. The moment that the force of moral obligations is admitted, we can discern the doubtful outlines of another world; but the obscurity that hangs over the view cannot be dispelled, without the certain light of the Word of God; to which, in the third, an appeal is accordingly made.*

Many readers would, in these days, demand that an appeal should be made to a fourth authority, the nature and limits of which the writer is utterly unable to define, but which they would describe as the "tradition of the church." To this tradition, they would say, the ultimate appeal must be made, and all deductions from Scripture, however unimpeachable in themselves, must bend before it.

There is, however, only one question considered in the following pages, on which the advocates of tradition have been accustomed to rely much upon its authority; namely, that relating to the intermediate state, between death† and

---

* The objects of these books may be stated generally to be,—of the first, to inquire on physical principles, How can man live again?—of the second, on moral principles, Why should he live again?—of the third, on Scriptural principles, What shall be his future life?

† The word "death" is commonly used in two very different senses: which it is most important to distinguish. Sometimes

Digitized by Google

resurrection. This state they deem to be one of happiness or misery, and the present writer, one of insensibility; and as on this question tradition does, on the whole, coincide with the earth-born feelings and imaginations of men,—as will invariably be the case, where the tradition does not really come from above,—the writer must be prepared to find himself charged with presumption, and disrespect of legitimate authority, greatly aggravated by a want of sympathy with the majority of Christians, in regard to a point of belief which they very fondly cherish.

But on this point tradition has not been appealed to. First, because—just as we may set Scripture aside for a time, in order to ascertain what would be the judgement of reason alone respecting man's state after death,—so we may set aside tradition, whatever its legitimate authority, in order to ascertain the judgement, on the same point, of reason and Scripture alone. Even if tradition had the right of over-ruling the judgements which men collectively or individually form upon theological questions, after consulting reason and Scripture only, it would have no right to prevent the forming or pronouncing of those judgements. A superior court may on appeal reverse the decisions, but does not supersede the jurisdiction, of an inferior court. The author of this volume has a right to

---

it signifies the passing out of a state of life, mental and bodily, into another state; and sometimes that other state itself. It will unavoidably be used in both senses, in the course of this work.

Digitized by Google

say,— reason alone speaks thus, —reason and Scripture thus, whatever may be the language of reason, Scripture, and tradition.

And secondly tradition has not been appealed to, because it is not to be believed that the various and vague notions of the Christian writers of the third and fourth centuries, to whom those who differ from the author would refer, were founded upon any apostolic tradition whatever. What is called church-tradition variously contradicts Scripture, but neither *interprets it*, nor pronounces any unanimous and definite sentence of its ŏwn, concerning the state of the dead. And there are good grounds for supposing that, according to the general belief of Christians of the first two centuries at least, the dead remained out of the reach of joy or pain, until the day of resurrection."*

---

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

BOOK I.

PHYSICAL EVIDENCES OF A FUTURE LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE DEPENDENCE OF THE HUMAN MIND ON THE BODY; AND ON SLEEP.

THE opinion that the soul will continue to exist, and will experience no diminution, at least, of its powers, after the dissolution of the body which ensues on death,* has been maintained, without any aid from Scripture, or from any moral considerations, chiefly upon the two following grounds. Its independence of the body; as being an immaterial thing, which cannot possibly owe its existence to any arrangement or structure of material senseless particles;—and its essentially indestructible nature; as being one and indivisible, and therefore incapable of dissolution or decay, or indeed of any change whatever.

The object of this first, and of several following chapters is, to show that granting the immateriality of the soul, a connection with the body, such as we know to exist during life, however incompre-

* Lord Brougham has founded an argument, upon which he places great reliance, and which will be stated and considered in a future chapter, upon the fact of a "chronic dissolution" of the body *during life*.

Digitized by Google

hensible the nature of the connection may be, as apparently essential to *the exercise of* any of the mental functions; and in the latter part of the book it is argued, that even if consciousness, and the subject in which it resides, be indivisible, and be indestructible, consciousness is nevertheless capable of *complete suspension*, and probably will be completely suspended by, and after, death.

In reference to the first point Bishop Butler, the most successful of all vindicators of the reasonableness of the Gospel dispensation, has argued, and justly enough, that *if* death and the dissolution of the body* do not *of themselves* destroy our capacity for thought and action, we may reasonably expect to retain it through and after death. That death does not destroy them would certainly be a "sufficient reason" for supposing them to survive. And many facts have been brought forward, by Butler, and by other writers, with a view to show that death does not in any way destroy this capacity. Matter, it is observed, is universally, under every form and in every modification, inert and insensate; no commixture of elements, however subtle, no organization, however complicated, can impart to it motion or life. These are derived from the soul, the body being merely the means by which we per-

* These are not the same thing; but one the cause of the other; as will be hereafter further considered. This has been generally overlooked: and has led to much and serious misrepresentation.

Digitized by Google

ceive and act upon external things. How then, it is argued, can the dissolution of these elements, or the breaking up of this structure, destroy or impair the soul? Now not to call in question, in this place, the justice of the assumption, that man,—mind and body,—is nothing beyond an aggregation of passive particles, and an indivisible soul; it can only be replied that our inability to explain *how* the body can influence the soul at the time of death must not be permitted to create any doubt that such an influence is *possible*, unless we are also entitled to doubt that the mind and body reciprocally influence one another *during life*, because we are unable to give any account of the mode by which that influence is maintained. The language of some writers is such, indeed, as to go far towards denying this connexion and influence, at least that of body on mind, altogether. Dr. Butler calls consciousness one and indivisible, and argues that it is therefore indissoluble, imperishable, unchangeable: and further says that the subject in which consciousness resides, the mind, must be so to. Is then the mind, the whole mind, *unchangeable?* This it seems would naturally follow.

And Lord Brougham speaks of the mind, as continuing *the same*, from youth to old age, amidst all the changes of the body, "without shadow of turning." Now there *may be* some inmost essence of soul, some *consciousness of consciousness*, which remains the same during all the *waking* hours at least, of a man's life. And

Digitized by Google

there may be, *beyond* this, some faculty of consciousness, which remains the same during the profoundest sleep, the most utter insensibility, and which even death will not destroy. But however this be, it is certain that the mind does possess and exert powers at one time, which it does not possess, or (which is practically just the same thing) cannot exert, at another; and is, in a perfectly intelligible sense, the most changeable thing we know. And are we to reject all that is changeable; and having thus reduced the mind as it were to the skeleton of its former self, call man an immortal being? Such an existence would be of no value; it would be a virtual death. Unless not merely the faculty of consciousness, but all or a considerable portion of the active and ever varying energies of the mind, remain entire and unimpaired after the dissolution of the body, nothing remains worth contending for. And the question now to be considered is, whether there is, or is not, so close a connexion between mind and body, as that the latter is essential, if not to the bare existence of mind in the abstract, at least to the *exercise* of the mental functions. The practically important question is, not whether any *capacity for* thought, but whether any thoughts, will survive the death of the body; or whether they will not "all perish, when man returns to his earth."

There are many facts, familiarly known, and indeed matters of universal experience, which very strongly show, that the mind, however dis-

Digitized by Google

tinct it may be in nature from the body, closely sympathises, and co-operates with it: and further, that this co-operation is *mutual;*—that as mind is necessary to produce corporeal activity, so also is body to produce mental activity. Mind by itself, or we should rather say, the human mind, as at present constituted, is no less *insensate* than matter. Sensation is an attribute, (let the shrinking of the tentacles of the polype when touched be the illustration and proof of this) is an attribute of *mind* AND *matter*, residing in neither alone. And in like manner, as a vast number of facts go to prove, is mental activity, generally, inseparable from corporeal.

A stunning blow on the head renders the mind as inert and insensate, (and as unconscious too, notwithstanding the indivisibility of consciousness) as the weapon that inflicted the injury.

After certain intervals of action and excitement, our bodies imperatively require rest; of which they cannot be deprived either by sickness, or by excitement continued from external influences, for any considerable time, without suffering great and sometimes permanent injury. And it seems that the repose is incomplete, and the body imperfectly recruited, unless the mind partake, in some degree at least, in this inactivity; and, as if withdrawn from the body, cease not only from controling the movements of the limbs, but from all sympathy with, all consciousness of, whatever may affect the organs of sense. How far the other powers of the mind, such as me-

Digitized by Google

mory, imagination, reason, and others, partake in the common lethargy of the body and of the mental powers of perception and voluntary motion, it is impossible for us to discover with certainty. Any one who pleases may assert, that the mind is as active as ever, although we have no recollection of our sleeping thoughts, our dreams. But this want of recollection affords at least a presumption, either that the impressions made during sleep are extremely feeble, or that no ideas whatever pass through the brain during the greater part of our sleeping hours. For when we are awake, the distinctness of our recollections is very nearly in proportion to the force and depth of the original impressions; and beyond this, seems to depend on no other cause than the degree of *exclusive attention* with which they have been entertained. Now when our bodies are awake, and we are experiencing fresh sensations almost every instant, our attention, it would seem, must be more distracted, than during sleep. How is it, then, that we do not recollect? If the mind is so independent of the body as some persons would believe, what is there in the transfer from a waking to a sleeping state of body, or the reverse, that should interrupt the current of our recollections in a greater degree, than when one exchanges rest for activity, or activity for rest, *without* waking or falling asleep?

But we do sometimes remember our sleeping thoughts, our dreams. And they are, in general, as faint, as evanescent, and as confused as the

Digitized by Google

images which float before our eyes when we close them in composing ourselves to rest: and are so easily banished by the most trivial waking thoughts as these images are by the admission even of faint light.* Moreover it appears that dreams never take place during *deep* sleep; but only when the body is disturbed; is, like the mind, in a state between sleeping and waking, and acts, like the mind, feebly, irregularly, and involuntarily. Lord Brougham has mentioned in his Discourse on Natural Theology several curious facts—and Abercrombie, in his work on the Intellectual Powers, gives some similar instances—to show that an exceedingly short space of our sleeping time is occupied by dreams, even when to the dreamer himself many hours, or even days, seem to have elapsed. In many cases a sudden sound, or some painful sensation, both rouses the sleeper to his full consciousness,

---

* If, when the eyes are closed in a dark room, and the mind is calm, any faint streaks of light, specks, or figures seem to float upon the dark stream, these may be made to assume the shape of almost any object, especially of a brilliant one, to which the thoughts are steadily directed. After becoming distinctly visible for a few seconds, the object will generally pass off into another nearly similar: and when the eyes are familiar with the mode in which the transformations most naturally succeed one another, the figure may be changed, step by step, into nearly any other desired. Thus an arrow may be transformed into a fish, the fish into a leaf.

If, immediately on waking in a dark room, from a dream which presented any vivid scene to the eye of the imagination, the attention be turned to the spectra before the eyes, particular

Digitized by Google

and before awaking him, suggests a long train of ideas; which must all, from the nature of the case, have passed through the mind in the space of a few seconds only.* "There seems every reason to conclude from these facts," he adds, "that we only dream during the instant of transition into and out of sleep. That instant is quite enough to account for the whole of what appears a night's dream. It is quite certain we remember no more than ought, according to these experiments, to fill an instant of time; and there can be no reason why we should only recollect this one portion, if we had dreamt much more. The fact that we never dream so much as when our rest is frequently broken, proves this almost to demonstration. An uneasy and restless night passed in bed is always a night studded full with dreams. If it be said we always or generally dream when asleep, but only recollect a

---

spots and streaks will be seen, *corresponding with the most prominent objects just before observed in the dream.* It is scarcely possible to avoid concluding, that dreams are owing to an excitement of the nerves of sensation, though of a very faint kind, during imperfect sleep—and that in *all* mental operations in which objects of sense are recollected, there is an action of the nerves, similar to that by which a knowledge of these objects was originally transmitted to the mind. See Chapter V.

* Discourse on Natural Theology. Part i. Sect. v. But does it not still remain to be established, whether in fact it is not the dream suggested by the sound or sensation, not the sound or sensation itself, which, after the interval perhaps of several minutes, awakes the sleeper?

Digitized by Google

portion of our dream, then the question arises, why we recollect a dream each time we fall asleep, or are awakened, and no more? If we can recall twenty dreams in a night of interrupted sleep, how is it that we can only recall one or two when our sleep is continued? The length of time occupied by the dream we recollect is the only reason that can be given for our forgetting the rest; but this reason fails, if, each time we are roused, we remember separate dreams."

If, then, we are absolutely without thoughts, during life, except when the communication between the mind and the body is, more or less perfectly, kept up, may we not conclude that death, which interrupts that communication much more completely, destroys the power of thought? It may be said that this conclusion is opposed by the fact, that the velocity of thought is greater in dreams, when the body is only partially awake. But this velocity has certainly been much overestimated; and notwithstanding the facts above alluded to,—of persons being awakened by the very same sensation, commencing very shortly before they were fully awakened, that suggested a dream, it is *highly* probable that thought is on these occasions not more rapid than when the mind is in a state of excitement during our waking hours. This it is thought the following observations will render very evident.

Any one who will consider the nature of the impression produced upon his mind, by merely

Digitized by Google

reading or hearing, in any real or fictitious narrative, of a *lapse of time*, or even by barely imagining such a lapse, must be aware that the mind is capable of transferring itself from one period to another, and getting a general notion that a long interval has had place between them, without there actually passing through the mind *the thousandth part of the number of ideas* which would successively occupy it if that space of time were actually lived over. It is very true that we measure time, as it passes, by the continuous flow of ideas through the mind, and that if the rapidity of thought be really capable of an indefinite increase, it is perfectly possible that a single hour might be, to the individual, practically equivalent to all the remaining hours of his life put together: but in recollecting or imagining a lapse of time, we do not revive in our minds the whole current of ideas, but think only of a few of the more prominent; or even without any aid from them, think only of the general impression which the passage of the current has left, or would leave, on our minds. Any one who is fully awake can, in a few moments, without any extraordinary exertion of thought, imagine himself, or any other person, to be in a considerable number of different positions in the world in succession. Any one familiar with the original description of them, could probably think over Shakespear's Seven Ages of Man in less than as many seconds. Now if these occurred to him in a dream, he would,—it is almost invariably the

Digitized by Google

case—imagine that he himself was the subject that acted or suffered, and passing naturally—for all things, however strange, in dreams seem perfectly natural—from one age to another, would, if he were to awake immediately on concluding the series, imagine he had *just lived a life completely through.*

In fact, a mental process extremely similar to that which has been just supposed, is commonly performed by every man, and every day and almost hour of his life. Let any one be asked, whether he is certain that he did, on a certain day long past, himself witness certain transactions; or whether he did not hear, from a third person, a relation of that which he supposes he recollects; he will perhaps answer without an instant's hesitation, that he was himself present when the transaction took place. Now whence comes this confidence? It can only be accounted for by supposing that the person interrogated retraces in his mind a continuous chain of circumstances, commencing with matters of actual and present consciousness and terminating in the transaction which he remembers. He in an instant of time perceives the reality of the past event, by connecting it in his mind with present realities. Similarly, if one were required to believe that there did actually exist, no matter where, a race of creatures whose heads grew beneath their shoulders. In what would the (supposed) reality consist? Plainly in a supposed connexion between the place of their

Digitized by Google

existence and the scene *actually present* to the mind that was imagining these monsters, and of which scene the reality was made known to him *by immediate consciousness.*

In all such cases as these, the mind rapidly, and probably in less than a second of time, runs over a long chain of ideas, connecting the present with the past or the remote, or both: omitting every time that the chain is gone over a greater and greater number of intermediate ideas, yet never losing the general impression of reality, which the evident possibility of connecting all the ideas link by link, produces in the mind.

The thoughts of the man recur to some incident of his boyhood, they pass on to one which took place in youth, they terminate in a contemplation of his actual position. This may be the work of a moment. Yet, though no intermediate incidents are recollected, the idea of the lapse of two considerable intervals is distinct and vivid. If the same succession of ideas, the same impression of reality, the same general notion of lapses of time can take place in a dream—and why should they not?—it would seem that the phenomena of dreams prove no such velocity of thought, as to encourage the belief that the mind is most active when it is least in connection with the body. Besides it is far from being entirely disconnected during sleep. Cut off it certainly is from the external world; but its connection *with the brain* may be, and probably is, as

Digitized by Google

intimate as ever; nor do we know that that organ partakes very extensively* in the lethargy of the nervous system.

But we pass on now to the consideration of another class of facts, which furnish ground for a still stronger argument: and which show that the mind sympathises with the body in cases, which if not in ordinary language the same, are very nearly identical with death. In the case of what is commonly called a fainting fit, the powers of the body are partially suspended by a stupor which sometimes,—as in consequence, for example, of a great loss of blood from a wound,—terminates in death: and the powers of the mind, as far as this can be decided from the total want of recollection at least, on the part of the sufferer, of any ideas during the state of corporeal stupor, are totally suspended. It is true that this is not always the case: but these exceptions are never found, except where the functions of the brain are unimpeded. In very many instances of mortal injury, whether produced by accident or disease, the vital powers may be seen gradually to sink, and attacks of total insensibility, mental and bodily, succeed one another more and more frequently, until at length the pulse ceases to beat,

* It certainly does in some degree. When the mind is active, the blood flows through the brain in a full current. If one be suddenly waked from deep sleep, an instantaneous rush of blood to the brain may generally be observed.

Digitized by Google

and the breath to ebb and flow. Is this cessation a symptom of increased energy of the mental functions, which just before were torpid, dormant, paralysed? The notion is really preposterous. Religious persons have indeed some reason to indulge a belief, that at this critical moment the liberated spirit of one whom they loved or revered wings its flight to heaven, and "wantons in endless being:" for there are many passages of Scripture which countenance such a belief; and to those who hang in sorrow over the couch of the departed it affords a consolation, to which nothing can be added but the hope that, after a few short years, they may rejoin those whom they have lost. And the same consolatory belief may be traced, here and there, in all ages and nations, but the most barbarous, among the priests and the common people, the poets and the philosophers; and for this belief there have been many different motives, some of which will be hereafter considered.* But from such of the phenomena of death as have just

* In Book II. It should be kept in mind, that a real and practical difference exists, between a lively and a lifeless faith, equally in false religion and in the true. It is not enough that a people should possess certain traditionary or speculative doctrines concerning the departed; nothing short of a lively and operative faith in these doctrines (a thing surely not more common in heathen than in Christian lands) can raise men to the enviable condition of those who—to recognise the important historical testimony of St. Paul—"sorrow not, even as the rest, who have *no* hope."

Digitized by Google

been alluded to, if *these alone* be considered, no other conjecture can be formed, but that opposite and more gloomy one, which also is most consonant with the dark forebodings natural to man, when oppressed by the sense of recent calamity, that DEATH IS A DREAMLESS SLEEP, a state in which ANIMATION IS WHOLLY SUSPENDED? The universal voice of mankind, (confirmed moreover, though this is to anticipate, by the declarations of Scripture) in according to the brutes no future state, has sanctioned this conclusion. For in the death of the lower animals we witness exactly the same decay of intelligence as in the death of man;—the phenomena differ in no respect whatever. The universal persuasion, therefore, of the mortality of all the inferior animals, shows that *considerations of another kind* have induced men to make a distinction in favour of their own species. It is thus with much probability made to appear that merely physical considerations are incapable of furnishing any hope of the survival of life and consciousness; which seem to be *so closely inherent in*, though forming no part of, the bodily frame, as to cease from all activity, when that frame can no longer sympathise and cooperate with them.

Men have expected an immortality which they have denied to the brutes; but *not* because "mind has an inherent essential indestructibility," or because "consciousness is one and indivisible." There is scarcely any people to

Digitized by Google

be found on earth in whose creed are not evident indications of an original correspondence with that favoured race, to whom were committed the oracles of God: scarcely any people whom tradition has not taught, or rather admonished, to expect an existence beyond the grave. And some have been threatened by Conscience with a retribution in another world; or Hope has pictured to them a relief from the pressure of distress; or Affection has tempted them to follow the departed into the gloom of Hades, attributing to them there an existence at least as substantial as that of their imagined dwelling-place; or the manifold motives which conduce to polytheism have peopled the universe at first with beings of human attributes merely; then also with spirits of earthly origin.* But still the minds of men continually recur to the belief, that when man returns to his earth, all his thoughts will perish; that there is no knowledge or understanding in the grave to which he hastens. And it can never be shown that this conclusion is adverse to Scripture, which assures men of a *resurrection of the body*, when life and consciousness are restored, at the time of the final award. "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and

---

* "Omnia de Superis aut Inferis, de Olympo aut Hade, de deorum aut mortuorum sedibus, confusa, incerta et incongrua sint. . . . . Poeta, *quæ accepisset*, tradidit, aucta fortasse et ornata, et audientes, *quæ prorsus nescirent*, ingenitâ animi affectione credere quam arguere maluerunt."—Knight's Prolegomena to Homer.

Digitized by Google

drieth up; so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not *awake*, nor be raised out of their *sleep*." "We shall not all *sleep*, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."

CHAPTER II.

THE DEPENDENCE OF THE MIND UPON THE BRAIN.

THERE are many persons, who, notwithstanding the authority of numerous passages of Scripture, such as those quoted in the last chapter, are averse to the supposition of a total sleep after death. The import of the biblical texts which seem to promise a state of consciousness will be considered in the third part of this work: our only concern at present is with the *physical* reasons which may be advanced in support of such a view. "It is true," it may be said, "that we are cut off from the *external* world by the loss of the organs of sense, but the faculties of memory, hope, imagination, reason, may continue as active as before. Our senses tie us down to things immediately around us; but these faculties are able to transport us in a moment into the regions of the future and the

Digitized by Google

unseen, and endow us even with a kind of creative power; they burst the bounds of time and space, by which all corporeal, all terrestrial things are limited, as if in anticipation of a season of still greater energy, when they shall be hampered no more by this cumbrous clog of clay."

The dignity of the faculties for which this extensive freedom is claimed may, very naturally, prevent suspicion in the minds of uninformed persons, that they, as well as the bodily senses, require a material mechanism for the performance of their functions. But nevertheless, the number of facts accumulated by modern researches on this subject is so great, and the conclusion drawn from them so decisive, that it may now be unhesitatingly declared, even of the most exalted flights of the human mind, that *a brain* is as indispensable to them, as nerves are to enable the fingers to feel. "In animals, where little mental power exists, there is a proportionate absence of cerebral organization; and in man, where such mental powers are found in the highest degree, the cerebral organization is the most elaborate. Again, when in man the whole brain has become torpid from disease, an alteration takes place, and he is *reduced in point of intellect to a level with the lowest animals;* he is capable of taking his food, but all other voluntary action is lost, in proportion as the disease prevails. Now what is the case when the brain is excited to an unusual state of activity? We find a corresponding alteration, that is, an in-

Digitized by Google

creased activity, in the mental manifestations. In the ordinary use of fermented liquors, until, from their being taken to excess, torpor is superinduced by a *quasi* apoplexy, the operation of the mind, the sentiments, and the passions, are quickened in the same ratio in which the stimulus increases the action of the brain." . . . . "The intellectual powers and feelings are *never* completely restored, if the inflammatory action has remained unsubdued until the organization of the brain and its membranes has become permanently injured." . . . . "It is quite clear that every other part of the body may be diseased or even totally destroyed; and still, if the brain continue to be healthy, the mental manifestations will remain unaffected. May we not then from these instances fairly conclude that there is a necessary connexion between the mental manifestations and the state of the brain, and that, at all events, in these extremes, cases of *complete torpor*, and excited action, the injurious alteration which results, is to be traced to the state of the brain?" "We know that the assistance of the brain is necessary to our intellectual manifestations, to our sentiments, and to our passions." *

---

* Ellis on Insanity, page 18, &c. According to Dr. John Abercrombie, however, there are circumstances in which the brain has been extensively diseased, "without the phenomena of mind being impaired in any sensible degree." This holds true both in regard to the destruction of each individual part of the brain, and likewise to the extent to which the cerebral mass may be diseased or destroyed. "A man mentioned by Dr. Ter-

Digitized by Google

And further, if the superior powers of the mind were independent of the bodily organization, those material causes which, as we know, destroy sensation, and the power of voluntary motion, would not affect *them;* and reason, and imagination, and whatever faculties are more excellent than the rest, would remain in full vigour, while the body was in a state of stupor, or in convulsions.

In confirmation of this view that the brain is the organ of the mind, without which the latter is as incapable of internal action, as it is of perceiving external things without the bodily senses, it may be fearlessly alleged, that each *part* of the brain is the organ of a *separate* faculty of the mind; and that no faculty exists which has not its appropriate organ. These faculties have been distinguished; and the brain marked out with such precision, as to enable any one who pleases, with practice and patient attention, to bring the

---

riar, who died of an affection of the brain, retained all his faculties entire till the very moment of death, which was sudden; on examining his head, the whole right hemisphere, that is, one-half of his brain, was found destroyed by suppuration." Several other instances, which it is not worth while here to give in detail, are mentioned by Dr. Abercrombie. In most of these cases, it should be observed, the disease has attacked only *one side of the head;* and as the organs on each side correspond exactly one to the other, each organ being in fact *double*, there is no reason why disease should impair the activity of mind in a greater, if in so great a degree, as the loss of one eye or ear impairs the faculty of seeing or hearing.

Digitized by Google

truth of the phrenological theory to an experimental test. "The organs of the mind can be seen and felt, and their size estimated—and the mental manifestations also that accompany them can be observed, in an unlimited number of instances."* The truth of the general theory, which is all that need here be insisted on, is confirmed not merely by scattered and miscellaneous instances, but in well ascertained and striking *classes* of instances. The mental characteristics of the principal races and nations of mankind, and of the sexes, and of infancy, youth, manhood, and old age, are well known, and the agreement between the development or deficiency of particular faculties and of particular parts of the brain is found to subsist, upon so extensive a scale, as to preclude the possibility of doubt as to the general fact, that the brain is the organ of the mind. *No* faculties, not even those which impel us to discover and adore a Supreme Being, or recognise the force of moral obligations, can in this world dispense with the aid of a *material* mechanism.† Immeasurably exalted as we are, by the possession of these powers, above the brutes, we yet do not appear to have made any

* The Constitution of Man considered in relation to External Objects. By George Coombe.

† I think it is now too late to deny all foundation to the phrenological system. But as it is a system based upon induction, and of such a nature that very material errors of observation may be committed, without in the least invalidating the general principles, it may be unsafe to assert positively, of any particular

Digitized by Google

approach, *physically* speaking, to an exemption from the general law of mortality.

If it is reasonable to conclude, that after death we shall no longer feel, or hear, or see, because those material organs are destroyed, or impeded in some essential function, by which we felt and heard and saw, it is also reasonable to conclude that *we shall cease to think, when the organs of thought are rendered incapable of action.*

It is very possible that the real nature and force of this conclusion may be misapprehended. It does not go so far as to assert, that nothing beyond mere particles of matter survives the dissolution of the body. For though we be incapable of thought or feeling, an immaterial principle which once animated the body, and by which, or rather with which, we thought and felt, *may* still continue to exist. But it does assert, that, at death, a suspension, a total suspension of *every* faculty of the mind ensues.

Such a suspension of the mental energies sometimes takes place without the *dissolution* of the body; in consequence of some severe bodily injury or other impediment to the corporeal functions; and ceases when the impediment is removed. "A man was pressed on board one of

---

organ, that its precise position and functions are ascertained. But those of the organs of Veneration and Conscientiousness are not considered by phrenologists as comparatively ill ascertained. If the suggestion of Dr. Mayo, in his "Pathology of the Human Mind," pp. 55, 56, should prove true, phrenology will gain both in simplicity of principles and practical certainty.

Digitized by Google

his majesty's ships, early in the late revolutionary war. While on board this vessel, in the Mediterranean, he received a fall from the yard-arm, and when he was picked up, was found to be insensible." So he continued for a long space of time, utterly incapable of motion, except of the lips and tongue when he wanted food. Above thirteen months afterwards he was trepanned, and gradually, in the space of four or five days, recovered his senses. "For a period of thirteen months and some days," says Sir A. Cooper, "his mind had remained in a state of perfect oblivion; he had drunk, as it were, the cup of Lethe; he had suffered a COMPLETE DEATH as far as regarded his mental, and almost all his bodily powers; but by removing a small portion of bone with the saw, he was at once restored to all the functions of his mind, and almost all the powers of his body." It is to no purpose to inquire what becomes of the immaterial part during the interval of torpor: or attempt to decide whether it ceases to *be*, or merely ceases to *act*. All consciousness ceases—and arguing from analogy we suppose that the same thing happens when we die; and it matters but little whether any living *powers*, or thinking *principles* survive, if consciousness be gone. We may believe, if we will, that something survives the dissolution of the body, which is capable of being put into new relations with matter, of inhabiting and using a new or a renovated body; or of being made to think and feel, and perceive external objects, and

Digitized by Google

even act upon them, without any body whatever. But that it actually will be put into new relations with matter; or that it will be endued with powers, (which *now* it certainly does not possess,) of perceiving or acting on external things, or performing any process of thought, without bodily organs, we have *no* reason whatever to expect, unless upon moral or religious grounds.

The force of this conclusion will be more clearly seen, if the nature of the mutual dependency of mind and body be attentively considered. *Neither* of the two, so far as we can discover, is capable of acting by itself. *Matter*, as has been already observed, is, by itself, inert and insensate: and so also is mind, except when matter, in peculiar forms, and in states in a great measure incomprehensible to us, is cooperating with it. It would be incorrect to consider the expressions, "mind and matter," and "mind and *body*," as equivalent. The body may be insensate, but it certainly is not *inert*. All organized matter has a certain inherent activity. Upon the ink in the glass before the writer, a greenish mould will appear, after a short exposure to the air; possessing *in itself* a power of growth and motion, apparently as much its own, as independent of the Creator, as are the minds of the highest earthly creatures, who in Him live, and move, and have their being. Nor is the human body more inert in itself than is the human mind, or the mould upon the ink.

Digitized by Google

A stunning blow on the head, as has been before observed, will render the human mind as inert and insensate as the weapon that inflicted the injury. It would seem, then, that a thinking principle, or sentient principle, or living power *may* continue to exist, without the continuance of thought or sensation, or any kind of mental life, or consciousness. Of this fact most persons in health have a practical proof, every night of their lives. Language does not admit of a stronger expression, to indicate a total cessation of consciousness, than *dreamless sleep.* From such a sleep we wake, as often as it pleases the Creator, and our mental powers come back to us,—whence we know not. We suppose that they existed in some mode during the interval of sleep, though we had no consciousness. "Sleep, or however a swoon," argues Dr. Butler, in his Analogy of Religion, "shows us not only that these powers exist when they are not exercised, as the passive power of motion does in inanimate matter; but shows also that they exist, when there is *no present capacity of exercising them:* or that the capacities of exercising them for the present, as well as the actual exercise of them, may be suspended, and yet the powers themselves remain undestroyed." "There have been instances of madness and apoplexy, in which all the ordinary operations of the mind having been completely suspended for several years, the patients, on the recovery of their senses, have been found totally unconscious of the whole interval, and distinctly remembering

Digitized by Google

and speaking of, as having happened the day before, events which occurred before the injuries; so that they could hardly be brought to believe that whole years had since elapsed." *

A want of attention to this distinction between mental powers and actual consciousness, or at least, an under estimate of its importance, has led many writers into error, in arguing on physical grounds for the immortality of the soul. "Whatever other effects death may have," observes Dr. Brown, "it is at least evident that when it has taken place, the bodily organs moulder away, by the influence of a decomposition more or less rapid. What was once to our eyes a human being, is a human being no more; and where the organization is as if it had never been, every feeling and thought, if states of mere organs, must be also as if they had never been. The most interesting of all questions therefore, with respect to our hopes of immortality, is whether thought be a state of *the mere organs* which decay thus evidently before our eyes, or a state of something which our senses, that are confined to the mere organs, cannot reach; of something which, as it is beyond the reach of our senses, may therefore subsist as well, when every thing which comes under our senses, exists in any one state, as in any other state." † And in a pre-

* "A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State. By a Country Pastor." (The Archbishop of Dublin.)

† Dr. Brown on the Mind. Lecture xcvii.

Digitized by Google

ceding passage the same great metaphysician says, "the belief of the immateriality of the sentient and thinking principle destroys the only analogy on which the supposition of the limitation of its existence to the period of our mortal life could be founded."

But though thought be a state of something which our senses cannot reach, and which survives the dissolution of the body, of what value are our hopes of immortality, if the action of the sentient and thinking principle be suspended; if, though the mental powers remain undestroyed, there be no "capacity of exercising them?" A swoon can in a moment deprive us of this capacity; sleep appears to produce the same effect; and every analogy leads us to suppose that we shall suffer a deprivation no less total, when we sleep the sleep of death. For the purposes of the argument of Bishop Butler, in his chapter Of a Future Life, it was sufficient to show, that we have no reason to conclude, from the dissolution of the body, that the principle by which we think and feel is necessarily destroyed. By proving that it may, and probably does subsist, all prejudice, all *à priori* objections are removed, to the probability of that future life, a belief in which natural religion dictates, and which is positively declared by revelation. In carrying his argument *beyond* this point, Butler has relied too much on a supposed independency of the *higher* powers of the mind on the body. "Human creatures," he says, "exist at present in two states of

Digitized by Google

life and perception, greatly different from each other; each of which has its own peculiar laws, and its own peculiar enjoyments and sufferings. When any of our senses are affected, or appetites gratified with the objects of them, we may be said to exist, or live, in a state of sensation. When none of our senses are affected, or appetites gratified, and yet we perceive, and reason, and act, we may be said to exist, or live, in a state of reflection. Now it is *by no means certain*, that any thing which is dissolved by death is in any way necessary to the living being, in this its state of reflection, after ideas are gained. For though, from our present constitution and condition of being, our external organs of sense are necessary for conveying in ideas to our reflecting powers, as carriages and levers and scaffolds are in architecture; yet, when these ideas are brought in, we are capable of reflecting in the most intense degree, and of enjoying the greatest pleasure, and feeling the greatest pain, without any assistance from our senses; and without any at all, which we know of, from that body which will be dissolved by death." . . . "There appears so little connexion between our bodily powers of sensation, and our present powers of reflection, that there is no reason to conclude that death, which destroys the former, does so much as suspend the exercise of the latter, or interrupt our continuing to exist in the like state of reflection, which we do now." . . . "Our daily experiencing these powers to be exercised, without any assistance

Digitized by Google

that we know of, from those bodies which will be dissolved by death; and our finding often, that the exercise of them is so lively to the last;—these things afford a sensible apprehension, that death may not perhaps be so much as a discontinuance of the exercise of these powers, nor of the enjoyments and sufferings which it implies."

Many of the physical facts which prove the dependence of our powers of reflection upon "that body which will be dissolved by death" were unknown in the days of Bishop Butler. The indispensable necessity to our present powers of reflection of a BRAIN, developed to a definite extent, and of a sufficient degree of health and soundness, was not then recognised. The facts, however, that every kind, or nearly every kind, of bodily affection, or injury,—such as sleep, a swoon, or a stunning blow,—that destroys sensation, *does equally destroy reflection;* tending as these facts certainly do, to imply a close dependency, might have led him to a different conclusion. It has since been demonstrated, that any cause which, though it may not deprive a man of his animal powers, renders his brain torpid, destroys his powers of reflection as immediately and effectually, as a disease of the retina will sometimes destroy the power of sight. It is impossible not to conclude, therefore, that our bodies are just as necessary to us, when we "live in a state of *reflection*," as when we "live in a state of *sensation*." For the continuance of this latter state after death, Butler never argues:

Digitized by Google

although it is evident that sensation is not altogether a corporeal and material function, but that there must be some sentient principle besides, of the destruction of which, at death, he would be the first person to deny that there is any proof.

CHAPTER III.

THE BODY NO IMPEDIMENT TO THE MIND.

THERE is only one hypothesis by which the force of the conclusion drawn from the dependency of the mind on the body can be diminished. It is that, which supposes our mental powers to possess an independent energy of their own, much greater than they are in this world permitted to exercise; and, far from being aided and promoted in their action by the co-operation of the body, to be limited and impeded by it. Relying on this hypothesis, Dr. Brown considers the temporary or permanent loss of reflecting powers in consequence of a nervous affection to be a proof of *nothing more* than a susceptibility of the soul to be affected by the body to which the Creator has united it; and "to be no proof of the soul's mortality." Now the loss of reflecting powers, to which Dr. Brown here alludes, ("from the influence of disease, or of age, which

Digitized by Google

is indeed itself a species of disease,") may certainly prove something more than a mere susceptibility of the soul to suffer injury through the body; and yet be no proof of the mortality of the thinking principle. A healthy condition of the nerves may do more, and many facts have been advanced in the preceding pages with an endeavour to prove that it actually does more for the soul, than merely *permit* the unimpeded exercise of its powers. It enables the mind to act. Such is the condition of human life, which consists in the mutual action of mind and body. "L'homme est à lui même le plus prodigieux objet de la nature; car il ne peut concevoir ce que c'est que corps, et encore moins ce que c'est qu'esprit, et moins qu'aucune chose comment un corps peut être uni avec un esprit. C'est là le comble de ses difficultés, et cependant *c'est son propre être.* Modus quo corporibus adhæret spiritus comprehendi ab hominibus non potest; *et hoc tamen homo est.*" *

But on the supposition of Dr. Brown,—a supposition of which many writers on this subject have made use,—our bodies form no part of ourselves, nor are we in any way indebted to them for our enjoyment of mental energy. To this effect is his quotation from Cicero:—"Suppose a person to have been educated from infancy in a chamber, in which he could see objects only through a small chink in the window shutter,

* Pensées de Pascal. Article vi. sect. 26.

Digitized by Google

would he not be apt to consider this chink as essential to his vision, and would it not be difficult to persuade him that his prospect would be enlarged by the demolition of the walls of his temporary prison?" * On which he observes, "In such a case as that which Cicero has supposed, *if the analogy may be extended to the present objection*, it is evident at least, that if the aperture were closed for years, or if the light transmitted through it were merely altered in tint, by the interposition of some coloured transparent body, these changes would as little imply any blindness or defect of vision, as if the darkening or tinging of the light had occurred only for a few moments." It is evident, certainly, that whether the aperture be closed or left open, or the chamber demolished wholly or in part, the faculty of sight of the person within,—who is

* This was a favourite view of the great Roman philosopher. In the first book of his Tusculan Disputations he says "there is no faculty of sensation in the body; but certain *passages* as it were, are hollowed out, from the seat of the mind" [the brain] "to the eyes, the nose, and the ears." And a little further on, "Although nature has wrought those openings which lead to the mind from the body, in the most skilful and workmanlike manner, they are nevertheless blocked up in some degree by gross and earthy matter; but when there shall be nothing except mind" [i. e. after death] "no obstacle will prevent its perceiving the qualities and natures of things."

This is as if we should improve our vision by taking out our eyes: which he treats as mere impediments,—blocking up the openings. Cicero is not the only philosopher who has been led into absurdity by the attempt to detect in physical phenomena confirmations of moral truths or conjectures.

Digitized by Google

analogous to the thinking and sentient principle belonging, for a time at least, to the body,—would not be at all affected: but for the *exercise* of the faculty of sight he would be entirely dependent on the condition of the chamber. But there is no sort of resemblance between the breaking down the prison walls, and the dissolution of the body. If the aperture be supposed to correspond with the bodily eye, then the enlargement of the aperture to any extent, even to an entire demolition of the walls, would correspond with enlarged powers of vision, not effected by a *destruction*, but by an enlargement or multiplication of the corporeal organs of vision. And on the other hand, if the chamber resemble the body, within which the mind is confined, then the walls, the floor, and the roof correspond with the different parts of the body; but the aperture, which is nothing but a mere negative idea,—*the absence of wall*, cannot possibly correspond with any part of the body. In common speech, or rather in the language of many reflecting persons, the body is called a "house of clay," an "earthly tabernacle," and the mind is said to "dwell within it." But these expressions, natural, and just, and beautiful as they are, when employed by those who are convinced, on better authority than any physical speculation can afford, that the mind will inhabit another mansion hereafter, must be cautiously used, as the basis of a philosophical theory. They must not be permitted to lead us to the conclusion, that the body acts as a

Digitized by Google

screen, hindering us from perceiving external objects; or is an *obstacle* to our acting upon them, or a *clog* upon the intrinsic activity of our thoughts. Surely it would be unreasonable to conclude that our nerves *hinder* us from feeling external objects, and that sensation would be more acute without them. From this extravagance Butler happily escaped; he had discrimination enough to see that those mental powers, to which bodily organs were attached, were dependent on the organs. But, owing probably to his ignorance or inconsideration of the functions of the brain, he committed the same error in respect of the reflecting, as Cicero did in respect of the sentient faculties. The Roman philosopher, not perceiving that the eye was *an organ of sight*, supposed that vision would be more perfect after the dissolution of the body; and the error of the English philosopher arose from a similar cause. The same reasoning that led Butler to differ from Cicero, should have led him one step further—to a rejection of the notion that our reflecting powers are physically immortal.

The Creator has not given us any general power of perceiving things without, but has only given us a consciousness of certain changes which external objects produce in particular parts of our corporeal frame, when that frame is in good condition. Does the fact that we are so restricted now, or any other physical fact, warrant us in supposing, that we shall *not* be restricted hereafter? In like manner, the powers of the mind

Digitized by Google

differ in different individuals, and depend invariably upon the physical condition of the brain. Does this, or any other physical fact, justify the conclusion, that when the brain is rendered utterly inefficient, the powers of thought will be equal in all men,—or greater, in each instance, than they were before?

Besides, what are we to assign as the actual limits of our powers, after the dissolution of the body, if they then retain, and more than retain, their former energy? To what regions of the universe are our perceptions to extend, when the bodily screen, if a screen it be, is removed: and what are to be the confines of human knowledge when we are no longer clogged and encumbered by the brain?

Is the enforcement of the penalty of death, imposed for the original transgression, to render men as gods, knowing all good and evil? and to defeat the purpose of their expulsion from Paradise, by enabling them to lay hold on the fruit of the Tree of Life? This difficulty may fairly suggest a doubt, whether the dependency, or connection, of mind with body, is more than the *necessary limitation* to which created beings are subjected. He, who by the Word of His power,*

* It is worthy of observation, that in the account of creation in Genesis, God is represented rather as speaking than as acting: that the universe appears to be not so much the work of His hands, as of His word. "God *said*, let there be light, and

Digitized by Google

called the universe into existence, and has, through the same Word, sustained it ever since, has alone the privilege of direct, unlimited communication with, and operation upon, all material things. Every particle of matter in the universe obeys his laws, and each, separately, and at every instant, whether it be in motion or at rest, is affected by His will. The Creator has granted to us a partial power over our own bodies, apparently analogous to His own infinite power over the created universe. We are capable of moving our limbs; and whether the contraction of the muscles be the effect of a direct operation of the will, or whether the will affects the nerves, or the brain, and they, or both of them, influence the muscular fibres, by some cause over which we have no control,—whether the effect of our will be chemical, or mechanical, or of any other kind,—it is clear that the effect, the motion, *originates* in a direct action of mind upon certain particles of matter. We have not this power over *all* matter, nor can we, by any exertion of will, subject one particle of matter to its control.

And He by whom all material changes are perceived at once, and not by any communicating media or any series of effects, has likewise granted to us and to the inferior animals a partial power

---

there was light." "God *said*, let us make man in our own image." Here is disguised, under the garb of rude and simple language, and in the form of a traditionary tale, one of the profoundest mysteries of our faith.

Digitized by Google

apparently analogous to his own. We are immediately conscious of certain changes taking place in particular particles of our bodies. When we feel pain in an extremity of the body, it may be that the mind is as it were brought into contact with that extremity, and is immediately conscious of the effect on the nerves situated there: or, for aught that we can discover, an influence is transmitted to the brain, and thence to the mind. But however long the circuit, however numerous the series of effects, it is clear that the material part of the process of sensation must have a termination somewhere; that there are *some* material changes, some states of matter, of which the mind is directly conscious. Our knowledge of all immaterial existences (besides our own) is yet more closely limited: since we have not even a partial knowledge of them of the *direct* kind; all our information concerning them being gathered from their effects on material things.* Now if we suppose that these powers of sensation or motion are re-

* It would be out of place to make more than a passing notice of the exceptions to this statement, which Revelation has disclosed to us. The influence of the Holy Spirit, and of the Evil Spirit upon the minds of men, is of the direct kind; and the former influence undoubtedly, perhaps the latter also, occasionally becomes the subject of human consciousness. It has been well observed that the influence of spirit on spirit, or mind on mind, which to some persons seems so incredible a thing, is really less strange than the influence of *matter* on *mind*, with which all are familiar. It is impossible to conceive how any *points of contact*, so to speak, can be established between things so utterly dissimilar as are mind and matter.

Digitized by Google

tained after death, not in a passive, or latent state, but with an energy unlimited by the body, where is the line to be drawn between our share and that of other disembodied spirits, nay even between our share and that which the Almighty himself holds under his especial and absolute control? Upon what portions of matter, organized or unorganized, is our faculty of *producing motion* to be exerted? certainly on no part of this sublunary world; in which, as we know from constant experience, all motion obeys either the laws, that is, the will, of the Author of Nature, or the will of embodied creatures: this stage the dead have altogether quitted, and can play their part on it no more, whether for evil or for good. And where are we to find room for the exercise of the *sentient* principle? Not in this world; though the mere sensation of earthly things by incorporeal beings could occasion no inference with any thing that is transacted here:—it would be absurd to suppose a total disunion between this faculty, and that of producing motion—to assign one world to the spiritual hand, and another to the spiritual eye.

"Let then these faculties of sensation and voluntary motion," it may be replied, "since they are common to the lowest animals as well as man, and seem from the very necessity of the case to require a body through which to act, perish, or become inactive, when the body is destroyed. The reflecting faculties are not under

Digitized by Google

the same necessity: sensation must reside somewhere; motion also is restricted by the limits of space; but thought has *no relation to place*, and may therefore go on as well after death as before."

That such a distinction as is here supposed is inadmissible, flows as a necessary consequence from the facts which have been already mentioned, in proof of the dependence of the reflecting powers on the body. The union of these powers with the brain is not less intimate than that of the sentient powers with the nerves: both alike are subject to a corporeal limitation, and stand in relation to place. It would surely be the height of presumption in us, to question the propriety of this arrangement, and declare it to be unnecessary. We cannot suppose that Nature acts like an ignorant workman, who improperly applies a general direction of which he does not comprehend the spirit, so as to produce a superficial resemblance, in cases between which there is really no analogy. If the higher faculties have a brain belonging to them, it is for some better reason than because the lower faculties have nerves; and further, if the sentient principle ceases to act after death, its inactivity must be the result of an inherent inability to act. And the moving principle, if the faculty of producing motion may be so termed, must be under a similar disability. It would be absurd to think that they will be inactive—that they are inactive now, in the case of those who have already suffered death

Digitized by Google

—on account of any inconveniency that would arise from their acting. If the powers which now depend on nerves do not act after death, it must therefore be in consequence of *an inherent inability to act, in a disembodied state.* And we are not entitled to exempt the reflecting powers from the same disqualification that affects the others; and to conclude, because no inconveniences would arise from their activity, and it would be *easy to suppose* them active, that therefore they are active.

In a word, since in this world the reflecting powers of the mind *do not* act without the aid of a material organization, although they do not appear to be necessarily related to place as the sentient and moving powers are, we must infer,—if we have a due estimate of the wisdom of all natural arrangements,—and are convinced that nothing, not even one slender fibre of a brain, is vainly made,—that all the mental powers alike, the highest as well as the lowest, *cannot* act without such aid from the corporeal frame. In forming this conclusion, we by no means deny or call in question the power of the omnipotent God, to cause the soul of man to exist in a separate state, if such should be His will. The conclusion amounts merely to a denial of any capability of the mental powers, *as at present constituted,* for independent activity: and in no wise contradicts the supposition that they may be rendered active after death, by some change in their nature then to be effected. Physical discoveries having shown that all the mental powers,

Digitized by Google

(whether peculiar to man, or common to the lowest animals,) are in an equally intimate union with matter; and that even the highest faculties do not dispense with a brain, but act *by means of* a brain, we conclude that all will meet the same fate, on the dissolution of the body; though there does not appear to be the same *à priori* necessity or expediency for the action of the higher faculties by material organs, as of the lower.

But we are not destitute of reasons for the conjecture, that the union of the higher, as well as the lower, powers of the mind, with matter, is an arrangement if not absolutely necessary, yet highly expedient, and peculiarly adapted for man, (if indeed we sufficiently understand what are the essential conditions of human existence;) and from which a departure cannot be rendered probable, by any argument based merely on physical researches. "The blending of mind and matter in the bodily structure of the sentient and rational orders, we may be assured, is a method of procedure, which if it be not absolutely indispensable to the final purposes of the creation, subserves the most important ends, and carries with it consequences such as will make it the general, if not the universal law, of all finite natures, in all worlds. A little attention to what is involved in the idea of corporeal existence will incline us to believe that it is the basis of intellectual activity, of moral agency, and of communion or sociality among intelligent orders."

Digitized by Google

. . . . " Body is the tangential point of the two worlds of mind and matter; or it is the amalgam of two substances wherein the properties of both are so blended as to constitute a mean, essentially unlike what could have resulted from any possible construction of the one, by itself. The body is to the mind the means of a mode of existence, and the organ of an exertion of powers, which in its incorporeal state it could never have known and exercised. If, metaphorically speaking, matter is refined and ennobled by its union with mind, it is mind that is really advantaged thereby, for it is absolutely indifferent to matter, whether it be left in a grosser state, or be wrought into a more elaborate form. On the contrary, by compounding itself with matter, mind takes possession of a world foreign to itself, and in a sense, doubles its powers of action, and its sphere of existence." " It is as embodied that mind comes under the potent and sovereign discipline of organic pleasures and pains, and how large a portion of its history hinges upon this susceptibility! Probably the whole of that peremptory and efficacious impulse which is necessary for putting the intellectual and moral faculties in activity springs from this exposure of mind to the stimulating properties of matter;—that is to say, from its corporeal constitution." *

The view, which is here so clearly set forth, of the importance if not the necessity of matter

* Physical Theory of Another Life, pages 21, 19, 20.

Digitized by Google

to the functions of mind, is perhaps the soundest of all that could possibly be formed on physical principles exclusively. And it is therefore fair to adopt it in this part of the present work, as an argument for the physical improbability of the activity of the mind, after the dissolution of the body. But it may be well to observe,—although this is to anticipate part of a subsequent inquiry,—that it is apparently contrary to the conclusion which should be drawn from various passages of Scripture, and particularly from that which the ingenious author of the Physical Theory has selected, out of a great multitude which bear upon the subject, as the basis of his reasonings—St. Paul's declaration that there is A SPIRITUAL BODY: an expression certainly very obscure, but from which it may be fairly conjectured, that *without* the aid of matter—which would seem to be rather a condition of the "*natural* body"—mind may be subjected to limitations;—which it is highly probable will be in a great degree analogous to those which matter now imposes on it.

It would be unjust to adopt these passages without observing that their eloquent author,—who, consistently with the Scriptural view which he takes of his subject, throughout his work regards the Creator as a moral governor,—when considering this branch of the inquiry in detail, represents the future union of mind with matter as probable, both from the apparent *expediency* of such a union,—as for instance, in blending and harmonizing by means of bodily emotions, the

Digitized by Google

otherwise conflicting faculties, or in regulating the social intercourse and communion of different minds;—and also from its necessity as a *restraint* upon the otherwise too great intensity of action of the spiritual part.

Thus, of our mental power of producing motion he says, "The mind impels matter with the celerity of lightning, and with a force that is bounded, as it seems, only by the adhesive strength of the engine it employs; that is to say, by the solidity of the bones, the tenacity of the ligatures and tendons, and the degree in which the irritability of the fleshy substance may be wrought upon."

The mind has then, according to this view, a sort of general and inherent tendency to put matter into activity, limited only (and it is difficult to see how, if it exist, it can be subjected even to this limitation) by what may be called the *passive* force, that is, the adhesive power, of the matter on which it operates. But it appears that the whole animal creation, including even creatures whose outward appearance would at first sight lead us to class them among inanimate things, and which can hardly be conceived to have any mind at all, partake in their several degrees of a *similar* moving power. Does not this obvious fact suggest a suspicion that the force by which matter is moved is *a mere brute force*, subject indeed, to a certain extent, to the control of the will, but resident rather in *matter* than in mind; and either directly arising from, or constituting an essential part of, that mysterious

Digitized by Google

principle of ANIMAL LIFE, which belongs to, and perishes with, the body?

In observing a man of finely proportioned frame and vigorous health, performing some bodily exercise with grace and dexterity, we may easily forget the immediate source from which the movements proceed. Every muscle is under the control of the will, every fibre of the frame seems to be instinct with mind. But a slight yet irritating wound disorders his nervous system; and, in a few hours' space, the same man is stretched helplessly on the ground, in violent convulsions, and conscious of nothing but severe bodily pain. By what *mental* force * are these fearful contortions produced? Surely the body of this man is something more than a mere aggregate of passive particles, and is "impelled with the celerity of lightning" by some other agent than his rational and immortal soul! †

And further, can we trace in any inherent tendency of the human mind to put matter in

---

* The expression "mental force" is used in reference to the *human* mind, and as opposed to material, mechanical, or animal force. Strictly speaking, and with reference to the *Supreme* Mind, every material force is mental, as being the direct result of His perpetually sustaining Will.

† There is some reason to believe that physiologists are now on the brink of the great discovery, that all muscular movements are caused by a galvanic action transmitted from the brain—the seat, or rather object, of will—to the nerves. Should this prove to be the case, the impulse will be *literally* communicated "with the celerity of lightning."

Digitized by Google

motion, the cause of those corporeal movements which are continued, from the earliest to the latest hour of our lives, not only without any effort of our will, but even without our consciousness? The beating of the heart and the heaving of the chest go on as well when we sleep as when we wake; and with these functions the mind never interferes except to disturb their natural regularity, generally *against* our will.* It is evident then that there reside in our bodies *some* forces at least, which are not derived from our minds; and when we further observe that even those parts of our bodies which are in general subject to the control of the will, are sometimes withdrawn from that control,—by convulsions, or cramp, or paralysis, or by mere fatigue,—and subjected on some occasions to a moving influence far more powerful than any which the will can exert, it appears not unreasonable to conclude, that the whole of the moving *force* we possess is of a material, or rather animal kind.

Not that we ought to infer from these facts, that the mind possesses *no* moving power. The Creator has put certain parts of our frame, and some of the forces residing within that frame, *under our control to a certain extent*, and has

* In spring time the sap circulates through the young shoots of the vine-plant with a rapidity greater than that of the blood in the veins of a hybernating animal. Is there any reason to suppose that the current is impelled by mind in one case, and not in the other?—*Gilbert White's Natural History of Selborne.*

Digitized by Google

permitted us by an exertion of the will, producing some corporeal change, the nature of which we cannot comprehend, ultimately, by means of a series of corporeal influences, to cause certain muscles to contract, and thus effect the desired movements of the limbs. These movements are not effected by a direct operation of mind, but by means, as has been said, of a series of corporeal influences, so that the ultimate effect, the motion, may be varied or prevented, or even altogether produced by, the interposition of some organic cause.* As one in authority says to his servant "come," and he cometh, to another "go" and he goeth, to a third "do this" and he doeth it, and the tasks they perform are often far beyond the strength or skill of him who orders them, so under the direction of the will, the body puts forth a strength which is properly its own: nor can any indication be discovered of a mechanical force, properly belonging to the mind.

It was before observed that "the Creator has granted to us a partial [motive] power over our own bodies apparently analogous to his own infinite power over the created universe." But this must not be admitted without some qualification.

---

* If the influence of mind were immediate, nothing (but some imperfection of structure) could prevent the absolute obedience of the limbs to the mind, and they would in every case perform precisely the movement it prescribed; so that what is commonly called awkwardness, or want of dexterity, could not then exist, and practice could not confer any additional expertness.

Digitized by Google

Both philosophy and revelation declare that "in Him, the Creator, we live and *move* and have our being. All our strength is, in the most literal sense of the words, and in the most direct manner, derived from Him. Our partial power, then, is analogous to His in its effect, motion, and in its cause, will; but differs from His, not only in being finite, (which would in nowise affect the justness of the analogy) but also in being mediate, in operating by a chain of causes and effects ordained and supported and made to succeed one another by His will. The bodily strength by which we accomplish motion is as independent of our finite mind, and proceeds as immediately from the Author of nature, as does the force which binds together the particles of which our bodies are composed, or that incessant energy which compels the planets to fulfil their "forewritten circles."

Next in order of rank above the faculty of producing motion is the faculty of sensation. It is worth while to consider whether this faculty also is of so corporeal a nature, as to lead us to suppose, that no actual susceptibility of feeling survives the dissolution of the body. To such a conclusion we are led, by perceiving that sensation is local, and resides in the body, though operating upon the mind. It is by means of a material medium that our minds receive those ideas which we ascribe to sensation; and we can discover no trace of a capacity of feeling, apart

Digitized by Google

from our bodily organization. The phenomena of somnambulism, little understood as they are at the present day, render it probable that a much larger part of the process of sensation is independent of consciousness and volition than we should at first suspect. Almost all the movements of our bodies, when we are awake, are suggested and regulated by our sensations. A man is able to stand upright, or to walk, when in the dark, or when his eyes are closed, by sensations, which, indicating an increase or diminution of pressure on one or the other side of his feet, and of his body generally, warn him in time, of any departure from the necessary positions.

And it would appear at first sight that the assistance of the mind is necessary to this process: that it must be *conscious* of certain sensations, and exert *volition* accordingly. But we find that in fact NEITHER are required. Impressions are transmitted from the nerves to the brain of a somnambulist, and motion, such motion as the sleeper is most accustomed to, and would voluntarily adopt, if awake—is thence transmitted to the limbs. And it is hardly possible to conceive, that any series of impulses, transmitted along the so-called nerves of *voluntary* motion, should be so exact and uniform, as to produce the correct movements often witnessed in somnambulists, without the aid of impressions communicated by the "nerves of sensation." The impossibility of walking perfectly straight forwards with the eyes closed, even with volition, and the

Digitized by Google

senses of touch and of muscular exertion fully awake and active, seems to be a proof of this. But against this must be set the fact, if indeed it be really well authenticated, that somnambulists walk with *fixed*, though open, eyes; and sometimes, though not so frequently with the eyes closed. But whether the material process be simple, or as complicated as these facts would seem to show, it is evident that there is *some* material process necessary to sensation, and regulated by laws with which mere mind has nothing to do; and we are not justified in concluding, from *any* observed phenomena, that the mind, as at present constituted, can under any circumstances dispense, as far as sensation is concerned, with material aid.

It may also be fairly urged, that the sensations of the brutes are similar to our own; that they have the same sort of corporeal apparatus for feeling, and a mental consciousness as perfect as ours. Yet no one ever supposed that the brutes must be immortal, *because they can feel.* Dr. Butler has stigmatised this mode of argument, which has been frequently used in these pages and in recent works, as invidious and weak: but it is an appeal to the common sense of mankind; and affords a presumption, that all solid proof of man's immortality rests not on physical phenomena;—but is derived either from divine authority, or from moral considerations.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

UTILITY OF THE BODY IN MENTAL PROCESSES.

THIS line of argument might if it were necessary be carried much further. It might be shown that every operation of the memory, and every other mental process, and they are exceedingly numerous, which depends upon "the association of ideas"—which is in fact only a peculiar form or forms of the faculty of memory—requires the aid of *the very same* material organs of sensation and volition as enable a man, nay even an insect, to perceive and avoid a blow.

In performing a process of moral judgment, we do indeed exert, with the aid of certain organs situated in the brain, a faculty immeasurably transcending, in the dignity of its functions, any possessed by the inferior creatures; but the actions or emotions or motives which we contemplate, and which are the subjects upon which that moral judgment is exercised are more or less *abstract* ideas or notions, ultimately derived, by changes and processes which it would require volumes even imperfectly to explain, from *objects of sense.* Now there are many physical facts which appear to render it certain, that the same material aids are requisite for the recollection, as for the first perception, of objects of sense.

Digitized by Google

For if the impressions produced on the mind by those objects of sense which are present be extremely feeble in comparison with the vivid recollections of the past, the latter will sometimes become visible not only to the "mind's eye," but to the eye of the body. If the mind be altogether withdrawn, by sleep, from the immediate influence of sensible things, past recollections, confusedly mingled together, often impress the mind with the force of realities. Now it is most worthy of remark, that they thus impress the mind, rather by their close resemblance to the images which have been the subjects of consciousness when we are awake, than by their equalling these latter images in intensity. For in fact the images that are seen by the sleeping eye are extremely faint and feeble. No sooner do we wake, than the visions are effaced; unless they have produced some strong bodily emotions, which like the waves of the ocean, cannot at once subside into a calm, after they have been strongly excited. Since, then, things recollected, and things perceived, differ rather in degree than in kind; it would be manifestly inconsistent with the general economy of nature, that *two distinct* sets of corporeal apparatus should be provided, as means of rendering them subjects of mental consciousness.

That *some* corporeal apparatus is in every case necessary, has already been sufficiently proved. It is highly probable, also, from analogy, that the organs of volition perform a similar part in

Digitized by Google

aiding the formation of abstract ideas, to that which is subserved by the organs of sensation: that in forming even the general conception of any action as of a thing which we might ourselves perform, if we would, the mind is aided by a material mechanism, and especially by the nerves of volition.

That these are in some instances very *strongly* excited, by the mere thought of performing an action, is shown, in a general and striking manner, by the common habit of gesticulation while speaking, and by the strong propensity of the speaker to enact himself the parts of the actors he describes; and this not merely for the sake of conveying clearer ideas to his auditors, but to gratify a natural impulse. An extremely curious fact is recorded, by a popular and most philosophical writer,* which seems to confirm this view: and which does not stand quite alone. A somnambulist, who possessed the extraordinary habit of repeating, during sleep, every conversation, and even every word which she had spoken during the course of the previous day, would often rise from her bed at night, and employ herself in her ordinary occupations. "Her occupations," it is stated, "were observed to have a relation to her engagements during the day, being either a *repetition* of some

* By Dr. John Abercrombie, on the Intellectual Powers. Page 302. 4th edit.

Digitized by Google

thing she had done, or the accomplishment of what *she had* INTENDED *to do, but had been prevented from performing*." In this remarkable instance it appears that an impression made on the nerves of volition by the mere intention to act, occasioned the accomplishment of the action intended, many hours after the impression was made, and without any attendant consciousness. There appears to be some analogy between this remarkable case, and others of a more evidently material, or rather animal, nature. It is well known that fever, sometimes of a very malignant character, will attack persons who have recently removed from an unhealthy to a salubrious climate: a pernicious impression having been made upon the constitution, which was in some way incapable of producing its full effect until the bodily vigour was increased.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE ARGUMENT FROM THE INDIVISIBILITY OF MIND.

AN endeavour has frequently been made, to vindicate the natural immortality of man, on the ground of the simplicity, and indivisibility, of the thinking principle. "*All* presumption of death's being the destruction of living beings,"

Digitized by Google

says Dr. Butler, " must go upon the supposition that they are compounded, and so discerptible. But since consciousness is a single and indivisible power, it should seem that the subject in which it resides should be so too." And in this he has been followed by one of the chief mental philosophers of Scotland, who observes that " if matter be not all, or rather if matter have nothing in common with thought, the decay of matter cannot be considered as indicative of *the decay of mind*, unless some other reason can be shown for the mental dissolution, than the mere external decay:" and that on the proof of the " indivisibility of the sentient principle" " the chief force of this argument" for the soul's immortality " seems to depend." The same opinion had been long before entertained by philosophers. Cicero says that the mind is " simple, that it cannot be divided; and therefore cannot perish." *

In thus contending for the soul's immortality from its oneness of nature, and consequent insusceptibility of decay and dissolution, both the ancient and the modern writers have overlooked, with a singular precipitancy, the fact, which every materialist as well as immaterialist must admit, that death and the dissolution of the body are not equivalent terms. Every one in the least acquainted with human physiology is aware, that the matter of which our bodies is composed, is

---

* Quæstiones Tusculanæ. Lib. I.

Digitized by Google

preserved in its actual state by a certain mysterious principle of *animal life*, one of the *effects* of which, in suspending or reversing the ordinary chemical laws of matter, is perfectly well known, though the *nature* of the principle is utterly incomprehensible. When this animal life has ceased, the chemical actions commence, and decay ensues. Death, and dissolution stand in the relation of cause and effect.* Every part of a living organized body, even of *a plant* no less than of an animal, is pervaded by a certain *corporeal vitality:* and in every case the decay of the body is the effect of the loss of this vitality. Whatever effect the death of the body produces on the incorporeal part, or more properly speaking, on the sentient principle,† whether it be an enlargement, or a suspension, of its activity,

* It is scarcely worth while to remark, that in cases of death from *mortification*, a partial dissolution may be said to be the cause of death. There are several instances of sudden, even of instantaneous death on record, in which the most careful investigations of scientific men could detect no alteration whatever, either mechanical or chemical, in the corporeal structure, excepting such as are well known to be consequences, not causes, of the loss of the vital principle.

† In the original language, "sentire" signifies both to think, and to feel—and has accordingly given rise to two words of very different meaning, sentiment, and sensation.—The expression sentient has been used in the above pages in both senses, with an unavoidable generality. The different writers who have been quoted have employed it in different senses, and in referring to their observations it has been always employed in the sense of the quotations.

Digitized by Google

must be produced *at once*, and before decay has begun. Whether then this sentient principle be simple or compounded, the decay of the matter of which the body is composed cannot affect it: for *by* death the connexion between them is destroyed; and *after* death, whether the body decay or not, the mind is beyond its reach.

It might, however, still be questioned (though the whole inquiry is most idle and fruitless), whether there may not be, perhaps, "some other reason for the mental dissolution, than the mere external decay:" whether the same cause, which in a manner perfectly unaccountable takes away the vitality of the body, and so leaves it subject to dissolution, may not at the same time impair the soul, if it be a compounded thing, and expose it also to dissolution? To this the previous observations afford a complete answer. *The body may be killed in an instant*, and without even a partial dissolution; and if the mind be, as it were, wounded through the body, it must receive an injury like that which the principle of animal life suffers,—an instantaneous destruction, or complete suspension of activity. Whether "consciousness," and the "living beings which are the subjects of consciousness," to use the expressions of Dr. Butler, be "discerptible" or not, their destruction, if effected by death at all, must be effected in a moment, and must take place *previously* to, and not by or in consequence of any decomposition. As it is perfectly conceivable that corporeal death should take place, without

Digitized by Google

any consequent corporeal dissolution, the possibility of death's taking place cannot depend on the possibility of dissolution.

In the same way a death of the mind may take place either without, or with, a consequent separation of parts, of the mental substance. We should recollect that the terms *divisible* and *indivisible* are borrowed from language that we apply to *matter;* and cannot with equal propriety apply to that which is immaterial. This has evidently been overlooked by Lord Brougham, where in his Discourse on Natural Theology* he observes, that "the strongest of all the arguments both for the separate existence of the mind, and its surviving the body," is not the less cogent "though the change undergone by the body be admitted to be *incomplete*, and though *some small portion* of its harder parts continued with us through life." (In fact the mental energies are suspended *before any* dissolution begins). "Probably no person at the age of twenty," he observes, "has one single particle in any part of his body which he had at ten, and still less does any portion of the body he was born with continue to exist in or with him. Yet the mind continues one and the same, 'without change or shadow of turning.' None of its parts can be resolved, for it is one and single; and it remains unchanged by the changes of the body."

* Page 121. 4th edit.

Digitized by Google

. . . " It follows then that the existence of the mind depends not in the least degree upon the existence of the body." . . . " The facts referred to prove that after the body's death, that is, after the chronic dissolution which the body undergoes during life, the mind continues to exist as before. Here then we have that proof so much desiderated—the *existence of the soul after the dissolution of the bodily frame with which it was connected.* The two cases cannot, in any soundness of reasoning, be distinguished; and this argument therefore, one of pure induction, derived partly from physical science through the evidence of our senses, partly from psychological science by the testimony of our consciousness, appears to prove the possible Immortality of the Soul almost as rigorously as if ' one were to rise from the dead.'"

Now if this argument proves the immortality of the soul, it proves also the immortality of every thing belonging to the body, that is not material; the immortality for instance, of the *seventh sense,** (if Lord Brougham and Dr. Thomas Brown are both correct) of heat and cold. For since their sensations continue precisely the same; or at least alter far less than the mind alters, in the progress from youth to maturity and from matu-

* Dr. Brown says that we measure the degree of muscular effort exerted on any occasion *not by the sense of touch*, but by a sixth sense: and Lord Brougham is of opinion that heat and cold are rendered perceptible by a seventh.

Digitized by Google

rity to old age, unaffected by the "chronic dissolution of the body during life;" (or, if they are at all affected by it, becoming most keen and delicate, when that dissolution is *most rapid*); since they *exist after the dissolution of the bodily form with which they were connected,* they stand in just the same predicament as the soul. Cicero, in his ignorance of optics, believed the eye to be an *obstruction*, blocking up the opening between the internal soul and external objects: but since the true functions of the ball of sight have been understood, no one has supposed, that we shall be able hereafter to see without eyes; unless, for reasons with which the present argument has nothing to do, the Deity should think fit to confer *new* powers upon man.

There is not a shadow of reason for supposing that the sensations produced by heat and cold, or by contact, in the body of man, differ at all from the sensations produced by the same causes in the bodies of the inferior animals, even of those lowest in the scale of creation. The polypus contracts its slender tentacles when they are touched, and extends them to seize marine insects that come within its reach,—it has sensation and voluntary motion, CONSCIOUSNESS and will.* Our

* It would be to no purpose to argue that consciousness and will are merely peculiar states, or attributes, of the unchangeable soul. If consciousness does not of necessity remain, nothing remains but a name: or at the utmost a mere mental conception, having no substantive reality.

Digitized by Google

evidence for this is exactly the same as that on which we rely without the slightest doubt, in inferring that any *human* individuals, excepting ourselves, possess consciousness and will. And if the chronic dissolution of the human body furnishes an argument for the Immortality of the Soul, much more does the continuance of consciousness in the body of the polypus, under a far more severe trial than a chronic dissolution can expose the human soul to, argue an immortality of the "life," or "soul," or "mind," or whatever it is called, of that wonderful animal. "The substance of these creatures is so instinct with life,* that nothing appears able to destroy it—a circumstance perhaps arising from the nervous molecules of which it seems almost to consist.† If divided transversely, each segment will become a distinct animal, send forth tentacles round its upper aperture, and close the lower: if it is divided longitudinally each half will form a separate tube in an hour, and begin to ply its tentacles in a day: even if divided into longitudinal strips, instead of the sides turning in, as in the former case, each strip becomes inflated, and a tube is formed within it: and what is still more wonderful and seems next to a miracle, these animals may be turned inside out, like the finger

* Kirby's Bridgewater Treatise. Vol. I. page 172.

† In the opinion of this writer, then, LIFE, including the powers of sensation and motion, is not a purely immaterial thing.

Digitized by Google

of a glove, without destroying either their vitality, or their power of producing germes, and of catching and digesting their food."

This extraordinary vitality is indeed marvellous in itself; but the argument we have been considering would make it more wonderful still. One animal, as it appears, can be multiplied into three or even four animals, one life into three or four lives. The consciousness and will of the polypus do not perish, even by a violent severance; but they are on the contrary multiplied. The consciousness and will of the human individual are during life always united to *a* body, but not always to *the same* body; or more properly, to the same identical component particles: and it is thence inferred that they are quite independent of body, and would exist just as well if in no way connected with, or belonging to, any body at all. The consciousness and will of the polypus survive a more complete destruction. For let the upper half of the animal be cut off and crushed to pieces: then the consciousness resides just as perfectly as before in the lower half; and after a short time a new upper half is formed. Let then the lower half be cut off and destroyed: the consciousness and will are then completely removed to a new set of particles, in a much shorter time than in the case of man, and by a much more violent and unnatural process. We therefore are to conclude that the consciousness and will of the polypus are quite independent of body,—and therefore immortal!

Digitized by Google

and that, by a process of division with a knife, three or four immortals may be made out of one!

The remarkable qualities of the polypus no less clearly refute the doctrine, that consciousness, being *one and indivisible*, is therefore not affected by the dissolution of the body. For the consciousness that resided in the body of one polypus, if it cannot be divided, must, of mathematical necessity, be multiplied, when we find it residing in the bodies of three separate polypi; and has therefore at least as good a title to be considered independent and self-existing (capable as it is, on this hypothesis, of increase but not of decrease), as human consciousness can be. The conclusion from the principles of Lord Brougham is evident enough,—not only that the polypus has an immortal part; but that three immortals can, by a mechanical process, be made out of one! But since this is extravagant, does it not follow, that the possession of powers of sensation and voluntary motion, of consciousness and will, and of something altogether immaterial,* of something that survives, sometimes a

* Not that consciousness and will themselves are altogether immaterial,—they result from the union of mind and matter, at least in man and animals—but that they imply the existence of some power, or energy or faculty, which is *not material*. Yet this power is not necessarily permanent. The *force of gravitation* is not material. It seems to result directly from the will of the Supreme, or of some Being to whom He has delegated the task. Matter, as far as we know, could exist if gravitation

Digitized by Google

violent severance of the parts of the body, sometimes a more gradual but more complete dissolution of particles, does *not* prove the existence of any thing entirely or at all independent of matter, and which survives bodily decay? *

Except for the purpose of giving an illustration, which should be unencumbered with the mysteries and difficulties, that at almost every point surround the nature of humanity, there was no need to refer to any inferior animal, in order to show that consciousness can be increased, (it

---

were not. But where were gravitation, if matter were annihilated? and the destruction of body may be to mind, what that of matter is to gravitation.

* There is only one hypothesis, and that of a very obscure and a metaphysical character, on which the analogy between man and the inferior animals, in respect of the common nature of their consciousness, can be got over. It has been supposed that man is the only creature capable of such a consciousness as to be able to speak or to think what is expressed by the word "I." That he has some (not clearly comprehensible!) notion of his separate existence and individuality:—perhaps what has been called in the text a "consciousness of consciousness." This *may possibly* be true: but if this is *all* that survives the dissolution of the body, of what value is it? There is a certain story of a little dog, who having been ill used by another, went away and fetched a powerful friend of his own species, who duly punished the aggressor. Had not this animal evidently a notion that he had received a *personal injury?* a clear idea of his own individuality. Excepting the faculty of veneration, and the power of voluntary attention to past ideas, (for most animals certainly revive past ideas involuntarily, in dreams) there is scarcely any, *if any*, faculty of the human mind, in which the elephant and the dog do not participate.

Digitized by Google

matters nothing whether we call it) by division or by multiplication. Every man born alive into the world, brings with him into it a share of the consciousness and will that belonged to others; which constitute in him a life as separate and complete as that of each of these polypi made out of one. As truly and as literally as the blood of his parents flows in his veins, does he partake of the same consciousness and will, the same φρονημα σαρκος, with them. There is absolutely nothing about him independent and self-existing, which he does not owe to his birth, and to his body, and to the *blood* "which is the life thereof." Generation produces all the life he has; and that life therefore, by all analogies, is a mortal life; and he must be "*born again*" before he "has everlasting life." Such is the doctrine of nature and of reason, no less than of Scripture.* Born into the world a mere animal, and far inferior to many other animals, at their birth; man, as he advances towards maturity, unfolds powers noble indeed, and immeasurably above those of the brutes, but which, by their resemblance to those of the beings whence he has sprung, clearly mark his parentage, and show that his highest nature is owing to no originally *separate* breath of life breathed into his nostrils, but that all comes, by corporeal descent, by material processes, from the first parents of mankind; and that he owes

---

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

to these processes every part of his separate being, separate consciousness, and separate will, just as the three polypi, made out of one, owe their separate existence to the strokes of a knife.

Nothing contributes more to false notions on this subject, than the opinions so commonly entertained of the intrinsic dignity of all that is not material. It is indeed "derogatory to the dignity of man, to acknowledge a brotherhood of mind, such as shall include the polypus, the sea-jelly, and the animalcule of a stagnant pool. But science knows of no aversions, and must hold on its way, through evil report and good report. Truth, in the end, will not fail to justify itself, in all its consequences and relations."*

The word "mind" is too often employed as if it were synonymous with "the mind," or "the human mind;" and all the noblest and loftiest attributes of the human mind, attributes which seem to some almost to demand an immortality by right of their nature, have been transferred to mind in the abstract, and have conferred upon it a false dignity. But, if all that is *not matter*, nor any form, modification, or quality of matter, is therefore mind, it must comprehend all that is meant by the words "living principle," "or life," no less than the energies of a Newton or a

* Physical Theory, p. 317.

Digitized by Google

Socrates. The power that causes a blade of grass to grow is *not material.* If by matter is intended that which is inert, and insensate, and all that is not matter is mind, then a polypus, or a sea-weed, are as truly composed of mind and matter as are human beings. *An oyster* has sensation and voluntary motion; it shares with mankind in the enjoyment of consciousness and will. Yet no one imagines that an oyster has any immortal part. What becomes of its volitions, its pleasures and pains, and its *capacities* for willing, or feeling, when it dies? They are *destroyed.* What becomes of the "living principle" when an egg is boiled? It is destroyed. We can hardly form any other supposition. Mr. Bakewell, indeed, in his "Evidence of a Future Life," maintains the indestructibility of the vital principle, whether in an egg, or any other living substance—plant, or brute, or man, on the ground of an analogy which is worth considering in this place, although it is not only very questionable at the best, but even if admitted, is totally inadequate to support his conclusion,—that men have immortal souls.—Not only gross matter, he argues, is indestructible,—varying indeed in form and bulk, and exchanging one combination for another, yet never varying in total amount, but so also are the more subtile immaterial agents or principles of heat, light, electricity and the like. And on the ground of a supposed analogy he infers that the same is true of the vital principle in vegetables, and in the lower animals; and even

Digitized by Google

with the still more inscrutable and mysterious essence of the human soul. Hence he concludes that man is an immortal being.

Of the indestructibility of matter we have the most convincing proofs. And we have very strong reason to believe that, in addition to those properties of extension and impenetrability without which a *particle* cannot be conceived, matter has certain properties which, with the exception of gravitation, vary in the different kinds of matter, yet in each kind continue always unchanged, and invariably exhibit and exert themselves in the same manner under similar circumstances. Of this nature are the properties of the attraction of cohesion between bodies of different kinds, capillary attraction (if this be distinct), and chemical affinity.

Now whether heat, light, and electricity be indestructible, as we suppose matter and its properties to be, can only be inferred, either from some community of nature between them and what we have already decided to be material things, or secondly, from experiments by which we can measure the amount of the heat, electricity, &c. at certain times and places—No experiments hitherto made would lead to the conclusion, that heat, and light, and electricity are material; natural philosophers do indeed loosely term them "fluids," but they do not suppose that they *occupy space*. And we know almost with certainty that they are destitute of *weight*. Neither are they properties of matter; for these belong

Digitized by Google

to the several particles or points of which matter consists, and are *not transferable*. It would therefore be most unphilosophical to assume that heat, and light, and electricity, are indestructible, simply because matter is so.

We have, however, much ground for supposing that heat and electricity at least never vary in amount. We can measure them by their effects: and so discover that what is gained in one quarter is lost in another. This is well shown in Mr. Bakewell's work. And though heat and electricity, to take the most favourable instances, may be for a time latent and imperceptible (unlike matter, the presence and amount of which within a given space, may always be ascertained by weighing it), yet they may be made to reappear again, and by their exhibiting *effects equal in extent* to those which they exhibited before their disappearance, we infer that nothing has been lost.

We have next to consider whether any analogy would lead us to conclude that the vital principle, in vegetables for instance, is, like matter, and the immaterial agents heat and electricity, indistructible; and always the same in total amount, though sometimes latent, and at other times active. Now, though it may perhaps seem paradoxical, we shall have a stronger argument from analogy here, than that which Mr. Bakewell has stated, if we can justly *deny* the force of his inference from analogy in the former case,—between matter and the immaterial agents heat,

Digitized by Google

electricity, &c. For if both matter, and heat, &c. be indestructible and invariable in total amount, *though they have not* any common property besides, whence the indestructibility of the latter could be inferred from that of the former, we have the stronger reason to infer that indestructibility is an universal property. If two kinds of things, *so unlike each other*, agree in this indestructibility, we might the more reasonably conjecture that a third thing, the principle of vegetable life as we term it, is indestructible too, though it be, as it certainly is in many important respects, extremely unlike either of the others.

Let us now bring this subtile principle of vegetable life to the test, not of experiment, which it baffles altogether, but of our experience of those changes which nature exhibits to us. We know of its existence, and we can measure its amount, solely *by its effects*. Like heat or electricity it may be latent. The seed may continue unchanged for years, showing no inclination to germinate; but when placed in a favourable soil, with the degree of warmth and light, and moisture suited to its nature, it puts forth its root and its slender sprout; and grows as vigorously as if it had been but recently dropped from the parent plant. But if sensible heat or electricity become latent, and is again actively developed, we find its activity exactly as great as before; and for *this very reason* infer that the amount has been always the same. But

Digitized by Google

the plant growing from a single seed flowers, ripens its seeds, and dies. The seeds are collected, and for a long time kept dry. In *each* seed there is a latent vitality, exactly equal to that in the original single seed.—They are sown, —and twenty plants arise to supply the room of one. Measured then by its effects, when in an active state, and in no other way can we measure it, the vital principle in plants appears to be variable in amount. The vitality of a single seed is adequate to produce effects absolutely infinite, if infinite time and space could be given for the developement of its energy. One grain of corn is capable of producing in a few years, a hundred millions of similar grains, each of which has an equally wonderful power of multiplying itself. As far as our observation can guide us, LIFE PRODUCES LIFE. Matter does *not* produce matter, nor heat produce heat.

There are, however, some cases of action between the particles of inanimate matter, in which a resemblance may be fancied to the phenomena of life. Fermentation in one part of a mass will produce fermentation throughout. The ignition of a single chip of wood in a pile, or grain of gunpowder in a magazine, will cause the whole to burn or explode. And were there enough matter, this process would go on without cessation and without limit. But in all these cases, as every chemist knows, properties which were *always* inherent in every separate particle or point of matter are merely developed in a

Digitized by Google

new mode. Tendencies which had always existed manifest themselves as soon as the impediments are removed. It is as when the pulling down of a house causes the fall of others in the same row. They fall by their own weight,—by the attraction of the earth,—obeying the impulse of a force which had always existed, but which, by lending each other mutual support, they had before withstood. But the phenomena of vegetable life and growth and propagation cannot be thus explained. There is absolutely no correspondency between these phenomena, and those of fermentation and combustion—unless we adopt the preposterous supposition, that every particle of matter in the universe, which is capable of forming part of a living body, contains in itself that infinite variety of tendencies, which can make it *adapt itself* to every exigency of the living frame. We must suppose every particle—of carbon for instance—to be so instinct with life, that it shall need only to be *awakened*, as it were, by the contact of other living particles, to exhibit on the instant not only life, but the exact *species* of life, which belongs to the plant of which it forms a portion. The particles will thus be as it were, an army which manœuvres without any general at the head; each individual soldier having intelligence enough to act his part with reference to all the rest! But this is altogether incredible. The mysterious principle of life dwells, as far as we can see, not in the particles individually; but in the structure as a whole.

Digitized by Google

It is *distributed to a certain extent;* so as to endure, in some instances, a division of the plant into two or more,—as when we cut off and plant a geranium shoot,—but yet has a certain unity in itself. It belongs to the body as a whole—not to the parts: and therefore we are bound to conclude that it ceases to be, when the body ceases to be;—unless we can discover some sign of its transference to other portions of matter. But no such sign appears. Vitality is not transferable. A body may be chilled, and nearly all its heat by the same process may be transferred to another; but a body cannot be killed, and another thereby animated. But even if vitality were indestructible, it would by no means follow that the soul of each man is immortal. The analogy, if worth anything, would merely go to prove that on a man's death his soul returns again to that general *stock of latent soul* of which other souls are to be made.

If the human soul be immortal, in the proper sense of the words,—that, is, if it exist as a distinct independent energy, after a separation from the body,—then analogy would lead us to suppose that the portion of heat, for instance, which filled one body, did, after quitting that body, remain in a separate state, preserving its *individuality* for ever: that when an oak tree died, the life that animated it continued undestroyed,—the immortal ghost of an oak tree! But all this is absurd. The life of the tree,—and in like manner the life of every animal—every plant,

Digitized by Google

seed, egg, as we have said, is destroyed. We can form no other supposition. In the case of a plant, perhaps, a different answer might be given. A plant, it might be said, has *no soul of its own;* the wonderful processes of its growth, the gradual formation and developement of leaf, and flower, and seed, argue *mind* indeed; but the work is either that of the Supreme Ruler of the universe, or of some created intelligence to whom the task has been delegated.* But the sensation of an animal, of an oyster, cannot be supposed to belong to any other being, and must perish with the oyster. There is no shadow of reason for supposing that a "substance capable of sensation" remains at the death of the oyster. The oyster itself *was that substance.*

If we are to consider the human mind as a "simple elementary substance," notwithstanding the endless variety of thought, the great diversity of faculties which it displays, the mind of an oyster, which has little beyond the faculty of sensation, may certainly be regarded as simple and elementary; and, from its more evident simplicity, as less likely to undergo *dissolution* than the mind of man. But if the sensations of an oyster perish, "mind" in this its enlarged and general sense, is not indestructible, though it be a "single and indivisible" thing. If we suppose

---

* In this latter conjecture Dr. Reid, among others, has indulged; and adorned it with a fancy so rich, that one is reluctant to resign it for what is probably the sounder opinion.

Digitized by Google

that when an oyster perishes, a substance capable of sensation remains, and is re-absorbed as it were into the Supreme Mind, or attached to some other being, (if the things are at all conceivable, seeing that we are all convinced that our minds belong of necessity to ourselves alone) such a transference or absorption would be, as far as the original owner is concerned, a virtual annihilation.—We do not find, then, in every organized body possessing life, an immortal essence.—If man lays claim to an immortality denied to the brutes, he must place it on some other ground, than on the nature of mind in general, as comprehending whatever is not matter, and as a simple immaterial substance, and therefore incapable of dissolution.

But the whole question respecting the liability of the sentient or thinking principle to destruction or suspension of activity, admits of a practical answer, far more satisfactory than could be gathered from any inquiry into the simplicity of its nature. *In fact*, every man has experienced many thousand times in the course of his life,—generally speaking once in every twenty-four hours —a loss—and whether it be called a suspension or a destruction is perfectly indifferent—a loss of consciousness. For it is not easy to say, what constitutes the difference between a suspension and a destruction. If, as Dr. Paley observes in the XXIVth chapter of his Natural Theology, the idea of "spirituality comprises *perception*, *thought*,

Digitized by Google

and *will*," all of which are incompatible with inactivity, the terms would seem to be not only practically indifferent, but virtually equivalent. And if the torpor of sleep, which is merely a partial suspension of vital energy, attended by no dissolution, but on the contrary strengthening the body and preparing it for fresh activity, can thus paralyze all the mental functions, it is not too much to suppose that the torpor of death, which instantly and utterly destroys the vital energy, has an influence on the functions of the mind no less complete in extent, and the duration of which—who shall determine, unaided by the express word of Him who made both body and soul; or by the suggestions of that moral power, the feebler and fainter, but more general revelation which he has written within us?

CHAPTER VII.

THE ARGUMENT FROM MAN'S PHYSICAL SUPERIORITY.

IT comes within the scope of this first part of the work, though verging upon the second, to consider the question, whether the consummate wisdom and ingenuity shown in the physical constitution of man,—the fearful and wonderful manner in which he is made,—affords any promise that those faculties will be perpetuated, for

Digitized by Google

the sake of which contrivances so exquisite have been resorted to, and, if the expression is allowable, so great solicitude manifested, by their Creator. Now in the first place, admitting, as it is here taken for granted that all will admit, the Omnipotence of God, it is evident that these contrivances and provisions are not essentially necessary to our being; and moreover they who suppose a future state probable for physical reasons, do not expect the perpetuity of all, or most, of them, since this would of course be impossible without the resurrection of the body into a world nearly similar to the present. We might have been made conscious of the forms and character of distant objects, without the refracting humours of the eye; we might have been capable of wielding and moulding external matter without the exquisite mechanism of the hand and arm; we might have measured out our span of threescore and ten years, unsupported by food, and with no complicated apparatus for converting it to the uses of the body;—but the Creator has thought fit to constitute us otherwise. Though the reasons for this kind of procedure, this *working by means*, which is adopted, it may be observed, no less in the moral and spiritual worlds, than throughout the material universe, are in a great measure inscrutable to us, it is at least evident that the contrivances have been resorted to,—since not for the sake of the end simply which could have been attained without them—partly for their own sake. And who shall

Digitized by Google

say whether the means are not, in the contemplation of the Deity, equally important with the ends? or whether the importance of the ends does not depend on their being brought about *by the means* actually appointed?

"We are greatly ignorant," it has been finely observed by Bishop Butler, "how far things are considered by the Author of Nature under the single notion of means and ends; so as that it may be said, this is merely an end, and that merely means, in his regard." At the instant of death the influence of all known *means* is utterly abolished; and, if not our mental existence itself, yet all that was recognised as contributing towards it, as modifying or influencing it in any way, is gone. Who can say that the end,—some form of human mental existence, when physically considered, is in the eyes of the Author of Nature so much more important than the means, as to survive their abolition? or that the end is equally important, by what means soever brought about?

Even granting that *human* existence is in itself, and without reference to the means by which it is to be supported, a higher end than any other, undisclosed by revelation,* that we know of; yet the analogy of the physical universe shows, that high things and low are subject to the same law of corruption. The animal is more excellent than

* I know not that revelation itself discloses to man any higher end in the Divine counsels, than human existence under certain conditions. But this is as much as we need know.

Digitized by Google

the vegetable world, yet is doomed even to a swifter decay. The surface of the earth bears traces and contains relics of sweeping convulsions, which have divided eras, each distinguished by its own peculiar productions, and anterior to the existence of man: traces and relics which the natural philosopher, uncorrected by revelation, must contemplate not only as records of the past, but as prophecies of the future. The stars of heaven have themselves been changed; and the fate of some, not the least brilliant among them, is a warning that the extinction even of our own sun is no impossible event. We are partial judges, and overrate our own importance. The exclamation of the Psalmist, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him," is dictated by a juster estimate of the physical consequence of this creature.* "Thou has put all things [on the earth] under his feet," he continues: and the

* The seemingly contrary injunction of our Saviour to his disciples, in Matt. vi. 25, to compare themselves with other and inferior objects of the Divine care, must not be opposed to this. For the disciples were taught, by Divine authority, to expect a high spiritual destiny. *Revelation* having previously made known to them how much better they were than many sparrows, they were *therefore* to take no thought for the morrow, —because He who fed the fowls of the air and adorned the flowers of the field, would surely provide food and raiment, in no less ample supply, for his own chosen friends.

Digitized by Google

source of the wonder is, the littleness of that being, on whom prerogatives so lofty are conferred.

In the second place, however transcendent were the superiority of the human mind to all other terrestrial things, we should at most be justified only in expecting, not the perpetuity of each individual life, but the perpetuity of the species to which it belongs. It might indeed be considered incredible that man should be altogether destroyed, that he should entirely disappear from a world which has been prepared, with marvellous skill and care, chiefly, though not exclusively, for his use and gratification; but with the perpetuity of the race, it would seem, creative Intelligence would be satisfied. The ancient Greeks entertained and propagated the fanciful notion, that the souls of the departed endured, rather than enjoyed, a sort of shadowy existence, a mere mockery of real life, in a world which, like the visions seen in dreams, presented the semblance, without the substance, of real things: and that they were perpetually afflicted with longings to return to that form of being from which they had been exiled. Unless creative Intelligence should think fit, for certain reasons which it is not within the province of *natural* philosophy to suggest, to depart entirely from the mode of procedure which, so far as we know, is universally adopted, and should create for the spirits of the dead a new world, and a new kind of corporeity; (a suppo-

Digitized by Google

sition which it would be most extravagant thus arbitrarily to assume, with no moral or religious considerations in its support;) their condition, whether more or less desolate than that pictured by the fertile imaginations of Greece, would certainly be inferior in dignity to that of a race enjoying an existence no less excellent, through the instrumentality of means beautiful, and, as we have reason to believe, *desirable* to an Omnipotent Creator, who can work by what means soever he will.*

Again, though man, even when considered merely in a physical point of view, is plainly at the head of creation, and though all things, even as the green herb, are given into his hand, yet contrivances and adaptations nearly as exquisite, and preparations hardly less ample, have been made for the well-being of many other species of creatures; as if they were objects of their Creator's solicitude in nearly the same degree as man himself. Gifted as these creatures are with faculties, for all of which the present world affords a full and appropriate gratification, there is not a shadow of reason,—even putting out of sight the Scriptural declaration of their mortality,—for supposing that they will enjoy any other than a terrestrial existence. Neither then can the Divine

* "I say unto you that God is able *of these stones* to raise up children unto Abraham."

Digitized by Google

provisions *for the temporal welfare* of man afford him ground for expecting immortality.*

The relative importance of what we term means and ends becomes more and more apparent, as we successively contemplate the lower and lower grades of creation. The faculties of animals, and their capacities of enjoyment, appear to decrease in a much more rapid ratio than the skill and care displayed in the provisions for their welfare. It is certain that if mere animal enjoyment, of various kinds and degrees, were the sole end of the animal creation, that end could be attained, without the diversity of structures, and of other contrivances which we find actually to prevail. To choose one instance out of millions—no reason whatever can be assigned, why among the birds that frequent marshes, one should differ

* The present world affords a *full* gratification to the species, but not to each individual of the species, of inferior animals. No one expects that the animals, who have been, in a certain sense, prematurely cut off, will find compensation in another world. But man is a creature capable of so much moral and intellectual improvement, that this world cannot provide a full and appropriate gratification for the faculties of any one individual of the race. Yet the analogy between man and inferior animals will so far hold good, as that we ought not, from the insufficiency of this world, to expect another existence *for all*, but only for the most improved, of the human species. For that analogy shows, as some ancient philosophers have observed, that it is enough if *some* of a species come to perfection.

Si ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur *magnæ animæ*.—Tacit. Agric.

Digitized by Google

from all the others in placing its nest between the stalks of three reeds drawn together for that purpose; or why of all those that inhabit the trees of Great Britain, a few only should suspend their nest, instead of placing them upon the branches: or again, why of all the fowls that fly beneath the firmament of heaven, each species should be distinguished by the manner of its flight, unless means themselves, even in things apparently the most insignificant, are also ends and objects of the Creator's regard. The structure of plants, the care with which their growth and propagation are provided for, the variety and beauty of their forms, in all of which particulars they far excel the lower species of the animal creation,* afford a conclusive proof, that the happiness of sensitive beings is not *the sole end* of contrivance and adaptation. For it cannot be supposed that the gratification of the human race was the sole purpose of all this beautiful variety of things. It is indeed calculated to excite pleasure and wonder in the minds of all, gratitude

* Many writers have, rather fancifully, represented all organized things as forming parts of one great chain, commencing with the lowest form of vegetable existence, and terminating in man; each intermediate species being linked with two others standing respectively higher and lower in the scale. But in fact the species which are to be reckoned as *links* are by no means intermediate in rank, between the classes which they join. The class of animals stands above the class of vegetables, but the links are at the bottom of each class. The cedar of Libanus must be ranked above a coralline, a polypus, or a sponge. Quadrupeds stand above birds; but the ornithorhyncus is not

Digitized by Google

and veneration in those whose thoughts ascend to the First Cause; but it would be inconsistent with these very feelings so to limit the Creator's bounty and contract the dimensions of the scheme of nature;—as unreasonable as to suppose that the stars were set in heaven, only to give light to our globe, or display to us the extent of creative power.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSION AND RECAPITULATION.

IT was a very prevalent opinion among the ancient poets and philosophers of Greece that when the primæval chaos, and the conflict of the "discordant rudiments of ill-joined things," as Ovid expresses it, were stopped by the Deity who fabricated the world, the four elements *naturally and of their own accord** assumed

---

superior to the rook. Many natural historians assert that both in the principal and in the subordinate divisions of organized beings the arrangement is not in a single but in a double line, each group being united with the rest of creation by two opposite links, which are themselves connected by a double chain of forms.

* "Hanc Deus, et melior litem *Natura* diremit." Ovid. Metam. "Terrena et humida *suopte nuta* in terram et in mare ferantur;" writes Cicero. Tusc. Quæst. Lib. I.

According to Ovid the waters were not above the earth, but "occupied the furthest parts, and held in as with a band, the

Digitized by Google

their proper positions: the earth standing lowest, with the waters upon and around it, the air being lighter, placing itself above them, while bodies of a fiery nature occupied the most elevated regions of all—thence called the "empyrean." And according to the Platonic doctrine, which Cicero seems to have preferred, the same thing happens at the dissolution of the human body, as took place on a more extensive scale at the creation, or rather formation of the world. "For just as the element of air," says Cicero, "is urged by its weight to the middle regions of the world, and that of fire is carried directly upwards towards the heavens, either because it is their nature to seek the highest places, or because lighter things are naturally repelled by heavier, so it is evident that souls, whether they consist of air,—that is, of breath,—or whether they consist of fire, must on their departure from the body, be carried aloft." And he afterwards says that the mind, or soul, "if it be,"—an opinion to which he is far from objecting—"of the same materials of which all other things are made, and consists of 'inflamed air,' must of necessity occupy the heavenly regions." It will penetrate through that sky in which are clouds and rain and wind, and which

---

solid orb of the earth." The general notion which the ancients had of the earth's figure was that of a flat circular surface ("orbis") surrounded by water: beyond which were regions of darkness, "where the day and night come to an end," where the "swaddling band of thick "darkness" began, and the shades of the departed dwelt. "Acheron" signifies "a remote place."

Digitized by Google

is rendered gloomy and damp by exhalations from the earth, and having reached a region of *thin air and solar rays*, congenial to its own nature, will cease to rise, and remain there."

It is not, perhaps, the strangest part of this strange hypothesis, that it makes out the union of mind and matter, or rather (since it supposes mind to be material), of mind and body, to be a forced and unnatural commixture, like the commixture which had subsisted from all eternity (though *how* and *why*, few ancient philosophers cared to inquire) between the four elements. It was the *separation* of those elements that produced order and harmony in the universe, on the earth as well as in the heavens; and it might justly have been suspected that the separation of mind and body was not an event of the same character; since the immediate consequence of the separation of the latter, as far as it could be traced, was disorganization and corruption, a conflict of moist and dry, which had before subsisted peaceably together, a return to the chaotic state.

However, philosophers, having come to the conclusion, that the heavens and not the earth, was the natural abode of the human mind, as a thing composed of air and fire, followed up the hypothesis by speculations on the vast advantages which mind would enjoy, when thus released from "the chains of earth's immurement," and in possession of "its sempiternal heritage." We shall there, according to Cicero, be "free from

Digitized by Google

all the cares and concerns of the world, and from all bodily passions, and devote ourselves entirely to the contemplation of things." The whole earth will then lay open to our view, and we shall be able to observe its position, and shape, and limits, and all its inhabited and desert tracts, gratifying to the utmost, and without labour or peril, that love of discovery which has urged men to adventure upon the treacherous ocean, and explore unknown and inhospitable shores, even as far as the straits, which to the Roman philosopher seemed to be on the confines of the globe, "where the hungry wave parts Europe from Libya." At present, "although the organs of sense, the *openings from the body to the mind*, are constructed with exquisite art, they are still blocked up in some degree by gross and earthly substances; but then there will be nothing besides mind, no obstacle will prevent our perceiving the relations and nature of things." Yet this mind itself, according to the same philosopher, consists of a certain fiery air, and nothing more. It is still *local*, having only exchanged one place of abode for another, and is therefore still limited in dimensions: and though he represents it as *in want of nothing*, he declares in the same breath that it will be "fed and supported by the same things that support and feed the stars." Will it be able to penetrate again the clouds through which it has ascended, and see what is passing within the habitations of men, or in the depths of the ocean?

Digitized by Google

This fanciful hypothesis, this strange jumble of the properties of mind and matter, would not have been here noticed, if there were not much reason to think that modern philosophers also, notwithstanding the wonderful progress which has been made in physical philosophy, have frequently fallen into a very similar error with that of Plato and Pythagoras and Cicero, and indeed of the greater number of the wise men of antiquity; and that while the immateriality of the soul has been clearly demonstrated, and is now fully admitted on all hands, the nature of its connexion with the body has been overlooked, through a confusion between the physical nature and the moral relations of the human soul. As Cicero exalted a certain fiery air into a thinking substance, possessing innate powers so extensive as actually to be impeded in the exercise of them by the organs of sense, so have later philosophers dignified the immaterial principle of life, possessed by the lowest animals no less than man; and given it an immortality which by right of its nature it has not. The mind of man can exercise powers and perform functions far above those of any other animal, but the permanency of the mind of man cannot be *therefore* greater than theirs. PHYSICAL DURABILITY DEPENDS NOT ON FUNCTIONS, BUT ON NATURE. A watch does not *of itself* go for a longer time because it goes correctly; nor run down the sooner because the hands are broken off, or the figures upon the

Digitized by Google

dial erased. In the former case, the owner of the watch is more likely *to wind it up*, when the spring is nearly uncoiled, than in the latter case: but the machine itself has no power of perpetual motion.

It was a conjecture of Aristotle that the soul of man consisted of "*a kind of continuous and perpetual motion;*" and constituted a sort of fifth power, altogether different from the four elements of which all other things were made. And though to call the soul a *motion* must convey an imperfect idea of it, yet this opinion seems not very far from the truth. It is common to speak of the "powers of the mind," as if beyond them were some substance, or essence, capable of exerting those powers; but in fact all we know or can well hope to know of mind, in this life, is merely *the existence of the powers.* So we speak of the "qualities of matter," *as if* we knew of something besides and beyond those qualities, and which would exist independently of them. But if extension and impenetrability be taken away, there is absolutely nothing belonging to matter left which can become an object of our conceptions. Nor is there any shadow of reason for supposing that any such hidden substance exists; any groundwork as it were, upon which the qualities of matter are supported. It is demonstrable that matter *may* consist (so far as any properties of matter with which we are acquainted by our present senses are concerned), of nothing but bundles of *mathematical points of attraction*

Digitized by Google

and repulsion; of nothing, in a word, but FORCES:* which forces are upheld, as revelation assures us, by the word of the Divine Power. Mind also may be called "that which thinks and feels and can originate motion," or "*a substance capable* of thought and feeling, and of the origination of motion," a *substance possessing* certain faculties, energies, and powers. Yet all that we know to exist is merely the energies, and powers. Nor does it seem at all incorrect to call the mind an ENERGY, or POWER; something corresponding to the *motion* of Aristotle: supported, as we know from revelation, by One, in whom we live and move and have our being. We have strong reason to believe that two powers of the mind, of sensation, and of originating motion, cease altogether on death. And it has been too hastily concluded that the power of thought and reflection remains because these seem to be nobler functions than the others which perish, and to be less dependent upon matter.

In the preceding chapters it has been pointed out as highly probable, that during sleep, not only the powers of sensation, and voluntary motion are suspended and cease, but that a complete suspension of *all* the mental powers ensues:—that dreams take place only during the state of imperfect sleep; commonly in the act of waking: and that the velocity of thought is not greater

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

during that partial lethargy of the body, than when the body is fully awakened. That more violent affections, such as a swoon, or insensibility from a blow or any severe bodily injury, suspend the highest as well as the lowest powers of the mind, and that DEATH, which differs from these cases only in being a more severe bodily injury, has probably the same effect: and it has been further argued, that the common consent of mankind, that the brutes are mortal, does strongly confirm this view.

But since an exception may be taken in the case of man, and it may be thought that his reflecting powers are exempt from the general suspension, it has been further argued, in the second chapter, that the very highest of all human powers *depend upon the brain for their activity*: that not only does general disorder and disease of the brain produce mental disease and disorder, and excitement of the brain mental excitement; but that the activity of particular parts of the brain is necessary to the activity of particular faculties of the mind; so that precisely upon the same grounds as we believe men and animals cannot feel after death—because their nerves have no action,—should we also believe that men cannot *reflect* after death;—because their brain has no action. And it has been proved by one very remarkable instance (in page 44), that a man may "suffer a *complete death* as far as regards his mental powers," merely in consequence of a pressure on the brain. Afterwards, in the third chapter

Digitized by Google

has been considered the opinion, that the body is a mere clog upon the mind, a temporary prison in which it is immured. And this opinion has been met by a very similar line of argument to that previously adopted. The faculties of sensation and voluntary motion, although it be admitted that the co-operation of an immaterial part is necessary, require *nerves*. And we find that the mind never does act, in this life, except with the co-operation of the brain. And surely this brain is not *useless:* but is given us because our minds are so constituted as to be unable to act without a brain. They *may be* able to act hereafter, without a brain; *if* the Creator and Preserver of men should think fit so *to alter their present nature*, as to give them that capacity; but are at present incapable of independent activity.

In the fifth chapter has been considered the opinion, that the mind, being a single and indivisible thing, *cannot* undergo any destruction, or detriment, or alteration, in consequence of the dissolution of the body: and it was remarked in the first place, that the dissolution of the body being not the same thing with death, but *the effect of death*, of the withdrawal of that in a great degree incomprehensible and mysterious principle of animal life, which suspended the ordinary chemical laws of matter, the dissolution of the body obviously could not be the cause of injury to the mind, whether mind were an indivisible, or were a compounded, thing. In the

Digitized by Google

next place it was shown that the living and immaterial principle of a human being and of one of the lowest of animals was capable of the same division or multiplication (for it may be called either), of life and consciousness: and that we must either suppose that two strokes of a knife, cutting a polypus, can make three immortal creatures of one, or give up the argument from the independence of mind on body drawn from the chronic dissolution of the latter; and deny altogether the indivisibility of consciousness.

In the sixth chapter was considered the opinion that man must be immortal, drawn from the wonderful skill and care shown in his structure. And it was argued, that for all that we know, these contrivances may be, in themselves, as important as the end—human existence and welfare; and that the importance of the end may depend on its being effected by means of such contrivances. Next, that, if human existence were itself, and without reference to the means, the highest of all ends, the analogy of inferior nature shows that even the greatest things are perishable: and further, that if man be destined, through the excellence of his nature, for perpetuity, the *species*, not all the individuals of the species, will continue: while there are, moreover, considerable difficulties in the way of the supposition, that the species would attain a higher degree of perfection in a disembodied state than in the present world. And finally, that nearly equal solicitude has been manifested by the Creator in providing

Digitized by Google

for the welfare of the inferior creation; and this,—notwithstanding that man is at the head of that creation, and is the sole creature capable of comprehending and admiring the works of God, and of recognizing the Maker with gratitude and veneration,—not with a view, solely or chiefly, to the gratification of the human race.

If all, or the greater part of the arguments which have been here employed, in proof of the dependence and connection of mind on organized matter, and on animal life, be correct, there arises, in the opinion of the writer, a very strong presumption that the death of the body will cause a cessation of all the activity of the mind, by way of natural consequence; to continue for ever UNLESS the Creator should interfere; and restore, by a fresh exertion of His power, either the soul alone, or the soul and body together.

The next Book will enter on the question of the probability of this restoration, as far as the future intentions of the Deity, with regard to man, can be collected from the present moral constitution and condition of the world and of its rational, or irrational inhabitants.

Digitized by Google

BOOK II.

MORAL EVIDENCES OF A FUTURE LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

TO search for proofs of man's immortality in the nature of his physical constitution is, indeed, to seek for the living among the dead. The word of God declares that man has forfeited the high privilege of life, his original birthright,* whereby he partook of an existence little inferior to that of the angels of heaven; and has become a creature *naturally* subject to corruption, condemned by an inevitable law, and by a change now inscrutable to us (though once it must have been well known, since it was *experienced*), sooner or later to return to the dust from whence he was taken: and no physical investigation of the structure of man, or of the nature of the living principle within him, can afford any solid reasons for believing, that the sentence, which was to render man perishable, has not taken full effect.† Man is indeed mentally superior to

* His original birth-right, not as a creature of dust, but as the possessor of Eden.

† An endeavour is made, in the next Book, to show that the curse of death, denounced upon Adam, takes *full* effect until

Digitized by Google

the brutes, and endowed with a bodily frame which is far more perfect than theirs, though less commensurate with the desires of its occupier; but in a large part of his compound nature he is evidently akin to them; and possessed too of passions and instincts which are so intimately interwoven and blended with his highest faculties on the one hand, and those which are universally admitted to be merely animal on the other, that no line of separation can be drawn between these faculties, marking off any portion as not of the earth nor earthy, and entitling us to assert that some have a different essence from the rest, and will survive the general destruction, or at least complete suspension, which will certainly befall all animal powers.

But we may avail ourselves of a further and better light, in the inquiry into these mysteries, than any which can be admitted in merely physical researches; the light of the *moral* faculties; which are far superior to the intellectual, and incomprehensible by them; less mechanical in their operations, less complex in their nature, and more spontaneous in their activity; and which, as they appear to be more immediately derived from a celestial source than any other faculties which the Father of lights has conferred on man, seem peculiarly calculated to assist in

---

the general resurrection:—the redemption of man, and victory of Christ over death not being completed till then: nor having, before that day, any other counteracting, except in conferring a spiritual life on men, during their sojourn in this world.

Digitized by Google

the investigation of the more abstruse and mysterious part of His designs: and may reveal to our hopes, though dimly and doubtfully at best, things beyond the reach of mere intellect; but which revelation alone can fully disclose. When by the aid of these faculties, we discern, in part, the character and counsels of the Supreme Maker, and come to understand, in some degree, the true moral condition of man; and his relations to God, not as a Maker only, but as a Moral Governor, who interferes with all events, in the history both of nations and of individuals; and, notwithstanding the apparent abandonment of all the *details* of that history to the operation of blind natural causes, brings about in the end, through their instrumentality, great moral purposes of his own; and when, rendered more confident by this addition to our knowledge, we attempt to decide *for what ends* this human race, seemingly so perishable, was called into existence, we are led to extend our views beyond this world, and the hope of immortality becomes no longer a baseless vision.* "Man we believe to be immortal," says the eloquent author of the "Physical Theory of Another Life," "man we believe to be immortal, (revelation apart) not because his mind is separable from animal organization; but

* The line of argument here alluded to is followed out by Dr. Chalmers in his Bridgewater Treatise, in the Chapter—On the Capacities of the World for making a Virtuous Species Happy.

Digitized by Google

because his intellectual and moral constitution is such as to demand a future developement of his nature. Why should that which is immaterial be indestructible? None can tell us; and on the contrary we are free to suppose that there may be immaterial orders, enjoying their hour of existence, and then returning to nihility."

In contemplating man as a moral being, we are raised, as it were, above the graves and charnel houses that furnished only proofs of his mortality; we breathe a purer air, and command a wider prospect. Our concern is not now with the essential qualities of mind and matter, the connection of body and soul, the dependence of consciousness upon indivisibility, or with any of those properties of the human constitution which come within the province of physiology, and demand for their successful investigation an exercise of intellect alone. We are to contemplate man no longer as an animal being, but as possessed of faculties which, however perishable in their nature, are in their functions so noble, as to separate him from the inferior creation by an impassable line. We may thus ultimately obtain, though not without many occasions of misgiving, more ample and encouraging views of the Divine economy, and see reason to think that man was created for purposes which cannot all meet their accomplishment in this world, and will find it in another; and to conjecture that after death the Creator may again put forth His power, in order to restore the spirit that had returned to

Digitized by Google

him,* and rebuild the structure that could not preserve itself from decay.

It has been beautifully argued by Dr. Paley, at the commencement of his admirable treatise on Natural Theology, that any one possessing a sufficient knowledge of mechanism, would be convinced on the examination of a *watch*,—even supposing that he accidentally met with that machine, for the first time, in crossing a barren and solitary heath,—that it was the work of intelligence and contrivance. At this conclusion he would certainly arrive, even though he failed to discover the end for which the watch was made,—the measurement of time. It would be evident to him moreover that the watch, however skilfully put together, and however regular in its rate of movements at the time of his examining it, *could not move for ever:* that from the very principle of its construction, it must go down at last. And if he could obtain no knowledge of the maker, and it exceeded the skill of the me-

---

* It is strange that any one should consider the predicted "return of the spirit (or life) to God who gave it," as an assurance and promise of immortality. As long as the *breath of life* remains in them, (for "the spirit" means no more) His creatures live; when the Giver resumes it, they die. So in Job, chap. iii. v. 34. "The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." And (chap. xxxv. v. 14.) "If God gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." The breath of life breathed into the nostrils of Adam was *animal* merely. For compare Genesis, chap. vii. v. 13. "All [animals] in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."

Digitized by Google

chanicians of that generation to bring back the main spring to its original position, he would not expect that the watch, having once stopped, could ever go again. But if he saw the watch in the hands of the maker, and knew also that it was formed for the mensuration of time, for a purpose that would continue to be desirable after the period had elapsed for which the watch, if left to itself, could maintain its motion, he would reasonably expect this maker to interfere, and by a fresh exertion of his skill and power restore the action of the machine. And thus, if man, though possessing in his physical constitution no principle of perpetual life, should nevertheless appear to be fitted for the fulfilment of moral purposes, which, from what we can learn, without revelation, concerning the character of the Supreme Governor and the probable economy of the universe, will continue to be desirable after the allotted period of human life has expired, we may reasonably hope that our Maker will interfere, and grant a renewal of existence to his creatures.* The lamp of life is fed with fuel

---

* The Creator made man "not prone and brute as other creatures," but "upright with front serene;"—with eyes which he can raise to heaven in adoration, and hands which he can clasp in prayer.

Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus:

and hence, from this structure, framed as it were in reference to a higher world, may arise a *moral* presumption that death will not annihilate him, though the eye and hand of man, *physically* considered, have no better title to immortality, than those of the monkey.

Digitized by Google

limited in quantity, and the flame cannot long maintain itself. Man may extinguish the flame, but to relume the lamp, or augment the supply of vital oil, exceeds his power. Whether its extinction shall be for a moment only, or for all eternity, depends on the will of Him who formed the vessel according to his own pleasure, and lighted it for his own purposes.

It is much to be apprehended that moralists, who have sought to prove the immortality of the soul, from the character of the Deity, and from the moral constitution and condition of man, and from his relation to his Maker, have often argued with much precipitancy and over-confidence. By the sure word of Revelation they have been instructed in, and made certain of those first truths or principles, from which the probability of man's immortality may be deduced. But it is obviously to no purpose to argue, with whatever logical precision, in favour of the reality of that future life which Revelation has disclosed, on principles which derive their only or their chief stability from that very Revelation. We must not in the first instance borrow our notions of the Divine power, and justice, and goodness, and of man's responsibility and imperfections, and capacity of improvement, from the Bible, and then, having proved the probability of a future state of human existence upon the principles we have adopted, imagine that human reason has succeeded in establishing a fact, which the Bible expressly declares. It would be much better to

Digitized by Google

adopt the conclusion at once, than to assume only the premises on which we found it.

The system of Natural Religion, as it is called in contradistinction to the Revealed, must be supported entirely by moral reasonings, and derive no aid whatever from the authority of Scripture, when employed to establish that authority. For Natural Religion may be employed either to *recommend and introduce* the doctrines of Revelation, or to *illustrate* them when admitted. When it is employed for the latter purpose we may, undoubtedly, avail ourselves, to a certain extent, of a *corrected* Natural Religion; but not so, when for the former purpose. That Natural Religion is capable of supporting itself, without any further assistance than that of the simplest and most obvious trains of moral reasoning, is sufficiently shown by the extensive prevalence of certain general notions of religion, among the heathen nations, and anterior to the Gospel Revelation.* By the moral philosophers of mo-

* This may be, in some instances, the corruption of Revelation, truth gradually obscured. St. Paul's account of the heathen world is, that they "*changed* the glory of God into an image, &c."—that they "*changed* the truth of God into a lie." Granting man to have the capacity for inventing a faith *de novo*, to satisfy the natural cravings of religious feeling, it may be questioned whether there has been often such a state of things as to give occasion for the exercise of this inventive power. It would imply a blank and chasm in man's religious history incompatible with those very impulses of his nature which would lead him to fabricate a religion out of the materials which nature furnishes. The Israelites in the Wilderness were punished not

Digitized by Google

dern times many of these notions have been corrected, and brought into a nearer accordance with the facts disclosed by Revelation; and the system of Natural Religion has been enlarged, and its doctrines propounded with confidence, as valuable auxiliaries to the cause of Divine truth. And in this task moralists have *professed* to avail themselves only of the light thrown upon the subject by the progress of philosophical discoveries, and of improvements in the mode of investigation. Scripture itself, in condemning the Heathen nations for their want of Natural Religion, justifies the Christian philosopher in endeavouring to carry out this system further than it was ever carried by the philosophers of antiquity. "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world," writes St Paul, (Romans i. 20.) "are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,—even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they, the Gentiles, are without excuse; because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." Yet, though the Gentiles did not avail themselves as they ought to have done of their knowledge of "the things

---

for *abandoning* the worship of Jehovah, but for beginning this process of corruption by adding the superstition of the golden calf. Left to themselves, they would have become in time idolaters; but their notion of religion itself—the superstructure of their errors would have been revealed truth.

Digitized by Google

that are made," and that knowledge has been since enlarged, in various ways, by the contributions of natural philosophers, it is impossible not to regard with some suspicion the arguments of men who, familiarised with all the leading truths of Christianity, attempt to demonstrate some of those truths without any dependance on its authority.

We should remember also, that, from the nature of the case, the progress of Natural Religion is not commensurate with that of Natural Philosophy; and that our enlarged and more accurate data give us but a small advantage over the Gentiles of the ancient world. He who can see no proof of benevolent adaptation in the varied clothing of animals,—in the absence of teeth at the time of birth,—in the rapid propagation of those plants and animals which are fit for food, as compared with those which destroy life,—will not be converted to theism by any demonstration of mathematical accuracy in the works of bees, or in the marvellous balance of powers which secures the stability of the planetary system.

If the immortality of man, or his existence in a state of consciousness for an indefinite period, after the dissolution of the body, does at all merit to be classed among the doctrines of natural religion, it is certainly one which depends upon the previous establishment of *nearly all* the others. Dr. Butler, in his Analogy, terms the immor-

Digitized by Google

tality of man a *fundamental* truth of Christianity. In regard to its importance it certainly is so; but in its doctrinal, or its historical relation with other truths, it should rather be considered as final, and crowning, than fundamental. And it is important to bear in mind, that a very slight degree of uncertainty, attaching to each of the propositions which constitute the links of a chain of argument, will often not only weaken the conclusion to be established, but even render it actually *improbable*.* To apply this observation, summarily, to the question before us;—

That God is a being of infinite power,—so that He cannot be thwarted or controlled in the performance of His will by any other being; and of infinite goodness,—so that no absolute moral wrong can occur within His government; and of perfect justice,—so that He will in no case clear the guilty; and of perfect benevolence,—so that He will not suffer any unnecessary pain to exist; and that man is responsible to God for his actions and his thoughts, and is a depraved and fallen creature, whose energies are perverted from their proper and original direction, and is nevertheless a being, whose moral and intellectual nature might, under favourable circumstances, develope

* Let us suppose that the probability that the plague visits a certain city is as two to one: and the probability that it attacks any given individual there, as two to one: and the probability that the attack proves fatal, as two to one. Then, while the plague is yet at a distance, the probability is more than two to one *against* the death of any particular citizen by that disease.

Digitized by Google

such excellence as would in this present world find an inadequate field for the exercise of its energies:—these are propositions, which, with several others of a similar character, requíre to be established by a consideration of the "things that are made," *before* the doctrine of man's immortality, or future existence beyond the grave, can be rendered morally probable. These things once ascertained, we may encourage the hope that in another world justice will overtake the guilty who on this earth have been triumphant, and, in conjunction with benevolence, will reward the virtuous, and give a full compensation to all who have suffered undeservedly; and further, that man, whose better nature is in this world often overpowered, always depressed and degraded by the temptations and corruptions that beset him, will be placed in a situation adapted to call forth and perfect those energies in which a Being of perfect goodness can take delight. But the varied forms of evil, subsisting in the world which God has made, render many of these truths at least doubtful on a first view; and yet, unless they are all ultimately established, or given a very high degree of probability, the doctrine that depends on them will become *itself improbable*.

The moral philosopher, having once distinctly discerned in the creation,—as well he may,—traces, and abundant traces, of great power, and wisdom, and justice, and benevolence; and within his own heart,—the heart at least of "the natural

Digitized by Google

man," much prevailing evil, and the seeds of much excellence, (if indeed they should not rather be esteemed the remnants of a former and forfeited perfection,) scruples not to carry out his conclusions to their furthest extent, and to argue upon them as ascertained; disregarding, in that confidence in their truth which he has derived from *other* sources, those evident marks of evil and imperfection which abound in the world, and which tend to render them doubtful, and the immortality to be deduced from them improbable. We are all too ready to consider that as proved, which we well know to be true; and to disregard the weakness of the premises when the establishment of the conclusion is necessary to our happiness. Whoever teaches man that he is an immortal being, supplies a want and gratifies a yearning desire which must ever be most keenly felt by the noblest and strongest minds; and which being gratified, even heathens will disregard earthly joys, or "the sufferings of this present time," as "not worthy to be put in comparison." But although there can be little doubt that *some* reasons for expecting another existence will be the fruit and reward of an extended and impartial inquiry into the moral and intellectual constitution of man and the condition of the world around him, it is no less certain that on a more limited inquiry many phenomena appear to be greatly at variance with Divine goodness or power; and are calculated to call forth the most gloomy apprehensions, LEST THE EVILS

Digitized by Google

WHICH PREVAIL SHOULD HAVE THEIR ORIGIN IN THE MIND OF THE SUPREME RULER HIMSELF; and the woes that encompass mortality should be altogether without a remedy.

Nature has her dark as well as her bright side; and it is the prerogative of the Christian, not of the mere moral philosopher, to discern truth most distinctly, while contemplating the latter only. Many of those joyous and ennobling emotions which a contemplation of the beauties of nature and the bounties of providence excites in the mind of a Christian, are such as the most elevated mind, uninstructed by revelation, and unfurnished with any key to the partial solution of the mystery of evil, could not reasonably entertain: unless indeed upon the principle (which the followers of Epicurus only would be ready to adopt and justify) that it is man's best and soundest philosophy to turn from the contemplation of all evils which he is unable to remove, and all difficulties which he cannot solve.

In the endeavour to determine how far the hopes or confident expectation of immortality should reasonably be diminished by a consideration of the more obscure and gloomy parts of the moral scene, a valuable test by which to try the arguments of Christian philosophers, is afforded by the recorded opinions of heathens,—and not of the reflecting few only, but of the reckless multitude also,—on the subject of Natural Religion. For there was nothing to create any prejudice (if we may so speak), in the minds of the

Digitized by Google

heathen, in favour of Natural Religion, except the uncertain hints which they derived from oral and unauthoritative tradition: and their voice may therefore justly be esteemed the true voice of fallen and unaided man. The Christian philosopher approaches the subject with his eyes purged and cleared by the euphrasy and rue of the Gospel.

The opinions entertained by the mass of the common people of pagan antiquity, whether among the more civilized or the semi-barbarous nations, are fully as important as those of the philosophers: for as we ought to call in question the correctness of our conclusions, with a critical jealousy, in every particular instance in which they go beyond those of heathen philosophers, so should we question the tenets of the philosophers themselves, when their truth was admitted and believed only by an inconsiderable train of disciples. "He only discovers, who proves;" and notwithstanding the inveterate blindness of men,—their love of darkness rather than light,—the number of its advocates is in *speculative* matters at least, some test of the truth of an opinion. And the belief in man's immortality, had it been far more firmly established among the heathen nations than it has proved to be, would still have been a matter of speculation, not of practice. Even in this country, where the doctrine is established on a foundation that can never be moved, and enforced by threats and promises of a most appalling or a most alluring

Digitized by Google

character, there are many professed believers to whom it is little more than matter of speculation.

To a consideration of the opinions of the heathen, therefore, we now proceed.

CHAPTER II.

SENTIMENTS OF THE HEATHEN ON NATURAL RELIGION.

IT is very remarkable, that many of those facts and phenomena which have suggested the lowest species of Natural Religion—if the superstitions which prevail among men who have relapsed into a state of barbarism* may be so termed,—are, in the system of Natural Religion which recommends itself to minds instructed by civilization and Christianity, to be reckoned rather among the *permitted exceptions*, than as coming within those established and general principles of the Divine administration, from which the character of the Supreme Governor is to be collected. It is the unusual rather than the ordinary phenomena of nature, and those which are

* The supposition of an original state of barbarism is of course inconsistent with the Mosaic history: and independently of this, modern researches have made it highly probable that men *never* emerge from the lowest state of barbarism, without the assistance and example of more civilized neighbours. See Sumner's Records of Creation. Vol. I.

Digitized by Google

calamitous, rather than those which are beneficial, which first strike upon the mind of man, and impel him to believe in the existence of invisible beings,* or *spirits*. It is not the refreshing breeze, the genial shower, the daily sunlight, but the hurricane, the waterspout, and the eclipse; not the wide spread luxury of health, the vigour and utility of reason, the charm of fancy, but the ravages of plague, and pestilence, and blight, the imbecility of the idiot, the wild ravings of the maniac, that remind men of the existence of spiritual influences and of supernatural powers: and since in these, considered by themselves, and without reference to the general laws, of which they are the occasional effects, is manifest neither benevolence of intention, nor unity of design, the religion of the savage, incapable of looking beyond them, into general laws or general consequences, consists in the dread and the worship of one or more malevolent deities, whose anger is to be disarmed by prayer, or their thirst for destruction appeased by sacrifices.

"Almost the entire of the religion of the Pagan nations," says Dr. Magee,† "consisted in

---

* This was written "invisible *agents*;" but the word does not imply mind. The wind is an invisible agent, but having no proper unity, is not a "being." It is mind, and mind alone, which can give any unity to material masses.

† On the Atonement. Dissert. V. p. 96. His statement is perhaps too general. The rites were chiefly of deprecation; but the religion contained also doctrines of a more liberal and encouraging character.

Digitized by Google

rites of *deprecation*. *Fear* of the Divine displeasure seems to have been the leading feature in their religious impressions; and in the diversity, the costliness, and the cruelty, of their sacrifices they sought to appease gods, to whose wrath they felt themselves exposed." And further on: "We find the reflecting Tacitus pronounce 'that the gods interfere in human concerns but to punish:' and Pliny, speaking of the deification of death, diseases, and plague, says that 'these are ranked among the gods, whilst *with a trembling fear* we desire to have them pacified.' Cudworth also shows, in the instances of Democritus and Epicurus, that terror was attached to the notion of a divine existence: and that it was with a view to get free from this terror, that Epicurus laboured to remove the idea of a providential administration of human affairs. The testimony of Plato is likewise strong to the same purpose: speaking of the punishment of wicked men, he says: 'All these things hath Nemesis decreed to be executed in the second period, by the ministry of vindictive terrestrial demons, who are overseers of human affairs; *to which demons the Supreme God hath committed the government of this world.*' 'Conformably with this character of their gods, we find the worship of many of the heathen nations to consist in mortification and suffering, in cutting their flesh with knives, and scorching their limbs with fire. Of these unnatural and inhuman exercises of devotion ancient history supplies numberless

Digitized by Google

instances. In the worship of Baal, as related in the Book of Kings, and in the consecration of Moloch as practised by the Ammonites, and not unfrequently by the Hebrews themselves, the Sacred Volume affords an incontestable record of this diabolical superstition. Similar practices are attested by almost every page of the profane historian." * * * "And it deserves to be remarked, that these unnatural rites, together with that most unnatural of all—human sacrifice—are pronounced by Plutarch, to have been instituted for the purpose of averting the wrath of malignant demons." "Thus the Gentile religion, in early ages, evidently appears to have been a religion of *fear*. Such has it been found likewise in later times; and such it continues to this day."—"From this enumeration of facts," he concludes, after quoting a very considerable number of authorities both ancient and modern, "it seems not difficult to decide, whether the dictate of untutored reason be, the conviction of the DIVINE BENEVOLENCE, and the persuasion that the Supreme Being is to be conciliated by good and virtuous conduct alone."

It is necessary to insist upon the conclusion to which Dr. Magee has arrived; inasmuch as it goes far to decide the whole question of the moral probability of another state of existence. Until, lifting our thoughts from nature up to nature's God, we can discern a Being rather to be *loved* than feared, there can be no hope, that

Digitized by Google

man, upon his departure from this world, will enter another and a happier state.

Let any man who has, by God's mercy, been rescued from that state of blindness and terror which enthralled the minds of the heathen—from polytheism, and idolatry, and the constant dread of calamities, the work of malignant deities, or demons, which could neither be foreseen, nor prevented—seriously and candidly ask himself, whether he considers the reasoning powers, even of the strongest mind, unaided by Revelation, could ever attain a height so far above that of the heathen, as to recognise in *all events, of whatever character*, the hand of One Supreme God, Almighty and All-good, the centre and source of all moral and intellectual perfection ;—in a word, Whether such a mind could have discovered the God of *modern* Natural Theology? Before any one can raise his mind thus, as it were, into a lower heaven, whence to contemplate the magnificent spectacle of a well ordered and harmonious world, and a perfect and all-ruling Deity, there are several intermediate positions to be taken up; and which must each be *made good*, and secured from *all* doubt, before the highest can be reached. The ambitious spirit seeks to erect a "tower whose top may reach unto heaven," but if he set each stone out of its true place by but the hundredth part of its breadth, he erects a structure, which becomes less and less stable as it ascends, and on reaching

Digitized by Google

a certain height, must inevitably fall to the ground.

The first great doctrine to be established,—of which the heathen worshippers of malignant demons were utterly ignorant—the foundation stone of the tower, is THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD; the centralization of all power, legislative and executive, in one Supreme Governor of the world. For there is no other doctrine than this, by which the existence of evil can be so explained, as to give man even a slender hope of its final removal. Admitting as we may and must admit, that *there is a Governor* of the world, that there is a superior Being, who has some power on the earth, who does justice and loves mercy, unless this Being be indeed *Supreme*, "to whom shall we go," in reliance that he will originate a better system than this world presents? If the evils that now prevail, (and whatever evil beings reason, unaided by revelation, may point out), prevail by their own might *now*, then can we have no hope that good will be triumphant. Our only hope must be, that there is one absolute King, who tolerates, for reasons of his own, and for a time only, the rebellion of his subjects. The doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead, the existence of one "Lord of ALL power and might," including, as it does, the doctrine of the *permission of evil*, must first be established. And if this whole doctrine can be made out, then we can decide that since evil does not exist of necessity, all that evil

Digitized by Google

which seems to be inherent in the present constitution of the world, *may be* done away, either by a change in that constitution, or by the disentanglement, as it were, of good from evil, by some method devised by infinite wisdom, without any alteration of now subsisting laws. But it is *from the present constitution of the world*, alone, that we are to judge of the attributes of God. How then are we to arrive at the doctrine which alone can give hope of immortality? Or,—to repeat the same argument in another shape,—In every part of creation evil in some form inheres, and there is *apparent* imperfection; in the mind and heart of man at least, *real* imperfection. Does this arise from want of wisdom in the Deity to foresee, or power to prevent? or, if he be All-wise and Almighty, does *He produce* the evil, and has it any counter-part in the Divine mind? or, if He love not evil, but for reasons inscrutable to us permits it (and we cannot frame a *more* promising conjecture than this), whence is our hope that it will ever be removed? That the Author of all things will ever make things better than they are?

We can go but a little way, at furthest, beyond the heathen nations in determining this great question. Modern philosophy has done much more to amplify and illustrate whatever gives a favourable promise, than to resolve those difficulties which create misgiving.

The Christian philosopher regards the manifold

Digitized by Google

evils of life either as having reference to the past,—in the light of temporal punishments;—or as having reference to the future,—as events, *permitted* by the Deity with whom no evil can dwell; and upon principles and in a manner inscrutable to us, "*working together for* (ultimate) *good.*"

By the majority of the heathens they are, and have always been regarded either as the work of beings of a nature purely malignant, whose proper office and chief pleasure is, to punish and afflict mankind: or of gods who possessed the power, more or less extensively, of conferring happiness as well as misery, of blessing as well as cursing; and who sometimes afflicted mankind from feelings of anger and indignation which their guilt justly called forth; sometimes punished them, with despotic severity, for neglecting to perform all the acts of worship required by their invisible tyrants; and sometimes, from motives of jealousy, hurled them down from prosperity, which too nearly rivalled the celestial joys; or lastly, in their utter inability to discover a better way of accounting for them, they ascribed all calamities to fate, or destiny. Not unfrequently they combined these different solutions of the problem, admitting at once fate, and the gods, and evil spirits, as the authors of their misery. There is no known system of ancient theology in which an attempt is made to grapple with the great difficulty of the origin and existence of evil; and reconcile it with the existence of a Being,

Digitized by Google

of perfect goodness and infinite power.* No where do we find any trace of the doctrine that *evil exists by permission, for ultimate ends purely good, and for a time only*:—yet unless this doctrine be admitted, (and it is not without an effort that even the Christian philosopher can embrace it), there is absolutely no hope left for man; but we are compelled to believe that the Deity wants either the will or the power to bring about a better order of things, than that which we see.†

In the theological system of Zoroaster, which was more or less closely followed over the greater part of Asia, the *first* supposition above mentioned was adopted; and evil was ascribed to a

---

* Central India has been for ages the seat of subtile and abstruse metaphysical speculation on theological subjects: and many different conjectures have been formed respecting the origin of evil. But in all, as far as I have seen, some distinct evil principle, existing independently, by fate or necessity, is recognised. In Java there is a sect of Buddhists, whose religion appears to be a simple theism; their temples have but one idol, and they *worship* only one God. Yet it is probable that they also recognise some separate source of evil.

† It may be observed that the heathen theology is not merely a system of *polytheism*—of gods *many*—but of gods not always acting in concert, and not unfrequently thwarting each other's schemes. Homer's machinery turns on this popular notion. Fate, with its mysterious influence, moulding the wills and intentions both of gods and men to the accomplishment of its ends, and directing the course of events through eternity, is the only idea they had of a Supreme providence and unity of design, and this notion was held without any recognition of the Being who provided and designed.

Digitized by Google

Being of a nature purely malignant. This doctrine of oriental philosophy "proceeded from the hopeless inquiry into the origin of evil. Convinced that this could not possibly be ascribed to the Divine agency, the speculators embraced what appeared to be the alternative, and attributed it to matter; and matter must of consequence be eternal. And then, when they proceeded to consider the various forms of matter, senseless and animal, exhibited in the visible world, and their seeming imperfections, they found it impossible to account for so many modifications of evil, except by the supposed agency of some Being, superior indeed to man, but subordinate to the Author of all good. At this point ceased the uniformity of the fanciful theory; and it branched off into inquiries like the following: *What was* this mighty, though inferior, being?—of what origin, power, attributes?—one and alone, or assisted or served by others, equal or inferior? All these points were disputed: all, however, agreed as to the independent existence of the two principles, good and evil; and nearly all, that "*the latter was the Creator of the world.*" * "The first and original Being," says Gibbon,† "in whom, or by whom, the universe exists, is denominated in the writings of Zoroaster *time without bounds;* but it must be confessed that this infinite substance seems rather a

* Waddington's History of the Church. Chap. V.

† Decline and Fall. Chap. VIII.

Digitized by Google

metaphysical abstraction of the mind, than a real object" [person?] "endowed with self-consciousness, or possessed of moral perfections. From either the blind, or the intelligent operation of this infinite Time, the two secondary but active principles of the universe were from all eternity produced, Ormusd and Ahriman, each of them possessed of the powers of creation, but each disposed, by his invariable nature, to exercise them with different designs. The malice of Ahriman has long since violated the harmony of the works of Ormusd. Since that fatal irruption, the most minute articles of good and evil are intimately intermingled and agitated together; the rankest poisons spring up amidst the most salutary plants; deluges, earthquakes, and conflagrations, attest the conflict of nature, and the little world of man is perpetually shaken by vice and misfortune." But at a destined period "the enlightened wisdom of goodness will render the power of Ormusd superior to the furious malice of his rival. Ahriman and his followers, disarmed and subdued, will sink into their native darkness; and virtue will maintain the eternal peace and harmony of the universe."

In more modern times, the doctrines of Zoroaster were brought into a nearer accordance with those of Mohammedanism; by the supposition that Ahriman was an *inferior* and *rebellious* spirit, the creature of Ormusd. And this change, trifling as it may perhaps appear at first sight, does in fact completely reverse the probability of

Digitized by Google

the final restoration of the world. If Ahriman, the principle of evil, be an inferior spirit, unequal in power to Ormusd, that doctrine remains unimpeached, on which the whole moral probability of another life depends,—that "there is one absolute King, who tolerates, for reasons of his own, the rebellion of his subjects;" but if the principle of evil can prevail *at all*, for any however brief a period, *by its own might*, and in opposition to the principle of good, there can be no sound reason for expecting that evil will ever cease to prevail. It is extravagant and intolerable to imagine that the universe should be, for any moment, without a sovereign ruler; but that while comparative order prevail in this nether world, there should be a chaos and a deadly struggle, and a continual conflict of first principles in the highest of all high places. Inferior powers must succumb at once to superior, and nothing but the will of the Supreme, who sits "high throned above all height," and whose will is the highest law, can occasion any interruption of the perfect and eternal subjection of all things to Himself.

The Christian view of the conditions on which evil exists is very different from that originally propounded by Zoroaster. For reasons which we can most darkly conjecture, and by processes so utterly mysterious that if this knowledge, THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL, were not matter of experience, it would be altogether inconceivable, God has created WILLS CAPABLE OF OPPO-

Digitized by Google

SITION TO HIS OWN WILL; and even when they ACTUALLY OPPOSE both Him and the wills that obey Him, He has permitted them still to exist, and to contend against all that is good, until a great day, known only,—as we can partly understand that the fulfilment of the period of this mystery of mysteries must be known—to God Himself. All this we know to be true, and yet can hardly conceive how such things can be. There is evil in the world; and yet God, the author of all things, is *not* the author of the evil! Though man lives and moves and has his being in God, yet has man *a spontaneity of his own;* a power of rebelling against and opposing the Almighty who made him; a power of going contrary, if he will, to the will of the Lord of all power and might!

This we know; and is not this our KNOWLEDGE OF EVIL?

But it is scarcely less marvellous that a mere creature, dependent for existence, from moment to moment, on its Maker, should have any *capacity for* rebellion, any spontaneity at all. From God all power proceeds, on Him all things depend, yet as it seems, He can detach power from Himself, and make it independent of Him. And the possibility of voluntary obedience is hardly less wonderful a thing than the possibility of voluntary disobedience. But such obedience we know can be: and is not this our KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD, that is, of the highest kind of good, moral good, or *goodness?*

Digitized by Google

But with the knowledge of "His eternal power and Godhead," the discoveries of human reason come to an end, and the pages of Revelation begin. From these pages we learn, that death has come into the world, and all our woe, through *a permitted rebellion*;—since, whether it were or were *not* possible for the Deity to make man a voluntary and responsible creature, and yet defend him effectually from the assaults of the Evil One, the creation of man was the act of God; and his fall, we know, was foreseen and prepared for.

Even supposing this doctrine of the sufferance of evil to be fully established, we are yet far from any confident expectation of immortality. Is evil unavoidable *now*; though God be Supreme, and no evil spirit can for a moment prevail before him? If so, whence is to come our hope that it will or can be hereafter done away. Or again, if the Deity permits it now, though *not* unavoidable, is He nevertheless perfectly good; and inclined to abolish it hereafter. Or, if He be perfectly good, and has the power to abolish evil, may not the inscrutable reasons which lead to its sufference at present, continue to hold good to all eternity?

The opinions respecting the nature and character of the Deity, that prevailed in Greece and Italy, not among the common people, who were fondly credulous of all the gross and puerile fables of the poets, but among the soundest and most

Digitized by Google

able reasoners, were scarcely more capable of giving a hope of the future removal of evil, than those of the oriental believers in Ormusd.* "All the polytheism of those countries recognised each of the gods as authors alike of good and evil. Nor did even the chief of the divinities, under whose power the rest were placed, offer any exception to the general rule; for Jupiter not only gave good from one urn and ill from another, but he was also, according to the barbarous mythology of classical antiquity, himself a model at once of human perfections and of human vices." In the poems of Homer and Hesiod Jove is represented as an all-seeing deity, the avenger of every species of wrong and injustice—the patron of the homeless and unfortunate—the rewarder of the hospitable and religious. Calamity and prosperity, whether public or private, were regarded as marks of his disapprobation. But in the popular fables his character was at the same time degraded by licentiousness and caprice; he had the passions as well as the form of man; and the ruler of Olympus was made to delight, as terrestrial sovereigns have since, in laying aside all state and pomp, in order to accomplish, undetected, some low and petty intrigue.

* The latter however, as has been already observed, believed in a final victory of good. But, as Lord Brougham observes in his Dissertation on the Origin of Evil, if the two beings were of *equal* power "the universe would be at a stand still;" and if they were *unequal*, what can delay the victory?

Digitized by Google

The more enlightened of the philosophers, while they conformed to the religion of the vulgar because it was established by law, and perhaps also because they conceived it the best fitted to influence grosser minds, did indeed ascribe to one Supreme Being, whom they never identified with any of the gods of the popular mythology, epithets of very lofty import. "They gave him the very same names, and clothed him *apparently* with the same attributes," as Lord Brougham has observed,* as Christian philosophers might have employed. He is called "immortal, incorruptible, indestructible,—uncreated, self-made, self-originating, self-existing,"—and is said to "have power over all things." The same philosophers believed also in the immortality of the soul; and indulged a hope (which who would *not* indulge, who could persuade himself into it?) that an eternity of calm and intellectual happiness was reserved for the wise and good, after the dissolution of the body. But their reasonings upon the immortality of the soul were extremely vague; and no moral principles whatever entered into them. They believed, it is true, that the Deity loved virtue and hated vice, and that the virtuous only would be happy hereafter: but they did not commonly look to the Deity as the source of future bliss. Plato indeed has spoken of the soul's departure to another world "*to render an account*" of the deeds done in the body, and has

* Discourse on Natural Theology. Note vii.

Digitized by Google

spoken of the incurably wicked being driven into Tartarus, "*whence they never more escape*," yet for the most part the philosophers held that the soul was immortal by right of its own nature, and that virtue would be its own reward. Socrates also hoped, and the hope was not confined to him, that the good man would after death be among the gods; and the evil be excluded from their council. For the vicious he believed there would be, says Cicero, *devium quoddam iter, seclusum a concilio deorum*,—a path leading out of the way, and shut off from the seat of the gods—whilst they who in this life had *imitated the life of the gods*, should easily return to those beings, from among whom they had come. And it is plain that the gods were not regarded as the dispensers of future happiness. That happiness each man who had led a godlike life would derive from himself, and take his place, unbidden, in their exalted abode.

It was never supposed that the future existence would be owing to an exertion of power by the Supreme Deity; that he would cause men to live again in order to punish or reward them according to his pleasure. "We ought to act in all things," says Plato, "so as to have our portion in virtue and wisdom in this world, for the strife is noble, and great the reward we hope for." The Christian reader might be inclined to compare this with St. Paul's triumphant boast, when he expected a speedy termination of his persecutions, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished

Digitized by Google

my course—henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which God, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day;" and might imagine that Plato looked to the Deity for his future reward; the more especially since his expression ἆθλον, signifies such a "strife" as took place between the combatants at the Grecian games, where the conqueror was rewarded with a crown by the judges. But Plato held it necessary to seek after intellectual excellence now, in preparation against the hoped for period, from which intellect, perfected by sedulous cultivation, and freed from the pollution occasioned by its alliance with the body, would be all in all for ever. Both mind and matter, according to the Grecian philosophy, were eternal and indestructible: God was but the architect of the world out of pre-existing materials; and the soul of man, in more or less close union with the Divine mind, had existed from eternity. Some of them held that after death it would be re-united to the divinity from which it had been separated;—whereby all consciousness and individuality would be lost; and the *man* virtually annihilated: others that it would remain distinct, and retain its personality. And it is very remarkable that both Plato and Aristotle held that *the soul cannot exist except in union with some kind of body or other;* an opinion which, just as it is in itself, and strikingly as it harmonizes with the Scriptural Revelations of a resurrection and a future spiritual body, yet renders the future existence

Digitized by Google

of the soul improbable on physical grounds. For no where but in Scripture, unless in moral reasonings which render it likely that the Deity himself will interfere, is there ground for the expectation that any body except the present will ever be united to the soul. The philosophers never imagined that the soul would enter into another and eternal state by means of a previous union with matter; receiving fresh energies from the cooperation of a body, in any sense derived out of the earthly and perishable one. On the contrary, it was a fancy of Socrates that the portion of the soul which had been in most intimate union with matter, could not emancipate itself, but lingered for a time in ghostly form near the decaying corpse, and then perished.

But the force of the reasonings of the Grecian philosophers on the immortality of the soul cannot be better estimated than by an appeal to the writings of Cicero, who has discussed the subject with great eloquence and ability, who was well acquainted with the opinions of earlier philosophers, and had an anxious desire to convince himself of a life after death. And to his opinions we have already referred in the preceding Book. The line of argument there taken is that on which Cicero himself mainly relies. Though throughout his writings he continually recurs to his belief in the immortality of the soul, and derived from it some real consolation, he was far indeed from feeling confidence. He declares that "he *does not deny* that men perish alto-

Digitized by Google

gether, though he sees no reason why the opinion of Plato and Pythagoras should not be true." *

It is perfectly plain then, that the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome did not rest the question of man's immortality upon the goodness and power of a Supreme Being. In this respect their systems are certainly inferior to those of the oriental philosophers, who distinctly recognised the necessity for some great overruling Power, to bring good out of evil, and effect the future happiness of man. In this disregard is to be found an explanation of the otherwise unaccountable circumstance, that the Grecian philosophers offer no attempt at a solution of the mystery of the existence of evil. They did not ground their expectation of future life and happiness upon the will and power of the Supreme; but upon the nature and faculties of the soul; and after death looked for neither good nor evil at the hands of the gods, who interfered indeed, as they supposed, with the concerns of this nether world, but had no control over the calm and elevated region occupied by the spirits of the just.

Very different from this philosophic view was the opinion of the vulgar. Yet even they, impressed as they were with a belief in retribution, in another world, at the hands of superior beings,

* Præclarum autem nescio quid adepti sunt, quod didicerunt se, quum tempus mortis venisset, totos esse perituros. Quod ut ita sit, (nihil enim pugno) quid habet ista res aut lætabile aut gloriosum? etc. Tusc. Quæst. Lib. I.

Digitized by Google

did not believe that any Supreme Deity, nor any of the gods who interfered with mundane affairs,—not unfrequently inflicting upon men temporal punishments for their irreligion,—were the authors of future happiness or misery. The regions beyond the grave, they thought, were ruled by gods of their own.

It would be altogether beside the purpose to go into any detail of the chief articles of the popular creed of ancient Italy or Greece. Enough has been said to show what these creeds did *not* contain: to prove that the God of *modern* Natural Theology was altogether unknown to that portion at least of the Gentile world. The most enlightened philosophers had but faint notions of the extent of His dominion. He was known to them as the Artificer, but not as the Creator of the world. Many of them believed that He exercised no superintendence over the affairs of men. Even the doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead, contrary as it was to the popular belief, never occupied a prominent place in the exoteric philosophical systems. The world beyond the grave was exempted from God's control. The course of nature, the force of destiny, were not identified with His will. Where the heathens approached nearest to the truth they conjectured, rather than *proved;* and would have been unable, had they possessed courage to make the attempt, to overthrow the popular mythology. The purest theism of Java dwells in the midst of unsubdued idolatry. Nowhere, but in the writings of some

Digitized by Google

modern natural theologian, do we find the desired union of just and lofty speculations concerning the nature of the one God, with warm feelings of devotion to Him. Probably philosophy has never yet in one instance, since men "wandered, and lost the light" of Revelation, brought two or three together, to sing praises to the name of the one true God, the Maker of Heaven and earth.* We are certain however, upon the authority of St. Paul, that this universal blindness and coldness was "without excuse:" since men were given over to idolatry, because they honoured not, nor were thankful to God, "*when they knew Him:*" having received this knowledge, it is evidently implied, by tradition from their forefathers. But how far the Christian theologians, who have, (though perhaps with the assistance of that Revelation which they profess to dispense with for a time) demonstrated "His eternal power and Godhead" from a consideration of the things that are made, are justified in adding the doctrine of future states of reward and punishment to their system of theology remains to be considered.

---

* For further observations on the religion of the Gentiles see Appendix.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

ON THE ARGUMENTS FOR IMMORTALITY, FOUNDED UPON THE SUFFERANCE OF EVIL.

THE lowest form of Natural Religion, if indeed it deserve the name, consists, as has been observed in the preceding chapter, in the dread and the worship of one or more malevolent beings, whose anger is to be disarmed by prayer, and their thirst for destruction appeased by sacrifices. The next step to this, and undoubtedly a most important one, is the recognition of invisible agency of a benevolent character. But from this point, great diversity of belief has prevailed; the evil and the good, in particular classes of events, being sometimes ascribed to *one* being, who is adverse at one time, and propitious at another, and sometimes ascribed to two beings, one uniformly the friend, the other the enemy, of mankind. A sufficiently extensive generalization conducts on the one hand to a Jupiter, on the other to an Ormusd and Ahriman. A more extensive and accurate examination into the connexion of causes and effects, while it is fatal to both these systems alike, threatens to conduct to difficulties as formidable as any of those which it does away. For let us suppose the great truth fully recognised that the eternal Power and Godhead of one Supreme Being are displayed in *all* the

Digitized by Google

things that are made, in *all* the events which occur upon the earth, without exception—nay, let it be admitted that all those evil accidents which the unreflecting and untutored savage ascribes to the direct agency of malignant spirits, are consequences of general laws, of His appointment, which so far as their operation can be traced, evidently appear to be in the main productive of GOOD—that the winds which purify the atmosphere and moderate the extremes of Wintry cold or Summer heat, are the effect of the same laws which produce the withering sirocco, and the devastating hurricane; that an occasional interception of the solar or lunar beams is a necessary consequence of the essential laws of gravitation and perseverance in motion,—these truths would seem, at first only to render the condition of man more desperate than before. The savage trusted to subdue the violence of the god of storms, the enemy of man, by prayers and offerings,—perhaps by threatenings and promisings; the more civilized worshipper of Jupiter and Neptune hoped, by similar rites, to appease the temporary *anger*, which, as he imagined, had produced the tempest; but the deist who has considered nature and its Author as far but no farther than has been hitherto supposed, while he derides all such attempts to purchase security, can only recommend in their place a stoical resignation under inevitable and irretrievable calamities, the necessary result of the laws of nature. The further the investigation of the

Digitized by Google

course of nature, and the relation of causes and effects, is carried, the more forcibly are we impressed with a conviction that THE EVIL WHICH PREVAILS, whether physical or moral, IS INEXTRICABLY ENTANGLED WITH THE GOOD, AND CANNOT BE ERADICATED without a subversion of the whole. The wheat is mingled with tares; the seeds were sown and the plants must grow together; and our hopes, if any we venture to entertain, must regard the harvest time, when the husbandman who planted the one, and suffered the other to grow, shall separate them finally. Unless the progress of years should at length bring about such a consummation, we may be certain that the field of the world will never present a different scene from that which it now presents, of mingled good and evil.

But here we are immediately pressed by a great difficulty. According to the parable to which reference has just been made, after the good seed had been sown by the husbandman, "while men slept his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat;" and these having been once sown, were of necessity suffered to remain. But, to confine our attention at present to external nature,—the evil does not seem to have been *originally* separate from the good; and even if it were, we cannot conceive it to have been inserted, like the tares, without the knowledge of Him who sowed the good seed. We are informed indeed by Revelation, that the world is not as originally constituted; but that

Digitized by Google

the enemy for reasons inscrutable to us was *permitted* to sow his tares, and a curse was consequently passed upon the earth, which took effect upon the external world, as well as upon the soul of man. But human philosophy is altogether unable, by any however careful investigation of natural operations, to arrive at this conclusion; we cannot even in thought radically separate all physical evil from all physical good, and imagine a state of things in which the latter could have existed without the former, by means of any general and uniform laws. Nay, it may further be observed, that certain parts of our moral constitution imply the existence of evil, and the adaptation of man to it by his Maker. *e. g.* The innate feeling of compassion is as good an indication that man was intended to live in a world of suffering, as the structure of his teeth is of his being intended to eat such various kinds of food as the earth furnishes. With very few exceptions then, if any, physical good and evil seem to be *essentially* connected, good often springing out of evil, and evil arising from good. And so close has this connection appeared to some philosophers, that they have endeavoured to show that the system of external nature is a system of OPTIMISM; they have sought to vindicate the Divine wisdom and goodness by proving that the constitution of things, though not perfect absolutely, and productive of unmingled enjoyment, could not be altered for the better; that no natural law, nor

Digitized by Google

any disposition of matter, at least upon a large scale, could possibly be altered in any way, so as not to produce on the whole more evil than good by the change. But man's inability to discover how the constitution of the external world could be improved,—admitting that this inability exists,—does in fact decide nothing. We have not faculties equal to the investigation. We should not be justified in asserting that by the coercion of all evil thoughts and tendencies, with slight changes in the physical laws, the Deity could not convert this earth into a paradise, in which sin, and *pain* of every species, would be alike unknown. No one who admits the authority of Revelation can venture altogether to deny the possibility of such a restoration, unless he is prepared to treat it as absolutely certain, that the prophecies seeming to relate to a millennial period will not be literally fulfilled. Part of the curse was, that men should eat of the fruit of the ground in the sweat of their brow. To fallen man the necessity for labour is unquestionably beneficial upon the whole, though attended with many and severe sufferings: and the properties of the soil and of the plants it nourishes may be *relatively*, though not *absolutely* the best. But even this relative goodness will no longer be found, if we regard the whole race of fallen man, and the present system of things only. All things work together for good, we are told, "to them that love God, to them who are the called according

Digitized by Google

to his purpose."* On such as disregard Him, we have, on the same authority, much reason to think that the world will bring POSITIVE EVILS, UNPRODUCTIVE OF FUTURE GOOD, but rather tending to increase their final misery, by increasing their present depravity. It appears then, that even with the aid of the first chapters of Genesis, to help out our Natural Theology, we can find no good ground for expecting a restitution of the world to a paradisaical state; and that the sanguine views of the optimists are in some respects darkened, even by the encouraging assurance held out to Christians by St. Paul.

But we must endeavour, for the present purpose, to put aside the authority of Scripture, and walk without its light. We must, at the outset, consider ourselves to be destitute of any positive knowledge that the moral and physical constitution of the world were ever different from what we now find them to be, of any reason for supposing that a renovation and restitution will take place at some future period; or that another world exists, wherein compensation will be made for all the evil and misery of this. And we shall now proceed to examine the weight of some of the strongest arguments which have been brought forward of late years, by writers of eminence, in favour of the *latter* supposition.

---

* Romans, viii. 28.

Digitized by Google

"The miseries of life," says Dr. Chalmers, "in their great and general amount, are resolvable into moral causes; and did each man suffer here, accurately in proportion to his own sins, there might be less reason for the anticipation of another state hereafter. But this proportion is, in no individual instance perhaps, ever realized on this side of death. The miseries of the good are still due to a moral perversity—though but to the moral perversity of others, not of his own. He suffers from the injustice and calumny, and violence and evil tempers, of those who are around him." * * * "It is this inequality of fortune, or rather of enjoyment, which forms the most popular, and enters as a constituent part at least, into the most powerful argument, which nature furnishes, for the immortality of the soul. *We cannot imagine of a God of Righteousness, that he will leave any questions of justice unsettled;* and there is nothing which more powerfully suggests to the human conscience the apprehension of a life to come, than that in this life there should be so many unsettled questions of justice, —first between man and man, secondly between man and his Maker." * * * "We might here expatiate on the monstrous, the wholesale atrocities, perpetrated on the defenceless by the strong; and which custom has almost legalized—having stood their ground against the indignation of the upright and good for many ages. Perhaps for the most gigantic example of this, in

Digitized by Google

the dark annals of our guilty world, we should turn our eyes upon injured Africa,—that devoted region where the lust of gain has made the fiercest and fullest exhibition of its hardihood; and whose weeping families are broken up in thousands every year, that the families of Europe might the more delicately and luxuriously regale themselves." "It is a picturesque, and seems a powerful argument for some future day of retribution, when we look, on the one hand, to the prosperity of the lordly oppressor, wrung from the sufferings of a captive and subjugated people, and look, on the other, to the tears and the untold agony of the hundreds beneath him, whose lives of dreariness and hard labour are tenfold imbittered, by the imagery of that dear and distant land from which they have been irrecoverably torn." * * * "There are sufferings for which there is no redress or rectification upon earth, inequalities between man and man, of which there is no adjustment here,—but because of that very reason, there is the utmost desire, and we might add expectancy of our nature, that there shall be an adjustment hereafter. In the unsated appetency of our hearts for justice, there is all the force of an appeal to the Being who planted the appetite within us; and we feel that if death is to make sudden disruption, in the midst of all these unfinished questions, and so to leave them eternally,—we feel a violence done both to our own moral constitution, and to the high jurisprudence of Him who framed us."

Digitized by Google

But there are, furthermore, in this life, unfinished questions between man and his Maker. The same conscience which asserts its own supremacy within the heart, suggests the God and the moral governor who placed it there. It is thus that man not only takes cognizance of his own delinquencies; but he connects them with the thought of a lawgiver to whom he is accountable. He passes, by one step, and with rapid inference, from the feeling of a judge who is within, to the fear of a judge who sits in high authority over him." * * * "Now it is thus that men are led irresistibly to the anticipation of a future state,—not by their hopes, we think, but by their fears, not by a sense of unfulfilled promises, but by the sense and the terror of unfulfilled penalties; by their sense of a judgment not yet executed, of a wrath not yet discharged upon them." * * * "If there be no future state"—"the moral constitution of man is stripped of its significancy, and the Author of that constitution is stripped of His wisdom and authority and honour."*

Dr. Chalmers has here not only admitted, but assumed as the foundation of his argument, that if the present world, with the great moral evils, the oppression of man, and the defiance of God, which are permitted to have place therein, be considered in themselves alone, and without any relation to a future state, they do *not* bear wit-

* Bridgewater Treatise. Vol. II. chap. 10.

Digitized by Google

ness to the Divine goodness: but would lead men to believe their Creator was one without righteousness and without authority. This is a tremendous conclusion; and one from which, we trust, *some* way of escape will be found, without availing ourselves of the method pointed out by Dr. Chalmers, even though we should therefore be compelled to take refuge in utter doubt and uncertainty. "The present world," say the passages just quoted, "not only exhibits a deplorable amount of moral evil; but it also bears witness of, and points to, a future world, where the evils shall all be remedied." But where is this witness to be found? Surely not in the evils themselves. "We cannot imagine," says Dr. Chalmers, "that a God of Righteousness will leave any questions of justice unsettled." But the God of this world *does* leave most questions of justice unsettled: and the present prevalence of triumphant injustice assuredly does not *in itself* bear witness to the righteousness of God, and to a future administration upon principles directly opposite to those which are now suffered to prevail. In a former part of the work from which the foregoing passages have been extracted, Dr. Chalmers has clearly pointed out the error of those who endeavour to reconcile perfect Divine benevolence with the existence of much misery in this world, by the supposition of a future state, while at the same time they rest their expectations of a future state upon an assumption of perfect benevolence:—who argue, that if the Deity

Digitized by Google

be perfectly benevolent (which they expect will be admitted), there must be a future state; and again, that if there be a future state (which also they confidently assume in its turn), the Deity must be perfectly benevolent. Nevertheless an error nearly or altogether the same, appears to run through the whole of the above argument for the immortality of man, based upon the assumption of the perfect justice of the Deity. The future state is *inferred from* the perfect justice of God; but what assurance can we have of the perfection of that justice, so long as, avoiding the illogical mode of argument just mentioned, we confine our view *to the present world alone?* That world, considered as one wherein injustice often triumphs, can give us no ground for hope: and in what other point of view shall we regard it, that we may find assurances strong enough to remove those gloomy misgivings which the success of wickedness is calculated to excite? The moral Governor of the world has indeed so appointed the course of human affairs, as clearly to indicate "*which side He is of;*" yet, notwithstanding that the consequences of human conduct are generally such as to mark his approbation and encouragement of virtue, He often suffers vice to go unpunished. This sufferance does indeed, to our imperfect faculties, *seem* to be, in itself, irreconcilable with perfect justice: and we are tempted to seek for an explanation in the hypothesis of a future world. But would even the admission of this hypothesis really remove

Digitized by Google

the difficulty? The answer, if we will fairly consider the matter, must be, that it will not. The sufferance, for example, of the enormous iniquities and cruelties of the slave trade, is no less an enigma to the Christian philosopher, than to the deist who expects no future life.

We do not clearly perceive how any subsequent bounty of God, to those who were unjustly afflicted, in this life, by the tyranny of man, however richly and liberally, and for however long a time that bounty be bestowed, can altogether do away the moral wrong which seems to have been committed in the first instance, in the permission of that tyranny by One who had power to prevent it. In such a case as this, the doctrine of compensation can be of no service. Between man and man, indeed, evil is sometimes remedied by the interference of a court of justice, which decrees that a compensation shall be paid. And this compensation is sometimes so ample, in proportion to the injury suffered, that he who obtains it has, on the whole, no cause to regret the inconvenience he endured for a time. But if that body in a state, which is charged with the administration of justice, should in any case where it had power to interfere in the first instance, *permit* injustice to be done, because it could be remedied afterwards, its conduct would plainly be contrary to the first principles of right and wrong, as subsisting between man and man. The intention to compensate would be no justification whatever. "It is impossible to imagine that a God of Righ-

Digitized by Google

teousness would leave any questions of justice *unsettled.*" But, if we may presume to judge of questions so profound,—does it not appear that there is some moral wrong done, by the original permission of injustice; by permitting that moral derangement to take place, which may afterwards be rectified?

To take an example of the other class. Is it consistent with our human and undoubtedly most inadequate notions of right and wrong, that the Deity should permit men to despise His laws and blaspheme His name, because He has the power, and has decreed, to punish them after death? Does not the permission of the insult to His most holy name seem to us to be in itself derogatory to the Divine dignity; an injury not to be extenuated by any subsequent punishment of the offenders? These are difficulties, which it is evidently beyond our power to resolve. We cannot discern the reasons for which the Deity sees fit to suffer so great moral evils to prevail in this present world. The hypothesis of another world is utterly insufficient. Unless therefore we are to abandon our belief in the perfect justice of the moral Governor of the world, our legitimate, although discouraging conclusion must be, that this sufferance of oppression and of blasphemy, to which we are reluctant witnesses, is *in itself* for some altogether inscrutable reasons, just and fitting in the eyes of Him whose thoughts are not as our thoughts. For these present evils, when considered in relation to another world, do

Digitized by Google

not therefore change their aspect; they remain evils, unaccountable evils, still. Unaccountable they are, even to the Christian: for, according to our human notions of a righteous moral administration, the first duty of the moral Governor is, *to prevent:* and a future punishment seems to us to be no justification whatever of a deliberate non-prevention. It is from Revelation alone that we can form even the faintest plausible conjectures, as to the true nature of the "long-suffering" of God.

Further, it is an objection of considerable weight against this supposition, of a future and remedial world, that philosophers have never had recourse to it, to explain the difficulties arising from the existence of many *physical* evils. Yet these difficulties are of precisely the same nature with those which are met with in the moral world, though they do not come so nearly home to men's business and bosoms, and so loudly summon us to serious reflection.

That the Deity, who is on the side of virtue, wills also the happiness of his creatures, is perfectly plain. We may be sure, without the express word of God, that every sparrow is under His care,—that His eye is over all his works. Of the provisions made for the maintenance of the various races of irresponsible creatures the great end and aim appears to have been, the promotion of animal enjoyment. Yet among these creatures sickness and want, and pain of many kinds, bodily

Digitized by Google

and mental, prevail to such an extent as to constitute a formidable exception at least to the general rule—that enjoyment is the end of their being. Perhaps among the enjoyments of animals there is none which seems more beautiful and more sacred, and more nearly allied to the noblest and purest feelings of humanity, than the love of mothers for their young. Why then is the panther permitted to tear the young antelope from its dam? There is a difficulty here of the same kind with that which we perceived in the sufferance of the slave trade: and in one respect even a greater difficulty. For in the latter case the agents are following the impulses of a perverted nature, and the voice of God within them is protesting still, from time to time, against the enormities they perpetrate. But the leopard has no compunction, he has in his constitution no opposing principles; he was formed by the Deity to be a beast of prey, and nothing more. And thus is the Divine sanction evidently given to an act, which to every sensitive mind is painful, and in a degree, shocking. So also is it undoubtedly lawful for man to use animals for food. He is by nature carnivorous, formed to ensnare and to kill,—to masticate, and to thrive upon, flesh: (and he has moreover been given, according to the sacred records, an express permission to exert his dominion over the inferior animals, even to this extremity.) Nevertheless the slaughterhouse presents a scene horrible alike to the senses, the imagination, and the feelings: and the necessity

Digitized by Google

for its establishment appears to be a thing to be deplored, a hardship, an evil.

Again, what multitudes of creatures, especially of the various winged tribes, of insects and of birds, perish annually through the rigours of winter, or from premature birth in a wet spring! How acutely painful are the numerous deaths which sometimes ensue from a single case of that inscrutable disease hydrophobia! It offers not even an approach towards a solution of the mystery of physical evil, that the human mind, with its limited faculties, is incapable of suggesting any method by which these evils could be removed, without introducing more serious evils in their stead. It is possible, indeed, that any change would be for the worse. Humanly speaking, there may be, though we are far, very far, from a certainty that there actually exists, what is called an optimism, or more properly, a comparative goodness, in the present constitution of the physical world. Yet the evils remain; and their sufferance by One Almighty and All-wise remains as inexplicable as before. "The case of animals devouring one another," says Paley, "furnishes a consideration of large extent. To judge whether this, as a general provision, can be deemed an *evil*, even so far as we understand its consequences, which probably is a partial understanding, the following reflections are fit to be attended to.—Immortality upon this earth is out of the question. Without death there could be no generation, no sexes, no parental relation,

Digitized by Google

that is, *as things are constituted*, no animal happiness." * * * * "The three methods by which life is usually put an end to, are, acute diseases, decay, and violence," and he argues, with much apparent reason, that the latter is the least painful death, "*as things are constituted*;" that, under *the existing system*, it is such a kind of death as a benevolent Creator would prefer to inflict. But since that system owes its origin to the same Creator, it does not render the mystery of the apparent evil the less, to argue that the evil might have been greater: inasmuch as it is admitted on all hands, that for aught we can know, there might have been another constitution of things, without any such evils at all.

And in this particular instance, it may be observed, Paley is proving too much: since it does not appear that a violent death is the fate of the majority of animated creatures.

There are then in the natural world evils, the amount of which may be estimated differently by different minds, but which the notion of optimism cannot explain away: present evils, for some of which there does not appear to be the slightest prospect, or even possibility, of any future remedy. If then the sufferance of these physical evils be consistent with the Divine benevolence, though they be all unredressed, since no immortal and painless life is reserved for the inferior creatures,*

* It would be contrary to the principles of fair argument, to seek to prove the unlikelihood of a future state reserved for man, by any analogy drawn from the condition of inferior ani-

Digitized by Google

are we justified in asserting that the prevalence of evils in the moral world, the administration of which we can comprehend far less than we can that of the physical, cannot be reconciled with the perfection of justice, unless compensation and retribution be made in another state?

But further, we must conclude, from many natural analogies,—and Scripture confirms the conclusion—that in a vast number of cases the exact compensation, the appropriate retribution, the future settling of all questions of justice now pending between man and man, which some suppose necessary to vindicate the perfection of the Divine attributes, is a thing impossible. Where, in this world, the guilty triumph and enjoy pros-

---

mals, as made known to us merely by Scripture. We do not therefore in this place rely upon that mentioned of "the brutes that perish," in the 49th Psalm;—where the context plainly implies that God will not "redeem from the power of the grave" the souls, i. e. lives, of any of the brutes, any more than of "the fool and the brutish person."

But it must be plain, upon a little consideration, that unless *the whole nature* of the inferior animals be supposed to be changed, they must live in a world very nearly resembling this, or their several propensities must remain ungratified. Such a world is their fitting sphere. How then shall we dispose of the prædacious orders? unquestionably the tiger growling over his prey, and rending its quivering limbs with his bloody teeth, is as properly an object of the Creator's care, as the lamb that grazes in the meadow. And we doubt not that it is He, who "fills the appetite of the young lions, when they couch in their dens, and abide in the covert to lie in wait;" and who teacheth the young ones of the eagle to "suck up blood." Even the

Digitized by Google

perity, and the innocent suffer from their guilt, *retaining still their own innocency*, we may indulge a hope, that a day of retribution will come at last, and that the sufferers on earth will be taken to God, and be comforted. But what if part of the scheme of guilt, or its necessary consequence, be the corruption of the innocent? What if the wickedness of the parents entail upon the children, as assuredly it too often does entail upon them, a wickedness equally great? Reason declares, that the sins of the fathers *will* be visited upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation, both in this world, and in whatever world may lie beyond it,—and Revelation confirms the terrible sentence. Innocence is in this life exposed to many irretrievable calamities; and

---

lamb is virtually prædacious; for the grass is full of living beings.

Again, is death to be painless: a miraculous extinction of a creature the moment before in the possession of perfect health and unimpaired happiness? or, if death in any shape seem to be somewhat of an evil, are all creatures to go on multiplying for ever? There is no unravelling all this; and natural reason is compelled to return from its extravagant excursion, and admit that the present natural world, and the irresponsible creatures which inhabit it, were *made for each other* in every respect. We make an exception in the case of man, not because some of his propensities find in this world an *imperfect* gratification; (for such imperfection is traceable everywhere throughout nature; and may be exemplified by any stunted tree) but because we fancy he has propensities not at all intended for gratification in such a world as this; but implanted in his nature beforehand, like the budding wings of the butterfly in the body of the caterpillar, for future exercise.

Digitized by Google

a melancholy but irresistible analogy shows, that on all except the disciples of Christ—even the least of whom has powers above those of the highest human philosophy—man has power to bring destruction, irrevocable ruin, both of body and soul. It is of no avail to argue that the innocent, who yield to the temptations of the guilty, and are corrupted, if they suffer in another world, will meet only a fitting retribution; it will still be true, that he who tempted them was permitted to do a mischief, which must be absolutely and for ever without a remedy.

Undoubtedly it is not without reluctance that the mind will admit the force of any philosophical argument of which the tendency should seem to be to render a future day of reckoning improbable. The mind hesitates and shrinks back, in fear at its own presumption, in for a moment entertaining a doubt as to the reality of future punishment and reward. The idea of insulted Majesty vindicating itself at last by a tremendous retribution on all unrighteousness of men, and welcoming its faithful servants to a scene of unutterable joy, has become familiarised to the thoughts, and is wound up with all our notions of religion. And God forbid that anything in this book should appear to have a tendency to render that improbable which the Word of God has most solemnly and plainly declared. But still it must be insisted that human reason, so

Digitized by Google

long as it relies on its native strength alone, cannot declare this awful truth.

We look abroad into the world, and we behold numerous instances of the sufferance of moral wrong, of which, as far as reason can inform us, neither time nor eternity shall or can ever do away the evil consequences. And if, in the midst of our perplexity we turn to the Book of God, we obtain no relief: we discover that reason was not an erring guide, that it bore no fallacious testimony. No hope whatever is held out in Scripture of any remedy for *all* the evil originally introduced through the permission given to Satan to become the tempter of mankind. Through that original and mysterious sufferance of evil the sentence of death—by way of natural and necessary consequence, as we may believe,—passed upon all mankind; and the word of Him, in whom alone man has any hope of immortality, has declared that in many, aye, in the majority of instances, His salvation will be of no avail. Now, inasmuch as we know that all the evil wrought upon earth by the sons of men is the work of the servants of Satan, all those particular moral evils therefore which have come in the train of the first successful temptation must be reckoned to be evils of the same class, and be ascribed to the same motives or principles—if we may so speak—in the unfathomable depth of the Divine counsels, that caused the sufferance of that temptation: and if the consequences which

Digitized by Google

Revelation teaches us to refer to that temptation be to a large extent irremediable, we are compelled to doubt, perhaps even forbidden to hope, that the miseries caused by wickedness now shall ever find a remedy. There are indeed many, to revert again to Dr. Chalmers's well chosen and picturesque illustration, "whose lives of dreariness and hard labour are imbittered by the imagery of that dear and distant land from which they have been irrecoverably torn." Their tears, their dying sighs may cry unto God, like the blood of Abel, for vengeance against the oppressor. But if the victims themselves remain utterly polluted in nature, can we dare to hope that these tears and sighs will come before Him, demanding eternal happiness as the compensation for earthly sufferings? If so, then can man be saved by his own blood; and even by that blood poured out against his will; when he is not, like "the innocents" in the days of Herod, so much as an unconscious martyr in the cause of truth. No: the pollution of which those slaves are unconscious, the alienation from God of which they complain not, will cry with a far louder voice of accusation than all their sighs and groans, calling for judgment on the oppressors who have exasperated those moral evils, for which, it is repeated, heaven itself has no remedy.

To sum up the argument which has been just employed:—The doctrine of compensation, in those cases where we may conceive compensation to be possible, does not in any wise explain

Digitized by Google

away the mystery of the sufferance of evil; and there are moreover many cases in which, arguing from the analogy of things in this world, we must suppose a recompense to be impossible. And Scripture confirms this awful conjecture, by showing us that there does subsist an amount of moral evil, great beyond all calculation, heinous beyond all conception, which—however it may contribute towards the production of some ultimate good, *beyond* its own sphere, is in itself only and for ever a thing hateful and incurable: compelling us to a belief, that the present sufferance of evil is for some inscrutable reasons right and fitting in itself, without any reference to a future dispensation.*

There are multitudes among the children of Adam—may we not say a majority of the whole race?—of each of whom it may be said, "It were better for that man that he had never been born." Such is the sentence at once of Scripture and of reason. "May it not be said of any person, upon his being born into the world, He may behave so as to be of no service to it, but by being made an example of the woful effects of vice and folly: that he may, as any one may if he will, incur an

* He ventures upon dangerous ground, who maintains that men ought to look for a future state of reward and consolation from the *justice* of the Deity. For in Scripture immortal life is represented as the free gift of God: who has "predestinated (his redeemed) to the adoption of children, *according to the good pleasure of his will.*"

Digitized by Google

infamous execution from the hands of civil justice; or in some other course of extravagance shorten his days; or bring upon himself infamy and diseases worse than death: so that it had been better for him, even with regard to the present world, that he had never been born?"* The same thing may be said of many who do not by their wickedness incur misfortunes such as Butler has spoken of. Reason pronounces the scriptural sentence upon all those who from selfish dispositions and deadened feelings deal hardly with others, even though they commit no act of extreme injustice or violence, such as to render them amenable to the penal laws of their country; and though they may through a long life pursue, unchecked, a career of worldly prosperity. Such as these neither know nor can confer any portion of true happiness, their thoughts are more or less evil continually, in all meetings where charity reigns they are foul blemishes. *Scripture* pronounces the sentence upon a yet larger number; and in fearful accordance with that course of divine administration in this world, which often brings sufferings and punishments upon those who err, not from evil propensities and wilful misconduct, but from mere ignorance and inadvertence, it declares that even of those who have heard of the name of Christ, the majority shall *not* be chosen to everlasting life.

It is truly astonishing that these facts should

* Butler's Analogy. Part. I. Chap. II.

Digitized by Google

be so greatly disregarded, and that not only the mere moralists, but even religious writers, should display such "fearlessness as to what may be hereafter under the government of God." Some of them represent all men as by nature only the weakly erring children of an indulgent Father, who knows all their frailty, and will never be extreme to mark their misconduct. Our race, it would appear from their specious representations, is advancing gradually in knowledge and virtue, in such a path—beyond doubt!—as must eventually lead to divine favour and universal happiness. And the religious writers, listening only to half the message from heaven,* regard the present world with an unaccountable complacency, as if nothing but virtue and happiness were to be found beyond it; and as if their decreed future dominion was enough to explain away all the mystery of permitted wickedness and pain. But "every attempt to explain the wisdom and the exact ultimate intention of the Supreme Being, in constituting a nature subject in so fatal a degree to moral evil, will fail. And even if a

* The Christian's book is called the Gospel,—the book of good tidings. But it may be called, with equal justice (to sinful man), a book of *evil* tidings, revealing indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish. Nay with greater justice: for the passages in the *Old* Testament which point to a happy immortality are far more numerous than those which speak of punishment to come,—and if the New Testament "brought life and immortality to light" it has, with equal plainness, revealed the regions of darkness, and of wailing, and of eternal death.

Digitized by Google

new Revelation were given to turn this dark inquiry into noonday, it would *make no difference in the actual state of things.* An extension of knowledge could not reverse the fact, that the human nature has displayed, through every age, the most aggravated proofs of being in a deplorable and hateful condition, whatever were the reasons for giving a moral agent a constitution which it was foreseen would soon be found in this condition. * * * * To this exclusive sphere, of our own condition and interests, Revelation confines our attention; and pours contempt, though not more than experience pours, on all presumption to reason on those grand unknown principles according to which the Almighty disposes the universe. * * * * Considering man in this view, the sacred oracles have represented him as a more melancholy object than Nineveh or Babylon in ruins; and an infinite aggregate of obvious facts confirms the doctrine. *This doctrine then is absolute authority in our speculations on human nature.*" * * * * But "our elegant and amusing moralists, while they censure the follies and vices of mankind, maintain that many of these are accidental to the human character, rather than a disclosure of intrinsic qualities. Others do indeed spring radically from the nature, but they are only the wild weeds of a virtuous soil. Man is still a very dignified and noble being, with strong dispositions to all excellence, holding a proud eminence in the ranks of existence, and (if such a being is adverted to)

Digitized by Google

high in the favour of his Creator. The measure of virtue in the world vastly exceeds that of depravity; we should not indulge a fanatical rigour in our judgments of mankind; nor be always reverting to an ideal perfection; nor accustom ourselves to contemplate the Almighty always in the dark majesty of justice.—None of their speculations seem to acknowledge the gloomy fact, which the New Testament so often asserts or implies, that all men are 'by nature children wrath.'"*

This doctrine of universal condemnation is indeed terrible, and one which every mind not stayed and strengthened by the hopes of the Gospel, would gladly hide from itself, if possible: so terrible indeed, that had this portion of the truth been revealed at a period prior to that which brought life and immortality to light, all who believed would have been driven to utter desperation, and like the evil spirits, would have trembled, but not repented. And even many of those who write professedly to vindicate the truths of Scripture, seem unwilling to admit the full extent of this doctrine, and to judge of the natural constitution of the world, as it is incumbent upon them to judge, by the light, or rather by the darkness, of this part of the Revelation. Thus it has been argued in favour of a future state,—that is, of a *happy* immortality, which is all these writers seem to contemplate,—"The further we

* Foster's Essays. Last letter.

Digitized by Google

carry our researches into the physical and the moral world, the stronger becomes our conviction that no pure evil exists. Amidst the numerous pains and sorrows which we are doomed to bear, we have every reason to believe, that there is not one, which has not a tendency to improve our nature, and to make us wiser and better. The beneficial effect of adversity it would be easy to illustrate by a variety of examples. * * * Apparent exceptions doubtless occur; but the general constitution of the system in which we are placed, warrants the affirmation that few, if any, direct or pure evils exist; and every pain, every sorrow, every discord, and every irregularity, permitted under the divine government, tend to the production of greater harmony and higher good. It would be repugnant then to the general plan of the Divine administration to suppose, that the scene of human life should close with suffering. * * * Is it not probable therefore, that death, like all our other sufferings, will conduce to our benefit, and, by a temporary suspension of our existence, if it is to be suspended, tend ultimately to improve it, and advance us to higher happiness? This supposition will reconcile it to the general plan of the Divine administration. * * * How is the sufferer benefited by this the last of all the evils which he is doomed to undergo, if there be no future state? Is his sun to set for ever in a cloud? * * * Under the omniscient eye of unchangeable Benevolence, no evil can take place, not eventually beneficial to the suf-

Digitized by Google

ferer himself."* It is really hard to say whether this preposterous argument is more directly contradicted by the words of Scripture, or by the daily experience of human life. "All things work together for good *to them that love God;* to them that are the called according to his purpose." Not for all men, but for those who are graciously called out from among the great multitude of the ungodly, do all things work together for good. Was the case of Judas an *apparent* exception only? or shall any dare to assert that he is the only one among the sons of Adam, whose "END *is destruction?*" The sun of many shall, most assuredly, "set for ever in a cloud:" and they will be covered with "the blackness of darkness for ever," as says the infallible word.† "It would be easy," it seems, "to illustrate by a variety of examples the beneficial effects of adversity;" and "all pains and sorrows tend to

* Crombie's Natural Theology. Essay IV. Sect. vi.

† The writer of the passage here quoted has ventured to say, in another place,—"We have every reason to hope that the sufferings of the wicked hereafter will be remedial, and will be continued until the purposes of the Divine Being shall be fully accomplished. Though there be one or two passages in the New Testament which *seem* opposed to this expectation, the general tenor of the Gospel appears favourable to it." We have here a striking proof, how treacherous an ally a natural theologian may prove to the cause which he attempts to serve. One text, out of about fifty, may here be quoted in refutation. *Revelation* xxi. 27. "There shall *in no wise* enter into the city anything that defileth, * * but *only* they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." We know that some will "*not* be found written" therein: but they shall be cast into the lake of fire.

Digitized by Google

make us wiser and better." Let the writer search for these beneficial effects among the thousands of degraded Africans still kept in slavery in the West Indian Islands, or in the southern states of the American Union; or among that wretched population whom a mistaken leniency has consigned to the most penal of our Australasian Colonies; who would, perhaps to a man, seek escape from their miseries in suicide, were they not previously too hardened to feel the full wretchedness of their living death; and whose moral rule is, *literally*, "Evil be thou my good."

Or, nearer home, let him look among the neglected children of the metropolis, trained for theft or prostitution; and mark the sweet uses of adversity among the squalid troop whom their parents' poverty or dissipation has reduced, in our manufacturing districts, to the condition of living machines. Or let him show how a man is rendered wiser and better by being rendered idiotic by a sudden fright, or insane from cold and want—or from inheriting, through the inebriety of his parents, a feeble and irritable brain.

These, it may be admitted, are extreme, though most of them are far from rare, instances—of evils, physical or moral, arising from the constitution of this fallen world; and resulting in no moral good whatever, generally in positive moral degradation. And they show us where to look for a far more numerous, though less remarkable class of evils, arising rather from the absence of some of those conditions requisite to the perfect-

Digitized by Google

ing of the moral and intellectual character, than to any positively prejudicial influence. To select one case; that of a youth of naturally good dispositions, whose moral feelings are warped and perverted by the maxims of an ignorant parent. Here is an evil done, as evidently as if that parent were, through ignorance, to feed him on unwholesome diet; an evil for which, humanly speaking, no remedy whatever is provided; but which must be, to the close of that child's existence, a thing to be deplored.

It is impossible to reconcile with facts like these, the supposition that all evils, and especially that last evil, death, are intended for the future benefit of the sufferer, and promise to mankind a state of happiness beyond the grave. If, from such facts, we are to form any conjecture respecting the future condition of man, our conjecture must be of precisely the opposite character. Men are born into this world corrupt and ignorant. They grow up amidst a society more polluted and consequently in greater darkness than they are themselves. They partake of the common plague, and in their turn communicate it to others. And though, humanly speaking, it be a moral certainty—and we have here no higher source of knowledge to look to—a certainty that they will not, cannot escape the contagion, yet *the hand of retributive justice is not stayed*, but they suffer, acutely suffer, through the whole of life, the misery and pain which the laws of the Moral Governor have attached to moral depra-

Digitized by Google

vity. Hateful in its nature, deadly in its effects, is the moral pollution around them: yet is no hand stretched forth from heaven to shield them or withdraw them from its influence; but the same judgment overtakes both them and the authors of their misery.* If then there be an hereafter, arguing from analogy we can only expect that those who have in this world received the most deadly injuries, namely, moral pollutions, will suffer most, will be punished most, in that which is to come. "The theology of nature," says Dr. Chalmers, "emits and audibly emits, a note of terror; but in vain do we listen for one authentic word of comfort from any of its oracles."

But Dr. Chalmers, influenced probably by a natural aversion to dwelling only on the darker view of things, has, with apparent inconsistency, advocated in another place a bolder opinion;—maintaining that, although no sound argument for the immortality of man can be based upon the (supposed) intentions of his Creator, so long as we give to that Creator the attribute of benevolence only, without admitting also the attribute of righteousness, yet "we might incorporate them together into the solid groundwork of a solid reasoning." * * * "It might not resolve," he says,

* When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumbling block before him, he shall die; because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin;—but his blood will I require at thy hand." *Ezekiel* iii. 20.

Digitized by Google

"but it would alleviate the mystery of things could we, within the sphere of actual observation, collect notices not merely of a God who rejoiced in the physical happiness of his creatures, but of a God who had respect unto their virtue." And we may gather from the phenomena of human life, that "physical enjoyments and sufferings are mainly resolvable into moral causes,—insomuch that in the vast majority of cases, the deviation from happiness can be traced to an anterior deviation from virtue." * * * "Now what is the legitimate argument for the character of God, from the existence of misery thus originated? Wretchedness, of itself, were fitted to cast an uncertainty, even a suspicion, on the benevolence of God. But wretchedness as the result of wickedness * * * tells us that however much the Deity may love the happiness of His creatures, He loves their virtue more. Instead of extinguishing the evidence of one perfection, it may leave this evidence entire, and bring out into open manifestation another perfection of the Godhead." If indeed in this world there were no exceptions to the rule of universal happiness, except when justice evidently required the infliction of pain, we should possess that open manifestation of the Divine perfections, which all who look into the theology of nature must desire to find there. But it is not in this world permitted us to behold such an unclouded display of the glories of the Godhead; not even in this world as made known to us by Revelation. The Creator has not yet

Digitized by Google

made an end of the mystery of iniquity;—hereafter He will, it is promised, "take unto himself His great power and reign." Now He permits his creatures to continue in a condition, often as unfavourable to their virtue, as to their happiness: a condition in which moral ruin seems to be inevitably their lot. It in no respect alleviates the mystery of this, that we are able to trace present evil to past evil. If the evil which each man is permitted to do were to terminate in himself, being the subject of an account only between him and his Maker, it would be less surprising that man should be now permitted to sin; and the hypothesis of a future state of punishment would undoubtedly remove much of the difficulty. But observation teaches us that evil, to the misfortune of our race, does not so terminate; but its mischief is often permitted to spread beyond all calculation, in every direction invading the harmony of that system—now, alas! no longer to be found on earth—in which we can imagine that a God of perfect justice and benevolence would take delight. One or a few men have power to render many as morally corrupt as themselves; and Revelation, far from alleviating the mystery of this, declares that they have moreover power to bring their victims into as great a condemnation as their own. Happily for mankind the same Revelation discloses a way of escape from the power of evil; and vindicates the perfection of the Divine attributes, by disclosing to us a higher and a future world, widely different

Digitized by Google

from this, and revealing to us the hand of a Most Holy and Mighty Spirit, whose beneficent agency ever was, and ever must be, hidden from the eye of Natural Reason. But the evils, in their great amount, remain unexplained. Many will be ruined for ever, though He wills not that any should perish. Christians believe in the good-will of God, NOTWITHSTANDING the mystery of evil.

But the heathen philosopher never found, nor can the modern natural theologian find, any other explanation, than that the whole race of mankind has fallen under the Divine displeasure, under which every soul of man is suffering more or less, and by which those who seem, contrary to the usual administration of the world, to have escaped here, will be overtaken hereafter.

This is indeed a gloomy view; and far different from that in which many natural theologians of recent times have indulged themselves: but it is far more consonant with the notions found to prevail in the heathen world, among conscientious men, and ignorant of Christianity; while, as far as it has any force, it confirms as strongly as any argument of a contrary tendency, that Revelation which, while it has made known the good tidings of mercy and immortality, by means of a most wonderful Divine *intervention*, has also declared the wrath of God upon all unrighteousness of men.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

ARGUMENT FOR IMMORTALITY, FROM THE GREATNESS OF HUMAN DESIRES.

AN argument for the immortality of the soul, more plausible and hopeful than that which has been just treated of, and founded upon a very different view of some of the evils which attend humanity, may be here considered. Hitherto, the depravity residing within the heart of man, the wide extent of misery which he is often permitted to spread around him, and particularly the moral injury which he is suffered to work in the hearts of others, have forbidden us to look forward beyond the grave, except with mere hopelessness, or with a trembling fear. But man, it is argued, has also, in the midst of his darkness and degradation, gleams of light as if from another sphere; conceptions of happiness which belong rather to heaven than to earth: and which the Creator would not have implanted within him, unless with a prospective view to a higher and nobler existence. For the analogy of the rest of animated nature shows, it is observed, that nothing is waste and meaningless; there is no contrivance without a definite purpose, no appetite without a corresponding object, no desire without a counterpart gratification. But man, it

Digitized by Google

is said, if there be not another world, would constitute a glaring exception to this rule of adaptation and commensurateness. "He feels," says Dr. Chalmers, "an interminable longing after nobler and higher things; which nought but immortality and the greatness of immortality can satiate; * * * to all which there is nothing like among the inferior animals, among whom there is a certain squareness of adjustment between each desire and its correspondent gratification."

The fish that populate the waters have no desire to penetrate into the regions of air, and the sea-birds that soar above seek not to explore the secrets of the ocean depths. Each creature enjoying itself after its kind is satisfied with its place and with the food and the society provided for it therein; and all, when their bodily wants are satisfied, secure even when in the neighbourhood of danger, and undismayed by imaginations of death, are for the most part perfectly content. And for their bodily wants a benignant nature provides so fully, that it would be as useless for them, as it is beyond their power, to "take thought for the morrow." Or if it should be necessary to make provision against a more inclement season, or for the birth and nurture of young, nature herself becomes their instructor, and under her unerring guidance they act, without hesitation or care, in such manner as fully to attain those ends, which are sufficient for the welfare of the race. Man alone is afflicted with desires which he has not the requisite powers, or

Digitized by Google

the appropriate opportunities for satisfying; he alone is discontented with his lot, desiring to explore regions beyond his reach, perplexed by difficulties which he has capacity enough to comprehend and feel, but not enough to resolve, turning from all which earth can offer in search of some higher and better happiness. In the words of Dr. Chalmers, "man alone labours under the discomfort of an incongruity between his circumstances and his powers; and unless there be new circumstances awaiting him in a more advanced state of being, he, the noblest of nature's products here below, would turn out to be the greatest of her failures."

Dr. Chalmers has even called this argument a "*proof* for the immortality of the soul." Now such an argument, at least when taken in its most general form, and pushed to its furthest extent, would go to render probable the future existence of the whole human race, under circumstances such as to promote the gradual but unceasing advancement of every individual in knowledge, virtue, and happiness. But the righteousness of God, as we know from Revelation, will not be thus evaded, nor death thus easily disarmed of its sting: and it is strange that so very flattering a view of the supposed destinies of our race, as made known by mere natural theology, should be entertained by one, who can hear in the oracles of nature "no word of comfort," but only a "note of terror;" and who declares, that natural theology is "*wholly unable* to disperse

Digitized by Google

the obscurity, which rests on the hopes and the destiny of our species." *

In truth, this argument is usually stated in far too general terms, being made to extend to a great number of points of difference between man and the inferior animals of such a kind that we cannot reasonably expect a completion of the analogy by any future dispensation: while the only difference on which, if it be actually found to exist, such an expectation *can* be founded, has been generally but little regarded.

It seems to be obvious enough,—and it materially diminishes the force of the argument—that it is *not every* desire which the heart of man can form, and for which, in his present circumstances, he finds none, or only a partial gratification, which can be gratified in another world consistently with the righteousness of God. There is an ambition, for instance, a love of unjust supremacy, which, had it commensurate power, would render all men the slaves or the victims of its tyrannous will, which would fain "cast abroad the rage of its wrath, and behold every one that is proud and abase him;"—a spirit which, enduring fellowship with none, if the whole earth were subjected to its sway, would covet a larger and more absolute dominion still. And there is a desire of forbidden knowledge and power over

* Bridgewater Treatise. The last chapter: and one of the most valuable in the whole work.

Digitized by Google

the material and the spiritual world, which would intrude into all secrets, not merely using, but controlling and reversing the laws of nature, and seeking by mysterious rites to compel beings of superhuman power to become its oracles and its servants. All such desires are unlawful now, and assuredly will never be gratified. Plainly, then, it is not a mere incongruity or inadequacy of this present world to meet *all* the large and ambitious desires of man, which can furnish an argument for another state. Therefore, under the government of a God of righteousness, no future state can be supposed, which would altogether complete the analogy between man and the rest of the animated creation. For *every* desire of the lower animals, as it has been observed, there is a counterpart object, for *every* faculty there is, in general, ample room and opportunity for exercise of commensurate extent. But for the doctrine of immortality, it is said, man would be an exception to this law. But even admitting the doctrine, man continues to be an exception to the law. There are many whose thoughts are wedded to this world, who by means of the faculty of imagination, or through the inquisitiveness implanted in man, fasten their wishes upon objects which they can never attain in this world,—just as if the fish were to desire to fly, or the bird to swim,—and which it cannot be supposed they will attain after death. There are incongruities between man and his present cir-

Digitized by Google

cumstances, which no new circumstances, we may be assured, will ever remove.

"But all those desires," it may be objected, "which have been just alluded to, properly belong to the earth. There is a general congruity between them and earthly things; and though they do not, and perhaps cannot, always meet their full gratification here, yet such a world as this is the only kind of world which can afford them any appropriate theatre. But it is otherwise with the desire of immortality."

Surely the mere desire of eternal felicity cannot demand, as of right, its infinite gratification. It may be entertained as well by the bad, as by the good. But strictly speaking, the human mind, being finite, is incapable of desiring an infinite object, such as eternal happiness. The desire of the mind is, *to obtain and never lose again;* to have continually a present, not an infinite enjoyment. There are vicious minds, of transcendent powers, and keen susceptibilities, which shrink with horror from the idea of annihilation, and which long to expatiate for ever in scenes of adventurous delight, with a passion less pure, but not less intense, than that of the most devout adorer of the God of nature, who hopes hereafter to find the Being searched for here in vain. But such minds will *not* be gratified. It is not, therefore, merely because desires are too large for this earth, that we are entitled to expect they will receive their counterpart in an eternal world.

Digitized by Google

It is the moral quality of the object desired which alone can furnish a solid ground of hope. It is extravagant to speak of desires which "nought but immortality and the greatness of immortality can satiate," as in themselves more noble than others, even if such desires be possible. For nothing is desirable for ever which is not also desirable for a limited time. Eternity is not in itself an object of human wishes,—a man might as well be said to desire an hour as to desire eternity,—but something which we conceive cannot but be desirable at every instant of time. The wish for immortality is merely the wish *to live and never die.* But unless our desire be for a life such as cannot be lived upon earth, and, moreover, a life consisting in the enjoyment of things pure and good, in which a pure and good God can be pleased, we cannot hope, on the ground of any analogy, that our desire will be gratified.

If it were to be found that the occupants of the sea had in general a desire to fly, fancied they should find more pleasure in the air, and had a dread of annihilation, we should have some sort of argument for expecting for them a future state. But if it were known that these creatures were corrupt and vicious, and did in the vast majority of instances desire things and lead lives displeasing to their Creator, we should pause to enquire into the moral quality of the aerial life they desired, and decide by reference to that only. It is be-

Digitized by Google

cause desires are too good, not because they are too great, for this earth, that we may hope for their future gratification.

The life desired must be such as *cannot be lived on earth.* For if it could be passed on earth, even in a few instances, the analogy of nature would not entitle us to expect more. For as far as we can see, the lives passed on earth by the inferior creatures are all pleasing to the Creator, yet in many instances the individual does not attain to the gratification of the desires which belong to his kind. Many of them die young: but we do not expect they will be restored to life; nor do we expect that those which are most fully formed for the enjoyments destined for them by their Maker, will live for ever. But here, however, in the case of man, a new element enters into the moral calculation,—that dread of annihilation which has been just alluded to. Would the Deity destroy a creature capable not merely of enjoying a pure happiness, and leading a good life, but also capable of a hope that it would continue for ever? Does it not seem contrary to His perfect benevolence that such a hope should be frustrated? The evil which prevails in the world, the incomprehensibility of the moral system of which we form part, may well throw some doubt upon this: yet may man venture to entertain a HOPE that all impediments to the full gratification of virtuous desires will be removed in another state; and virtue will find that happiness which we cannot conceive to be perfect, unless accom-

Digitized by Google

panied with an assurance that it will never be taken away. Here, therefore, at length we do find, as heathen philosophers have found before, some, though but a faint probability, that a future life of happiness is reserved for some of the human race.

But is it so very evident that man has in his constitution desires incapable of adequate exercise upon earthly things, and, moreover, so pure and good, as of themselves to claim from the justice and benevolence of God, a nobler and larger theatre upon which to display themselves? Before entering upon this serious question, it must be premised, that the principles in the human constitution, which are to yield a promise of immortality, must become subjects of consciousness to the individual, and, moreover, be called into some degree of exercise during life on earth. Otherwise we are not entitled, according to the analogy of the rest of creation, to expect a future developement of them in the case of that individual. We have no right to argue in favour of an immortality of *the whole human race*, unless the whole race does actually entertain pure and good desires, which do not and cannot find fulfilment here. We do not expect that an animal which dies young, without having tasted the chief enjoyments or felt the chief passions of its kind, will receive a new existence to effect those ends; although we do expect that the desires actually experienced by the species will in general

Digitized by Google

be gratified. This limitation is by no means strictly observed in the writings of the natural theologians; and yet without it, not only is the whole force of their argument impaired, but a future life is held out to the hopes of man, upon conditions utterly unlike those imposed by that Revelation which the argument is intended to support.

Our moral writers, enlightened by Christianity too fully to be sensible of the darkness of natural religion, and too well convinced of the truth of the doctrine of immortality to allow weight to any adverse argument, upon whatever principles it may depend, have confounded the character of the natural and unconverted human heart with that whose feelings have been chastened, purified, and strengthened, by a knowledge of the truth and by divine grace; representing man not as he actually is, but as his Maker would desire him to be. And they accordingly assert with confidence that man does entertain desires so noble and excellent, as to entitle him to expect, at the hands of a just and benevolent Creator, eternal happiness. "Man," it is said,—unlike the brutes—"refers his existence to a Divine original,—his preservation to an Omniscient Providence. He delights to contemplate the works of God, and longs for a more intimate communion with the Author of his existence." Again; "When we reflect that every breath we draw is His; that in Him we live and move and have our being; that all our public blessings, domestic comforts, and

Digitized by Google

individual enjoyments are the gifts of His munificent though invisible hand; our gratitude to our Preserver, and unwearied Benefactor is naturally awakened. Reverence, devotion, and love, with a profound submission of his weak reason to His infinite wisdom, are predominant feelings in the bosom of every man who meditates on the adorable attributes of his Creator. * * * Is it to be believed, that these pious emotions, which are the inspiration of the Being who made us, and are irresistibly excited by the contemplation of His works—emotions which constitute man's highest happiness, and the supreme dignity of his nature, elevating him above every low and grovelling passion, fitting him for a more intimate communion with his Creator, and associated with a desire to love Him with a purer heart, and serve Him with a more willing mind—are to be buried by death in everlasting annihilation? Are we formed to revere His power, to admire His wisdom, to adore His goodness, and to indulge in these pious affections with increasing delight, through an eternity of ages—are we formed thus, and is the flame of devotion kindled within us for no other purpose than to be extinguished in endless darkness and insensibility? * * * Have we not rather reason to believe, that to inspire a grateful, but only momentary, affection for an eternal object, is consistent with neither the wisdom nor the goodness of the Deity, and that our pious sensibilities are not given to perish for ever with the dissolution of the body. * * * If the

Digitized by Google

soul of man aspires to something more satisfactory, something more adequate to its conceptions, than the present life can yield, another and a better state awaits it."

This is written in a confident tone: but *among whom* are these "pious emotions, elevating above every low and grovelling passion," to be found? Shall we look for them among the savages of Terra del Fuego, or of Van Dieman's Land, who in their lusts are more ferocious than the brutes themselves, and who can scarcely be roused from their torpid inactivity, and sent to hunt the forests for prey, by the actual pangs of hunger? Shall we search in the empire of China? The inhabitants of the country are numerous; it includes at least a fourth part of the whole population of the earth. If certain vices widely prevalent there be in a great measure unsuspected in England, it is only because they are too gross and abominable to be plainly represented to the minds which Christianity has civilized. Or shall we turn to the followers of Mohammed? They believe in one God; they abjure the worship of idols; they profess to abstain from wine. But the nature of the Mohammedan paradise is well known. Its joys are probably most strongly longed for by those who know no higher pleasure than the gratification of passions common to the lowest of creeping things. Or were these ennobling emotions to be found, generally speaking, among the philosophers of ancient Greece or Rome? Not among these, certainly, who held

Digitized by Google

that while the mind was kept in a state of (imagined) elevation, it mattered not what was done with the body. That plague, which through the body infects the souls of the whole race of Adam, is not to be stayed by a philosophical hypothesis. Even they, few as they were in numbers, who hoped to obtain future happiness by leading a godlike life on earth, trusted only to the inherent qualities which they ascribed to the human soul. They did not experience any pious *affection;* they did not look up to one Supreme God, as a friend in communion with whom hereafter they would find the perfection of joy.

It is among Christians only that such emotions are to be found. But will it be pretended that they derive them from the Theology of Nature? If such a pretension cannot be supported, the argument is worth absolutely nothing. For it matters not, as has been said, that the whole race of man, or most of the race, have a certain *capability* of these emotions. The same Creator who implanted the capability, placed the creature in such circumstances as *not* to call it into action in this world. And the analogy of nature furnishes no shadow of reason for the supposition that it will, therefore, be called into action in another.

There are some animals, and the dog is pre-eminent among them, which are peculiarly susceptible of domestication; and to all appearance lead incomparably happier lives, for the most part, when they become the servants or companions of man. Are we to suppose that the wild dogs will

Digitized by Google

be provided with masters after death, because they have a susceptibility of enjoyment of a higher kind than any which their present circumstances admit of? The savage is, in this respect, in exactly the same predicament as the wild dog. His susceptibilities are completely dormant. Practically he is an animal being, and nothing more. His thoughts are confined to this world, and he is as utterly destitute of all just conceptions of his Creator, as are the animals which he destroys for food.

But if we turn to more civilized parts of the world, to countries rich in every species of literature, where luxury and leisure and mental refinement are possessed by multitudes, and the great truths of the Gospel are openly and continually proclaimed, we behold a prospect scarcely more encouraging. Let the moralist seriously ask himself how many they may be, whose thoughts and affections do truly centre in heaven; whose dissatisfaction with the world they live in springs from no disappointed earthly desires, but from a sense of the ungodliness which so lamentably prevails, and a conviction that to depart, and be in communion with God, is far better than to have all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. In the majority of instances the susceptibility for higher and purer pleasures than those of earth seems to be given in vain. Men live regardless of the God above them, and the futurity beyond; imitating outwardly the conduct of the virtuous only as far as may be conducive to

Digitized by Google

their safety, or ease, or success, in this life. Its fleeting gratifications are all which their hearts desire, and in them *verily they have their reward;* the only reward in store for them. There are men who possess natural capacity sufficient for the perception of the highest truths; whose minds for a time may be kindled with pure emotions and lofty desires; who learn to say "Lord, Lord," and to pray for admission to heaven; but their prayer is choked almost in its utterance by the force of lower passions, their "affection for an eternal object" is momentary only; their own base nature is the God they serve, and "their end will be—DESTRUCTION."

It is truly wonderful that any mind imbued with the spirit of Christianity, should imagine that the mere ability of the human mind to discover or to perform things in themselves neither virtuous nor vicious,—which display no moral excellence, but merely power of intellect,—affords a presumption of an intention in the Deity to perpetuate human existence. "The sublime attainments," says Dr. Thomas Brown, "which man has been capable of making in science, and the wonders of his own creative art in that magnificent scene to which he has known how to give new magnificence, have been considered by many as themselves proofs of the immortality of a being so richly endowed. When we view him, indeed, comprehending in his single conception the events of ages which have preceded him, and, not con-

Digitized by Google

tent with the past, anticipating events that are to begin only in ages as remote in futurity as the origin of the universe is in the past, measuring the distance of the remotest planets, and naming in what year of other centuries the nations that are now gazing with astonishment on some comet are to gaze on it in its return, it is scarcely possible for us to believe that a mind which seems equally capacious of what is infinite in space and time should be only a creature whose brief existence is measurable by a few points of space and a few moments of eternity.

Look down on earth, What seest thou? Wondrous things,
Terrestrial wonders that eclipse the skies.
What lengths of laboured lands! What lorded seas;
Lorded by man for pleasure, wealth, or war.
Seas, winds, and planets, into service brought
His art acknowledge, and promote his ends.
* * * * * * *
* * * Measured are the skies,—
Stars are detected in their deep recess,—
Creation widens, vanquished Nature yields;
Her secrets are extorted. Art prevails.
What monuments of genius, spirit, power!

And now, if justly raptured at this scene
Whose glories render heaven superfluous, say
Whose footsteps these? Immortals have been here;
Could less than souls immortal this have done!*

"These glorious footsteps," continues Dr. Brown, "are indeed the footsteps of immortals! Yet it is not the mere splendour of the works

* Young's Night Thoughts.

Digitized by Google

themselves, * * that seems directly to indicate the immortality of their authors. * * * It is by considering the relations of a mind capable of these to the Being who has endowed it with such capacities, and who is able to perpetuate or enlarge the capacities which he has given, that we discover in the excellence we admire, not a proof indeed, but a presumption of immortality. * * That God has formed mankind for progressive improvement is manifest from those susceptibilities of progress which are visible in the attainments of every individual mind; and still more in the wider contrast which the splendid results of science in whole nations, that may be considered almost as nations of philosophers, now exhibit, when we think at the same time of the rude arts of the savage, in his hut or in the earlier cave, in which he seemed almost of the same race with the wild animal with which he had struggled for his home. But if God love the progress of mankind, he loves the progress of the individuals of mankind; for mankind is but another name for these multitudes of individuals; and if he love the progress of the observers and reasoners whom he has formed with so beautiful an arrangement of faculties, capable of adding attainment to attainment in continual progress, is it possible for us to conceive that when the mind has made an advance which would render all future acquisitions, even on earth, proportionately far more easy, the very excellence of past attainments should seem a reason for suspending the progress

Digitized by Google

altogether, and that He who could have no other wish than the happiness and general excellence of man, in forming him what he is, should destroy his own gracious work merely because man, if permitted to continue longer in being, would be more happy and excellent."*

The general testimony of mankind declares however, that the majority of those who have by their discoveries or inventions promoted the civilization and increased the personal comfort and security of their race, have not been themselves in possession of any true happiness, or of that moral excellence in which a God of perfect righteousness can be well pleased. We must not look for examples among those philosophers whom Christianity has taught to form a due estimate of worldly things, and who regard the promotion of virtue and the knowledge of the Deity as the grand ultimate ends to which all their scientific efforts are to be directed. Excluding these, it is found, that the instruments chosen to carry on, by a gradual progression, the mighty purposes of the Divine administration are for the most part poor, mean, and insignificant in themselves. The discoveries of the astronomer may indeed strike us with wonder, and to a religious mind suggest many noble and elevating thoughts, but surely the power of calculation by which they are made is not in itself so excellent as to merit a life of perpetual happiness. Nor

* Brown on the Mind. Lecture xcvi.

Digitized by Google

are the immediate ends to which astronomical knowledge is applied, and to which the Deity unquestionably intended that it should be applied, ends of any moral excellence. Its chief use is in navigation. And the Creator undoubtedly intended that when the several nations of the earth increased in numbers and civilization, the various fruits of the earth or of human industry should be mutually interchanged; that so the comforts of the human family should be increased, and community of interests should secure political tranquillity, and true knowledge should be widely spread among men who had ability and opportunity of receiving it. But the merchant by whom this commerce is carried on, may be of a character mean, sordid, contemptible, iniquitous; and the sailors who work the vessels may be brutal and cruel, detained from the commission of the most atrocious crimes, as every master of a merchant ship well knows is too often the case, only by want of opportunity or by fear; and the mathematician whose ingenuity has facilitated their navigation may have been induced to exert it only by the desire of worldly distinction, or by finding in that exercise a gratification of intellect highly analogous to and closely resembling that which can be afforded by a game of chess.

"But if God love the progress of mankind, he loves the progress of the different individuals of mankind; for mankind is but another name for the multitudes of individuals." This would be true, if the progress of the individuals and that

Digitized by Google

of the race were properly the same; but they who really benefit by the general progress, making those advances in true wisdom which alone can be pleasing to the moral Governor of the world, form but a few among the multitude.

The general history of the world, as well the common as the sacred history, attests numerous facts which enable us to carry this observation even further: and shows that the human instruments by whom those Divine purposes are executed, which ultimately tend to the promotion of virtue, are often not only worthless, as being mere instruments, but must be, in the view of the righteous Deity, absolutely vile and hateful. Thus, to choose one instance, it was the criminal ambition of Rome, the desire to possess new countries from which to extort wealth, or to carry off men as slaves, that led to the re-introduction of Christianity into this island. It is not improbable that some even of the present generation may be reaping the fruits of that early communication of the truth, and making those advances in virtue which may be favourably regarded by the Deity. But though God love the progress of these individuals, we cannot suppose that He will therefore by any means overlook the guilt of the perpetrators of the acts of rapine and tyranny, who were among the first instruments by whom this progress was originated.

Christianity teaches us to form a far different estimate of the mental achievements of mankind. It bids us regard the whole history of the heathen

Digitized by Google

world, and the whole profane history of the Christian world, as subordinate to the progress of Divine truths; either by outwardly facilitating their dissemination and growth in the hearts of men, or by trying and strengthening faith through opposition; just as plants exposed to the action of powerful winds are either laid prostrate under the continued action, or acquire new tenacity and stubbornness of root and stem. Every invention and desire, every work of taste or imagination, of ingenuity or industry that does not spring from a religious source, and is not formed under the guidance of that Mighty Spirit which invisibly influences human hearts, is worthless and temporary, deserving no perpetuity either in respect to the excellence of the natural capacity in which it took its rise, or to the end for which it was calculated. Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like the lilies of the field, yet after lasting for a short season, they are suffered to wither and die. And so the generations of men spring up successively, and one after another go down into the dust,—*and their knowledge is buried with them.*

Or if their knowledge survives, it is but in the same manner as they themselves survive, not residing still in the minds of the original possessors, but being received from them by a younger generation, even as the life of the parents is continued in that of their children.

And it seems that this sort of perpetuity is sufficient for the Divine purposes. If the fairest

Digitized by Google

and loveliest of God's works in the inanimate or the brute creation are all mortal, the death of the individuals being of no moment whatever, so long as the species remains extant, we may well believe that all the energies of the human mind, wonderful as they are, and important as may be the ulterior purposes to be effected by those means, are subject to the same law, being continually reproduced in the species, but, as regards the several creatures in whom they flourished, UTTERLY PERISHING.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PERFECTIBILITY OF THE SPECIES.

THOUGH the human family passes away, generation by generation, its numbers continue on the increase; as the waves of a flowing tide roll towards the shore, and on reaching it appear to be destroyed, while yet the volume of waters is not diminished, but gradually gains upon the land. And so of the knowledge possessed by each generation but little is dissipated and lost; the greater portion is re-appropriated, and serves to promote the general advance. To such as are willing to indulge their imagination upon this topic, it cannot be otherwise than delightful to look forward to a period when moral and natural philosophy shall have completed

Digitized by Google

their discoveries, and shall be sufficiently understood by all men;—when in every country there shall exist a more perfect and stable form of government than any yet known; when intellectual refinement and liberal learning shall be every where diffused; when the languages, or the language, of mankind shall become a more complete instrument, uniting the excellences of all preceding tongues; when intercourse of every kind, commercial, or epistolary, or personal, between the remotest territories, shall be rapid and easy; when there shall be scarcely any sickness or disease prior to senile decay; and when a full command over all natural resources, and a universal willingness to share every burden upon the community and to supply the wants of others, shall have banished all poverty and severity of labour from the world of humanity. There is something alluring in such a view, which has often exercised a powerful fascination over ardent minds, and has led to efforts generous indeed, but for the most part as vain as they are generous. We can discern but imperfectly the future terrestrial destinies of man, even after having been instructed by the Scriptures, and having witnessed on a large scale, and through many centuries, their gradually ameliorating influence. But yet we may perhaps venture to hope that civilization and Christian education will extend their peaceful conquests, and triumph in the end, and lay their light yoke upon all nations.*

* Yet, as has been before observed, while the present con-

Digitized by Google

Such an ultimate production of good, by means of the natural and moral agencies now in cooperation, would somewhat lessen the mystery of evil, and more fully vindicate the perfection of the goodness and justice of the Deity. But at the same time, if we have any reason to look forward to such a consummation, we are therefore bidden to confine our prospect and to limit our hopes *to this present world and to future generations of men.* For it would surely be too much to expect a twofold remedy, without any warrant from Scripture to support it; we must not look both to another world, and to a future condition of the present, for compensations or alleviations of existing evils. Without any warrant from Scripture;—for Scripture does not declare the doctrine of compensation, nor represent the future life as remedial.

"Gradation," it has been argued, "seems to be a general law of nature. This fact furnishes some ground to believe that this is only the beginning of our existence. A state of being imperfect and unsatisfactory, as introductory to a better, is in perfect accordance with the whole economy of our system. * * * Nothing is produced instantaneously in its perfect state. Every transition, with few exceptions, proceeds by slow and almost imperceptible degrees. Plants spring from seeds and gradually proceed to maturity.

---

stitution of the earth endures, good and evil must contend. And for scriptural arguments on the unfavourable side, see Appendix.

Digitized by Google

Animals, by a similar progression, pass through different stages before they attain perfection. * * No part of the Divine plan, in the economy of the universe, is perfected at once. This fact seems to furnish a presumption that the whole system as now exhibited is only the commencement of a scheme formed in the Eternal Mind, maturing by degrees under his direction, and advancing by a gradual extension of knowledge and virtue, until its consummation shall be accomplished in the ultimate happiness of man. It is true that it is equally a law of nature that perfection, when attained, shall be succeeded by decay and dissolution. But if we find that every particle of living matter dies only to live again in some other form, why should we apprehend that what constitutes us thinking and intelligent beings, to whose purposes matter, unless subservient, is utterly valueless, shall everlastingly perish? If what is in itself impercipient and void of thought is indestructible, we have reason to hope that *the thinking substance*, which is of infinitely greater worth, will be *imperishable*."

The analogy of the rest of nature, as just above represented, does not lead to any such conclusion. Organization perishes, though more excellent than mere matter; vegetable life, and the principle of growth and assimilation in animals, which are infinitely more wonderful than organization, perish in like manner—and that not by dissolution, but by annihilation;—and so likewise perishes the animal power of sensation, *to re-*

Digitized by Google

appear again in other forms. According to this analogy, the perpetual revival of life and thought, of knowledge and feelings, IN SUCCESSIVE MINDS, is all that we are to expect. And if, as is unquestionably true to a great extent, this transference of thought be accompanied by a continual growth and progress,—an advance apparently towards some destined perfection, we are *forbidden* by the analogy to look for progress in another quarter; but are taught to regard the progress of individual minds as subservient only to the improvement of the general stock, or floating capital as it were, of thought.

On the supposition that such a future state of this world as has been here contemplated, were to be at length realized, there is just room for hope that creatures so perfectly fulfilling their Creator's will, and fulfilling it, as we may imagine, not blindly, but *because* it was His will, would become individual objects of the Divine regard, and being no longer required to make way for a race more excellent than themselves, would, by his especial favour, and some new exertion of His almighty power, become corporeally fit for immortality. Yet, in some degree, the analogy of nature in one respect discountenances even this view. For "His mercy is over *all* his works;" yet the lilies of the field perish, to give birth to other creatures, not more perfect or more lovely.

And it must be observed, discouraging and unwelcome though the observation may be, that if we

Digitized by Google

should do no more than plainly disclose a general tendency of the species towards perfection, without a just expectation that they can ever reach it, this would be enough to show the apparent intentions of the Deity, and forbid our looking for any different method of remedying the evils of this present world. For absolute perfection is nowhere to be found in any of the departments of creation. Not even in those which we believe to be fleeting and temporary: and which must therefore attain their perfection now, or never attain it at all. It is not to the purpose here, to argue that we do not fully comprehend the intentions of a structure, or contrivance;—that if we knew the whole counsel of God, every anomaly and all apparent imperfection would disappear. It may be very true, for example, that the subjection of the animal creation to various bodily pains, and the occasional existence of individual creatures whose lives from some accident are one continual suffering, brief or protracted, is reconcilable to some higher law than any known to us, or perhaps than any which we can comprehend. This may be true: yet still the evils, or apparent evils, exist, and we have not the slightest reason to suppose that while the earth endures they will ever cease to exist, or that, *on their account*, a new world will hereafter be established. We can only infer from such facts, that the supposed apparent failure of the human race, to reach that ultimate perfection towards which there is an evident tendency,—however great be the con-

Digitized by Google

trary tendencies—is reconcilable to some higher law than any known to us, or perhaps than any which we can comprehend.

To adopt an illustration from Lord Brougham.* "The problem has been solved by mathematicians, Sir Isaac Newton having first investigated it, of finding the form of a symmetrical solid, or solid of revolution, which in moving through a fluid shall experience the least possible resistance. The figure so found bears a striking resemblance to that of a fish. Now suppose a fish were formed exactly in this shape, and that some animal endowed with reason were placed upon a portion of its surface, say at the narrow part, where the broad portion or end of the moving body was opposed, or seemed as if it were opposed to the surrounding fluid when the fish moved—the reasoner would at once conclude that the contrivance of the fish's form was very inconvenient and inartificial, and that nothing could be much worse adapted for easy movement through the waters: but if afterwards permitted to view the whole body of the fish, what had seemed a defect and evil, not only would appear plainly to be none at all, but it would be manifest that this seeming evil or defect was a part of the most perfect and excellent structure, which it was possible even for Omnipotence and Omniscience to have adopted."

Let us make only a slight change in this supposed case: and place at the front of the head of

* Dissertations. Vol. II. page 79.

Digitized by Google

the fish an animal not only capable of reasoning upon the form of that part of the moving surface with which it was acquainted, but also suffering some inconvenience from the forcible resistance and the rapid motion of the fluid at that part. Such an animal would be just in the same predicament, it is conceived, as the human race; it would be suffering a certain evil, under conditions apparently similar to those from which moral evils arise in the world of humanity. And a more enlarged knowledge could only enable the animal to come to the conclusion,—that the evil it suffered was unavoidable—was reconcilable with perfect wisdom,—AND WOULD NEVER BE REMOVED.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE ARGUMENT FROM MORAL DERANGEMENT.

"BY inspecting a mechanism," observes Dr. Chalmers,* "we can infer both the original design of Him who framed it, and the derangement it has subsequently undergone; even as by the inspection of a watch we can infer, from the place of command which its regulator occupies, that it was made for the purpose of moving regu-

* Bridgewater Treatise. Vol. II. chap. 10.

Digitized by Google

larly; and that, notwithstanding the state of disrepair and aberration into which it may have fallen. And so, by the obvious place of moral supremacy which is occupied by the Conscience of man in his moral system, we can infer that virtue was the proper and primary design of his creation; and that, notwithstanding the actual prevalence of obviously different principles over the habits and history of his life. * * * * It is from the native and proper tendency of aught which is made, that we conclude as to the mind and disposition of the Maker; and not from the actual effect, when that tendency has been rendered abortive by the extrinsic operation of some disturbing force on an else goodly and well going mechanism. The original design of the Creator may be read in *the natural, the universal tendency of things;* and surely it speaks strongly both for His benevolence and His righteousness, that nothing is so fitted to ensure the general happiness of society as the general virtue of them who compose it. And if, instead of this, we behold a world ill at ease with its many heart burnings and many disquietudes, the fair conclusion is that the beneficial tendencies which have been established therein, and which are therefore due to the benevolence of God, have been all thwarted by the moral perversity of man. The compound lesson to be gathered from such a contemplation is, that God is the friend of human happiness, but the enemy of human vice,—seeing He hath set

Digitized by Google

up an economy in which the former would have grown up and prospered universally, had not the latter stepped in and overborne it."

It is impossible not to suspect that these observations, true and just as they are in a great degree, rest upon a foundation laid not by mere reason, but by the Scriptures; and form no part of the system of natural theology which could recommend itself to a mind unaided by Revelation. For they assume, as an undoubted truth, that moral good and evil proceed from entirely distinct sources; that man is not as his Creator made him, but is a creature cast down from a higher estate. The mechanism is represented as deranged, not through any original defect in its construction, but through an external violence. Such is the doctrine of Scripture: but mere reason cannot establish it, though there may be some good ground for a conjecture that some such disaster has occurred. It is only while the rest of the mechanism continues in correct order that the moral or the material regulator can duly perform its functions. It cannot maintain the action of the machine, nor prevent derangement of its parts. And if we should be wrong in inferring from the presence in a watch of a regulator, calculated to control the movement for an indefinite time, that the watch would continue to move, and would remain in order for an indefinite time, unless interfered with from without, should we not also be wrong in inferring from the presence of Conscience in the moral system, that derange-

Digitized by Google

ment would never occur therein, except from some extrinsic cause?

"It were surely far juster," says Dr. Chalmers, "in arguing for the Divine character, that we founded our interpretation on the happiness which man's original constitution is fitted to secure for him, than on the misery which he suffers from that constitution having been in some way perverted."

But unless reason can show that the perversion has an extrinsic origin, we must take man simply as we now find him; and in arguing for the Divine character found our interpretation alike upon the happiness and upon the misery which spring from the man's present constitution.

Yet, as was observed in a preceding chapter,* if the moral mechanism be still in the hands, and liable to the interference of the Maker, we may entertain a HOPE of the future remedy of defects, unavoidably resulting from the principles on which it was originally framed.

Assuming then that without a Revelation we cannot know whether the moral disorder now prevailing existed from the first, or not; nor whether its introduction should be ascribed to an extrinsic cause, or to some original imperfection, —we have yet some room for an expectation that an interference of the Creator may remove it. And indeed, if the moral evil exist under the

* Book II. Chap. I. page 121.

Digitized by Google

condition last mentioned, and be the result of an original liability to derangement from internal causes, it does not appear that there is less room for hope than upon the contrary supposition. It does not seem less likely that the Maker should restore action to a watch, after its movements have been stopped by the rusting of some of the wheels, or by the unwinding of the main-spring, than after it has been injured by some force from without. Nor is this rendered more improbable, if we were to know that the Maker could, had he chosen, have constructed the machine so as to be capable of perpetual motion, without suffering at all from the imperfection of materials; and could have prevented, had he seen fit, any external injury.

To whatever cause we ascribe the moral derangement, we are compelled to draw from it a melancholy conclusion. "There is a state which the mind of man may attain, in which there is such a disruption of its moral harmony, that no power appears in the mind itself capable of restoring it to a healthy condition. This important fact in the philosophy of human nature has been already recognised, from the earliest ages, on the mere principles of human science. It is distinctly stated by Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics, where he draws a striking comparison between a man who being first misled by sophistical reasonings has gone into a life of voluptuousness under an impression that he was doing no wrong,—and

Digitized by Google

one who has followed the same course in opposition to his own moral convictions. The former he contends might be reclaimed by argument; the latter he considers as incurable. In such a state of mind therefore it follows by an induction which cannot be controverted, either that the evil is irremediable and hopeless, or that we must look for a power from without the mind which may afford an adequate remedy. We are thus led to perceive the adaptation and the probability of the provisions of Christianity, where an influence is indeed disclosed to us, capable of restoring the harmony which has been lost, and raising man anew to his place as a moral being. We cannot hesitate to believe that the power, who framed the wondrous fabric, may thus hold intercourse with it, and redeem it from disorder and ruin. On the contrary, it accords with the highest conceptions we can form of the Deity, that he should thus look upon his creatures in their hour of need. * * Sound philosophy teaches us, that there is a state in which nothing less than such a complete transformation can restore the man to a healthy moral condition, and that for producing it nothing will avail but an influence from without the mind; a might and a power from the same Almighty One who originally framed it. Philosophy teaches in the clearest manner that a portion of mankind require such a transformation;—Christianity informs us that it is required by all. When the inductions of science and the dictates of Revelation harmonize to this

Digitized by Google

extent, who shall dare to assert that the latter are not truth? Who that places himself in the presence of a Being of infinite purity, will say,—he requires not such a change; or that for the production of it he requires no agency beyond the resources of his own mind? If none be found who is entitled to believe he forms the exception, we are forced into the acknowledgment of the truth so powerfully impressed upon us in the sacred writings, that in the eye of the Almighty One, no man in himself is righteous;—and that his own power avails not for restoring him to a state of moral purity."* And we are forced into the acknowledgment of a further truth: a truth of incalculable importance; and the omission of which from many writings on the immortality of the soul, vitiates all the rest, and tends to induce impressions upon the too easily satisfied mind of man, directly hostile to the interests of practical Christianity—that unless the Deity should in His mercy vouchsafe to interfere before death, to restore the moral purity of man, we are forbidden to hope that He will interfere after death, to restore life to man. Such an interference, we know from Scripture, was destined from the first, has actually been made, is still in active operation. Reason can show our need of it, but can never prove its existence, nor do more than establish a slender, even a desperate hope that it might one day be made known. But

* Abercrombie on the Moral Feelings. Part II. page 132.

Digitized by Google

they who, upon principles which presuppose no knowledge of this, promise man an immortality of more perfect existence, are not laying a foundation upon the true corner stone, are building a house upon the sand. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise FROM THE DEAD; and Christ shall give thee light," says the warning voice of Scripture; but our too easy moralists and natural theologians, not being with Him, are against Him; are lulling the apprehensions of men by vain speculations; and like the Old Serpent are instilling into the minds of their too credulous hearers, under the disguise of wisdom, and with the form of knowledge, the fatal doctrine, that man may eat the fruit; but "he shall not surely die."

The systems of natural religion present at many points difficulties, which are insuperable by reason; and which Revelation removes, only to introduce analogous and sometimes greater difficulties in their stead. Such a difficulty lies over the whole question, in part created by Scripture, as to the future condition of the heathen, which on account of its relation to this part of our subject, has been briefly considered in another place.* We never can know how far they who have, comparatively speaking, walked uprightly in this present world, by the light of nature, or with the addition of a very imperfect form of Revelation,

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

may hereafter be accepted for the sake of Christ. But our general view of the condition of the heathen must undoubtedly be a gloomy one. And, Revelation apart, we are in an analogous difficulty. We never can know how far they who have fallen but little below the standard of moral purity which we, arbitrarily and doubtfully, construct and adapt to the condition of humanity, may be here aided by their Maker, and hereafter restored, and more than restored by Him. We may HOPE for a restoration,—not in consequence of any reference to the principles of strict justice, but with reference rather to *one part* of the truth which we can discern, the general desire of the Deity for the happiness of his creature.

At this point the author must lay down the inquiry; leaving it to each reader to determine or to conjecture for himself, according to the disposition of his mind, towards hope or towards fear: only reminding him that it appears from Scripture, that the truest, if not the most natural conclusion to be formed without the aid of Scripture, is, that happiness hereafter is to be looked for, through some interference first made here; and originating in some entirely unmerited and freely given mercy of God.

Digitized by Google

BOOK III.

THE FUTURE STATES AS REVEALED IN SCRIPTURE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

IN the preceding Book, the fundamental truths of Natural Religion,—the power, wisdom, and goodness of God, and the moral responsibility and actual guilt of man, were assumed to furnish the only basis for any probable conjectures that some future states were reserved for man: and it was contended that the aspect of the moral world, such as it must appear to one ignorant or regardless of Revelation, does *not* completely vindicate the perfection of the Divine attributes, nor sufficiently declare His intentions towards man, to establish any solid ground of comfort: that it speaks not of remedial love, of intervening mercy, of ultimate salvation; but merely convinces us of our own natural helplessness and hopelessness, and of our inability to solve even in part the fearful mystery of evil,—of depravity, pain, and death,—by the help of that doctrine of Divine permission, which alone can afford us hope,—though not, even then, *certainty*,—of its ultimate removal. But in this Book the authority of Revelation is to be called in, to establish on a

Digitized by Google

firm foundation that great argument, which justifies the ways of God to men.

Having in Scripture ample assurance of the immortality hitherto so darkly seen, our enquiries must respect only the nature and conditions, not the probability, of the immortal life. It will appear more and more evidently as we proceed, that the futurity of which moral reasonings afford a dubious hope, and that which revelation makes certain, are not one and the same; that beyond the mere fact that *there is* a life to come, the truths declared in Scripture differ in many and important particulars from the conjectures of human reason; that the *natural* state of man is more desperate than he has ever been willing to believe; that without a "regeneration," which philosophy could at the utmost only hope for, none can enter into the kingdom of God; that "man has no life in him, except it be given him from above;" and that the immortality which *is* opened to him is fenced off, so to speak, by conditions far more strictly exclusive than any which our moral feelings could lead us to anticipate, and such that no physical investigation could possibly suggest their existence.

In such a future world as principles merely physical may be supposed to render probable, the virtuous and the vicious would equally participate; in such future worlds as our moral feelings may lead us to hope for or to dread, those who had been virtuous on earth must be supposed to live, for an indefinite but probably endless period, in

Digitized by Google

the undisturbed enjoyment of a high degree of happiness; while the vicious would either suffer a total annihilation *at once*, or would first have to endure certain temporary punishments proportioned to their guilt; or would undergo a course of purifying discipline, in order to restore them to a state nearly allied and gradually approximating to that of those who had led (comparatively) virtuous lives during their sojourn on earth, *probably their only* place of trial and discipline. But how widely, utterly different from these conjectures are the declarations of Scripture. The separation of the virtuous and the vicious shall be complete and final, and a state of happiness shall be conferred, not on all, nor on the many, but on the *few* only who are chosen; and to them alone shall the gift of ETERNAL LIFE be given. Not only is all evil moral influence over good men to be withdrawn, but—what human reason, unaided by tradition, never could have anticipated,—the whole human race shall be separated into two classes, between whom shall be placed a broad and impassable gulf, on the one side of which shall be eternal Life in blissful communion with the Deity, and on the other DEATH, eternal punishment, everlasting destruction from the presence of God.

It was expedient to observe thus much, in the outset, respecting the future states revealed in Scripture, in order to show concisely, how revelation undoes all the little that reason can do;

Digitized by Google

how different are all the structures which human ingenuity can erect upon a moral basis, from the true "houses not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." These heavenly mansions, and the blessed condition of their occupants, and the state also of those who are excluded therefrom, will hereafter furnish matter for much serious inquiry: but inasmuch as Scripture also throws much light upon the *present* as well as future nature of man, and teaches us that immortal life, though the free gift of God to some at the general resurrection, must still be in a manner commenced or anticipated by SPIRITUAL LIFE ON EARTH, it will be necessary to refer to the inspired pages, in order to correct or confirm the conjectures contained in the preceding Books; and to prove further, how widely, and with what pernicious tendency, those writers have erred, who have deemed that they could reach the sublime doctrine of Immortality by paths searched out and selected by human wisdom. There is NO other path than that which was first trodden by the footsteps of the Son of God. HE is the way, the truth, and the life, no man cometh to the Father but by Him. He alone achieved immortality; He alone brought it to light, and published it abroad among the nations that walked in darkness. The saying of St. Paul, that "Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," is not contradicted by the fact that a resurrection unto life was promised in the Jewish Scriptures, and commonly believed in by the Jews. For the

Digitized by Google

Gospel of Christ was preached, although obscurely, before his advent. The Sun of Righteousness dawned before it arose.

Immortal life was obtained for us by a means, a mediation so profoundly mysterious, that even angelic intelligence is unable to fathom it,—by nothing less than the death and resurrection of the Beloved Son. Yet many who deem themselves philosophers enter in upon this sacred ground, each proposing, in the stead of Jesus, his own path to heaven, his own doctrines instead of the life-giving word, his own mode of future existence instead of the New Jerusalem. For the immortality of the soul they trust, not to union with Christ, but to the possession of an intelligence akin to that of the brutes; for the resurrection of the body they trust, not to the victory of Christ over death, to the power of God that raiseth the dead, to the quickening Spirit, but to the native though latent energy in some undistinguishable particles of the mass of putrefying flesh! They may raise their towers of clay; they may add brick to brick, and course to course, till many gaze at them with admiration; but heaven will yet be too high. They have not made Christ their foundation. And when the fiery deluge breaks forth, along with "the earth and the works that are therein," the ruins of their vain industry shall be consumed.

But before we enter upon the main subject, and compare with the feeble conjectures of reason

Digitized by Google

what Scripture has revealed concerning the eternal state of happiness, serious attention ought to be paid to the much controverted question respecting the interval between death and the resurrection of the body, the event *after* which men shall be put in possession of their eternal life: not only on account of its natural priority in order of time, but because, little having been *expressly* declared in the New Testament concerning it, there is much room left for the fond imaginations of men, and those modern philosophical speculations regarding the natural immortality of the disembodied spirit, the insufficiency of which has been already insisted on, have been brought to bear upon the question, and required to interpret the obscurities of Scripture; whereby the notions which unprejudiced minds would have derived from reflection on the inspired word have been too generally lost sight of. In the opinion of the writer, Scripture, when carefully and seriously pondered, positively confirms that sentence of unaided reason—"When man returns to his earth, all his thoughts perish." True philosophy, when summoned to interpret what the Bible declares of this state, will prophesy to man, as did Daniel to Belshazzar the king, "Thou deemest thyself to be a god, but thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting; thine end is at hand."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

IMMORTALITY BEGUN IN SPIRITUAL LIFE.

WHEN the Creating Word covered the earth with trees and plants, each was ordained to bear its seed within itself, after its kind, that so, while the first individuals of each species decayed, the species itself should be perpetuated. And we find that through the endless variety of the vegetable creation, the same law of reproduction is preserved, and though some are capable of propagation otherwise than by seeds, in all cases the life of the offspring is nothing more than a detached portion of the life of the parent plant. And thus vegetable life is, generally speaking, an immortal life, and appears to be as vigorous now, as it was in the earliest age. Yet there is only a conditional immortality; certain species of plants have become extinct, and their former existence is known only by their fossil remains. And the same law of reproduction, the same kind of perpetual life is found in animals; among whom the life of the young is in the fullest sense, and exactly in the same way as in vegetables, the life of the parents.

And we have very great reason to believe that the law of decay and reproduction prevailed from the very first, and before the transgression of Adam, throughout the whole inferior and orga-

Digitized by Google

nized creation. For there is no reason to think that only a few individuals of each species were created, as in the case of man: and that the reproductive principle was primarily intended only for the replenishment of the earth. The waters brought forth *abundantly* the moving creature that had life, and fowl to fly above the earth in the open expanse of heaven; nor need we doubt that the earth also brought forth, in equal profusion, the herb yielding seed, the cattle and creeping thing. All were *alike* intended to increase and multiply, not only in order to fill the earth, which could have easily been effected at once by the Almighty Word, but to repair the ravages of decay.

That the green herb, at least, was to perish may be concluded from the circumstance that it formed the earliest appointed food of man, and of the lower animals. An irresistible analogy compels us to believe that such mortality was the condition of *all* created things, man himself not excepted, unless we shall find in Scripture, to which alone reference is now to be made, special reasons for exempting him.

Now Adam was originally, like all other animals, a creature of dust, and, as has been observed in another place, the "breath of life" breathed into his nostrils was merely that of animal life, for it was also breathed into the nostrils of every living creature that moved upon the face of the earth. A Paradise, or garden of Eden was planted by the hand of the Lord, who "there put the man whom he had made;" not forbidding him to "eat

Digitized by Google

of the fruit of the Tree of Life." But Adam transgressed; and he was expelled from Paradise, and that speedily, "lest he should put forth his hand, and take of the Tree of Life, and eating, live for ever." When he thus lost the Divine favour, and was deprived of all super-natural aid, it was made known to him that *his originally animal nature would subject him to decay;* that henceforth he must, like other creatures, maintain his life by his own exertions, and be exposed, as the originally necessary condition of terrestrial existence beyond Paradise, to sickness and pain, decay and death. "Cursed is the ground for thy sake, thorns also and thistles it shall bring forth to thee,—which yet, for anything revealed to the contrary, it may have brought forth *before*, though not for Adam,—in the sweat of the face shalt thou eat bread, *until thou return to the ground; for out of it thou wast taken;* FOR DUST THOU ART, AND UNTO DUST THOU SHALT RETURN." This does not appear to be merely a Fall, like that which attended the expulsion of the rebel angels from heaven; but rather a natural relapse, like the sinking of the apostle Peter, when, appalled by the fury of the waves, his faith failed him.

Now we here maintain, and seek to prove from the New Testament, that man has not, and never had, any principle of perpetual life, other than that which belongs also to the inferior creation, except by the special grace and mercy of God. That he inherits nothing of the kind from his

Digitized by Google

parents, nor receives it as a birth-right when he comes into the world; and can obtain it only *by means of Regeneration.** Many persons deem that to be true of the human soul—of the more excellent part, or according to them, the "only essential" part of the natural man—which is, as we maintain, true only of the Divine Spirit that enlivens the hearts of the regenerate. And these persons commonly draw a distinction between the mind, which they allow to be changeable and perishable, and the soul, which they consider to be in itself immortal. This distinction, however, directly militates against the Scriptural doctrine of original or birth sin. For were the soul or spiritual part, or whatever else it is to be called, essentially distinct from the mind, the intellectual, the corporeal, or animal parts, and did it exist independently of them, by right of its own nature, unaffected by their mutations, being a possession for ever, as they would represent it, with which every man is endowed at his birth, and which forms an original and essential part of the human nature, it would follow unavoidably that this immortal part of man, this soul, would *not* partake of the corruption, which by corporeal descent "naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam," according to the ninth Article of our Church, and according to the whole spirit and

* The word being employed here in that wider sense which includes all who, under any dispensation, have been moved by the Holy Spirit.

Digitized by Google

tenour of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament. The law of corruption pervades the whole nature of every soul of man: a fact which is of itself a sufficient proof that the whole nature comes by inheritance, is an off-shoot, a thing naturally engendered. The whole nature: for "the first *man*," the whole nature of the offspring of Adam, "is of the earth, earthy," a thing, according to the declaration of St. Paul, altogether "mortal," and "corruptible:" "the second man is the Lord from heaven." And there is no third nature, nothing appertaining to humanity, which comes not either through Adam or through Christ, no spiritual or immortal part, therefore, except in those who have part in Him. Men may be impelled by self love to explain away such passages as declare their natural worthlessness; to deny that we are *altogether* creatures of dust, inheritors of corruption, doomed to return to the earth, from which, through Adam, we all derive our being. But the doctrine of regeneration proves, that these passages are literally and distinctly true. For it is not enough that the nature of the old man should be *purified*, that flesh and blood should be sanctified, that sin should be pardoned; the doing away of the old man would leave—nothing: FRESH LIFE must be given from above: and it is given not to all men, nor at the period of natural birth, but to those who, by being born again, "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit," become members of Christ. To exhibit this most important truth in its full extent,

Digitized by Google

and in all the relations which a reverent and earnest study of Scripture may suggest, would require at least a separate volume: all that can be done in this place is, briefly to notice the principal texts and reasonings by which it may be established.

Scripture notices two principles as influencing the human will,—the flesh, and the spirit. To walk after the flesh is to sin, to walk after the spirit is to please God. Now they who walk after the Spirit, it is clear from Scripture, are not obeying the dictates of a purified human nature, nor, as some suppose,* of a particular part of it, namely of a "soul" or human spirit, which, once freed from the taint of original sin, is capable of guiding them aright, but of a higher principle, a Spirit extrinsic, superhuman, Divine. Even the Son of God, in whom dwelt no sin, who, though partaking of humanity, was in every part of his nature spotless and pure, thus declared concerning himself: "The Son can do *nothing* of himself, but what he seeth the Father do, for what things soever he doeth, these also doth the Son likewise. * * * As the Father hath life in himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself. * * * It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth *nothing*, the words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life. * **** As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so

* Such is the error of the Anabaptists.

Digitized by Google

he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. * * * This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the Last Day.† * * * I am the true vine. * * As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. *Without me ye can do nothing.* If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

St. Paul bears ample testimony to the same vital truths. To the Romans, (chapter viii.) he says, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you—If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness." And (1 Corinth. ii.) "What man knoweth the things of a man save the Spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth *no man, but the Spirit of God;*" [for the natural man receiveth them not]. And (Galatians ii.) "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet *not I, but Christ liveth in me.*" And many other passages to the same effect might be adduced: none, most certainly, to a contrary effect. Throughout the whole of Scripture not the slightest hint can be found of the existence, in

† Raise up then surely something more precious than the bodies of His saints.

Digitized by Google

the human nature, of any immaterial part which is not fleshly and corrupt in itself. There is no third nature, we repeat, in addition to the "first man," which is of the earth and earthy, and the second man, which is the Lord from heaven.

But here a difficulty may appear to arise. If men are born of the Spirit in this world, if they receive now a nature which is not earthly, surely this nature must survive the decay of the first or natural man; and then the regenerate, though not the unregenerate, would become possessed of immortal souls. "The Scripture hath taught us that there are two principles in the Christian, distinguished by the names of the outward, and the inward man, the latter of which may be increasing in vigour, while the former is hastening to its dissolution. The inward principle is that which is born again in baptism; and being born of God is of a divine nature. Consequently whatever may be said for or against the natural immortality of the soul, this principle cannot be subject to death in common with that nature which is born of the flesh."* To this it may be sufficient to reply, that we have no reason to know or believe that this divine principle *can* subsist at all, as a separate, personal, individual thing, except in union with the conscious soul; but we should rather think that it does, and must of necessity, return—in a higher sense than the

* Jones' Dissertations, Vol. ii.

Digitized by Google

mere breath returns,—to God who gave it; and subsist just as it did before that human soul which it inspired was called into being. And had our Blessed Lord retained this spirit when in the grave, he would not have "commended it to his Father's hands," at the hour of his death.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

THE Scriptures tell us plainly that on the Day of Judgement all the dead will rise again with their bodies. But they do not inform us, with equal clearness, what will be the condition of the soul of man between his death and resurrection.

They contain some passages which speak of an entrance into heavenly bliss, or into the torments of hell, as if no interval whatever was to elapse between death and judgement, but as if the final sentence was executed immediately on departure from this present world.* And in many religious works and discourses departed Christians are represented as having actually "entered

* E. g. "It is appointed unto men once to die, and *after this* the judgement." (Heb. ix.) and the Parable of Dives and Lazarus.

Digitized by Google

into their glory;" as if they were already partakers of the *full* beatitude of heaven itself. They who have avoided this error, which is completely subversive of the whole doctrine of resurrection unto judgement,—generally regard these passages as indicative of a *previous* judgement, and of *intermediate* states of happiness or misery; although it would seem more natural perhaps to conclude from them, that there was *no* interval between death and judgement worth considering, in consequence of the unconsciousness of the soul.

Again, the Scriptures sometimes obscurely reveal to us certain modes of existence beyond the grave, which yet seem to belong neither to heaven nor to hell, but to some different region, intermediate, it may seem, both in point of time, and of happiness or misery.* And these passages have afforded ample scope for the exercise of the inventive and speculative faculties, for the imagination, and for the affections; and seem to lighten up the cheerlessness of the grave with beams too welcome to be excluded, however feeble their radiance.

And again, in many places, the Scriptures speak of the grave as a region of darkness and unconsciousness, and of the dead as buried in sleep. And these passages, which are very numerous, are among those which have led to the

* Such as the account of the phantom of Samuel at Endor, and the appearance of Moses and Elias at the Mount of Transfiguration.

Digitized by Google

conclusion entertained by many persons, and advocated in this Book, that the dead are *utterly unconscious*, being spell-bound by the powers of Sin and Death, till the coming of the Great Day.

The majority of the Christian world has however preferred the more pleasing view, and has believed that the soul, retaining its consciousness after the death of the body, is at once consigned, by an anticipatory judicial process, either to a region of intermediate happiness, or one of intermediate misery: they who have died in Christ passing into a state in which they are exempt from all pain, conscious of a nearer approach to the Father of Spirits, and exultingly certain of the final consummation of their bliss, when, at the Last Day, heaven itself should be open to receive them: while they who have "had no part in Him," undergo punishment light in comparison of that which will be inflicted on the Judgement Day, but still heavy and grievous, and augmented by fearful anticipations of the torment to come. This view attracts belief even by its terrors. It lights up the unseen world with lurid gleams from hell for the fearful and unbelieving; and is sometimes thought to furnish a useful means of alarming careless sinners by a prospect of more speedy retribution.

It ought to be kept in mind, that the opinion advocated in the first of the preceding Books,—that the soul of man is *physically* mortal, is not directly and of necessity affected by, or con-

Digitized by Google

nected with, our decision of the Scriptural question concerning the intermediate state. For if it appear from *Scripture* that man is physically mortal, this should confirm our philosophical conjectures; but on no account should we reverse the order. We must not so far depend upon our philosophical conjectures as to regard them as confirmatory of scripture; nor suffer them even to modify in the least degree the conclusions we should otherwise form from an attentive study of the inspired word. Should our philosophy teach us that man is naturally mortal, such a conclusion consists well with a belief in an intermediate consciousness derived from the Bible. For the same Almighty Being, the Lord and Giver of Life, who will raise our corruptible bodies at the last day, might well be supposed to confer an anticipatory and intermediate consciousness upon the separate soul, which by right of its own nature it could not have enjoyed. And should our philosophy tell us that man is naturally immortal, we must be *nevertheless* content to bend implicitly before Revelation; and submit ourselves wholly to its sentence, unmodified by our previous conjectures, however contradictory to them, however unwelcome to the "natural man."

But at the same time, since many religious writers *have* mixed up their philosophical notions with those derived from Scripture, perverting the meaning of the latter into a false conformity with their speculations, the arguments contained in the foregoing Books may have, it is hoped, an

Digitized by Google

indirect influence, with some minds, upon the interpretation they attach to the word of God; by showing the strong improbability, on physical grounds, of consciousness after death; and thus removing that haze of prejudice, which, like a mirage, falsely promised waters of life in the dry and barren wilderness of the grave.

In considering the language of Scripture concerning death and the grave, life and resurrection, we naturally turn to the Old Testament in the first instance. We should reasonably expect that volume to contain less hopeful views of the grave than are presented in the New; inasmuch as in the latter "life and immortality were brought to light by the gospel" of Christ. Yet we have not reason to suppose that the first Advent effected any such immediate *change* in Hades itself* as to render the language of the Jewish Scriptures inapplicable to the now existing state of things. If the dead were unconscious till the resurrection or ascension of Christ, so do they still remain. The one volume exhibits chiefly the prison and bondage of the grave, the other Christ the Redeemer;—Christ, not altering the nature of the grave, not at once subduing death, but emancipating first himself from its dominion; and afterwards at his second advent, about to emancipate his saints: not at once *giving* them victory, but

* i. e. in the place or state of departed souls.

Digitized by Google

securing for them, and making more fully known to them, the certainty of their future triumph.

Turning afterwards to the *New* Testament, we shall have to consider whether it does not confirm the impression produced by the Old,—that the grave is to the soul of man a place or state of utter darkness and desolation, of profound sleep, of utter insensibility,—without hope, or retrospect, sorrow, or joy: whether it does not leave Hades still in gloom, and reserve all its rays of glory for "the brightness of the coming" of Christ and the resurrection of the dead.

To commence with the account of man's creation in Genesis. God made man in his own image, after his likeness: but he formed him moreover of the dust of the ground; and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, made him a living soul. Now is man immortal, because he was "in the image of God?" or because "he became a living soul?" Each conclusion has been maintained; but some supporters of the one have not ventured to maintain the other. The inferior animals, as has been already shown, partook of the same breath of life as man. *The same*, for in Genesis no difference is made, and further on the sameness is expressly asserted. "When God gathers unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Though the breath of God caused Adam to become a living soul, it did not therefore give him an immortal

Digitized by Google

soul; for the effect cannot survive its sustaining cause; and the "*breath* of life" being withdrawn, the life itself must cease. It is the *second* Adam that is immortal, not the first; the "quickening spirit," not the "living soul."* But this is to anticipate.

And why should a creature, formed in the image of God, be immortal? This reason sounds strangely from the lips of such as assert that man has *wholly lost*† that image. If, as is urged by Calvin and others, the image of the Father of Spirits could be represented, to our mental vision, in no other way than through the "spiritual part" of man, still it may be asked,—why an *eternal* part? Granting even that it was wholly "in righteousness and true holiness" that man was formed "after the image of him that created him," why should man therefore endure for ever, inasmuch as that holiness is a possession capable of forfeiture? Created *in* time, man might endure *for* a time, and yet be truly a representative, in many of his attributes, of the Eternal, and Unchanging

---

* 1 Cor. xv.

† That the image is not wholly lost is certain from several places of Scripture. Thus in Genesis ix. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, *for* in the image of God made He man:" which could be no reason, if that image were wholly lost by the fall. And man is termed in 1 Cor. xi. "the image and glory of God;" and is said by St. James, to be "made after the similitude of God."

And there is also some ground in Scripture for believing that God created man in his own image, in that "male and female created he them." See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

God. For why should a future eternity be held more essential to the resemblance than a past eternity? To the Being of God Himself the one condition is as essential as the other; and still more,—why should Adam be thought to resemble God in the attribute of future eternity, when in that of holiness no longer?

Some persons have held that the solemn deliberation of the Almighty, before the creation of Adam, and the minuteness of detail with which that creation is described, indicate an essential difference between man and the rest of the animated creatures. Be it so. But while these things lead us to believe that the indwelling Spirit of God made Adam "like the Most High," let them teach also the solemn lesson, that the glorious privilege could be forfeited, and the man "brought down to Hades;" that He who made Adam a creature *of* dust, could unmake him into dust again, and "cut him down to the ground;" that without the supernatural sustenance of the Tree of Life, his living soul and body, even as those of the other earth-born creatures, were but perishable things.

It might fairly be urged on the other hand, that other parts of Scripture prove the Mosaic account to be short of the real truth. The subtle serpent was Satan. The garden of Eden is universally held to have been a place of more than earthly delights, the Tree of Life, we know, can grow in the soil of heaven. The creation therefore of Adam from the dust, and his condemnation to

Digitized by Google

return to dust, ought not to be too narrowly and unspiritually taken. But what should be our more spiritual interpretation but this, that Adam was created mortal, and fell by natural relapse? That the first man was of the earth, earthy?

Moreover, death was the punishment of Adam's transgression. "*Because* thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife," toil and pain shall be thy portion, "till thou return to the ground, for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." If the separation of soul and body be not IN ITSELF a punishment, then was death no punishment to Adam. In what consists, according to the opposite notion, the proper "sting of *Death;*" and what is "the power of *the grave?*" They are plainly reduced to nothing. Punishments may indeed be inflicted for transgression upon a disembodied soul (as upon a soul incorporate), but this does not render death itself a punishment, nor give any reason why the grave should be dreaded by man, why the soul should abhor to be left in Hades, and should earnestly seek to be redeemed from its tyranny.

It has been urged that the separation of soul and body cannot be the thing intended, because Adam did not, in that sense, die *in the day* when he transgressed. The sentence is held to involve death, spiritual, temporal, and eternal; and Adam is supposed to have undergone the first kind of death immediately, and the second afterwards. But it is not easy to show how *any* part of the sentence could be delayed, without violation of

Digitized by Google

the letter of the law. Let us however remember, that on the very day on which Adam fell, and before the sentence of his death had gone forth from the mouth of his Judge, a promise of mercy through Christ was set before the trembling sinner. The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world arrested the execution; purchased present forbearance, and opened a new and living way, whereby the decree might be virtually annulled. And if Adam died "in faith," then, in the sense of the decree, he surely died not at all; he died a stingless death, a death which was, *to him*, at once swallowed up in final victory. But this may be rendered more plain hereafter, by the light of the New Testament.

The total privation of life is indeed a grievous calamity to a happy creature, and even they whose existence is far from being happy shrink from the idea of death: but if the privation be temporary, and be followed by a restoration to life and happiness, then death itself may seem desirable, *not* for its own sake, but for the sake of its consequences; or the interval may be altogether disregarded in comparison of the glories which are expected to follow. And thus we find the inspired writers of the Old Testament speak of the grave sometimes as a place of gloom and desolation (such as to be itself a punishment to the wicked), and from which the righteous shrink back, while at the same time they earnestly contemplate a *future* deliverance from its inevitable grasp; and

Digitized by Google

sometimes regarding it as a welcome resting-place for the soul until the end of the world; and sometimes overlooking it altogether, through the brightness of the vision beyond. NEVER is the grave said to be in itself desirable, to be a place of life, and light, and joy; NEVER is death represented to be a gladsome or even a hopeful state. In the most favourable view of it, it is called a sleep—a welcome word for the righteous, since it reminds them of their joyful awakening; but not expressive of *conscious peace*, as some pretend, since the same "sleep" is inflicted on sinners as their punishment.* Very commonly it is described by negatives, as a state wherein is no thought, no hope, no knowledge, no light; but wherein man is as a thing that is utterly perished and gone.

Thus David declares that man, when in the grave, has "no longer any remembrance of God," that he cannot "give him thanks," nor "declare his truth;" that "the dead cannot praise the Lord, nor any that go down into silence," that the *faithfulness and truth* of God are not manifested to man, so long as he lies in the grave, nor his *righteousness* shown in the land of forgetfulness;" that "when man's breath goeth forth he returneth to the earth, and in that very day his thoughts *perish*." † Solomon uses language even stronger than this, if possible, to show

---

* The force of this word "sleep" is more fully considered in the next chapter.

† Psalm vi. xxx. lxxxviii. cxlvi. etc.

Digitized by Google

the utter unconsciousness of the grave. "A living dog," he says, "is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not *any thing*."* And further, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is *no* work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." Tillotson's comment upon this is as follows. "This life is the proper season of activity and industry, of designing and doing those things which tend to our future happiness; and when this life is ended there will be no further opportunity of working; nothing will remain but to receive the recompense;" etc. But they who work well, "shall be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just*." And the Preacher's words are a warning to work, "before the night cometh."

Dr. Watts, in the same spirit of equivocation with Tillotson, chooses to suppose that David and and Solomon speak only of "such thoughts and actions, both religious and civil, as are practised in this life,"—"men's present way and manner of divine worship; and their management or consciousness of human affairs;" but not to exclude "all manner of consciousness, knowledge,

* See Eccles. ix. 4. Calvin could find no better mode of evading the force of this, than by supposing that by "the dead" were meant such as were so buried in trespasses and sins, as to be unmindful of death, and of all things of spiritual importance; while by "the living" was intended such as were duly mindful of death, and were alive to their best interests! It would seem then, that a living dog is one that knows he shall die, a dead lion one that does not!

Digitized by Google

thought, and action, such as may be united to the invisible state of spirits." But surely this is a most idle and weak pretence. If the state of those who have died in the love and fear of God be one of vivid consciousness, how can it be said that " all thoughts perish?" What manner of knowledge and consciousness is consistent with the assertion,—" the living know that they shall die, but the dead *know not any thing?* How can it possibly be said of beatified spirits who are rejoicing in the presence of Jehovah, worshipping Him for His greatness, glorifying Him for their redemption, that " they cannot give God thanks, nor declare His truth, nor perceive His faithfulness?" How could the grave possibly be to them a " land of forgetfulness?" How could it be said, that God's loving-kindness is there unknown? And how,—to proceed with our evidence from the Old Testament,—how could Job term the grave " a land of darkness, and of the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness?"* Further on, being weary of his life, because of the afflictions wherewith he was visited, he exclaims, " Are not my days few? cease then [O my God] and let me *take comfort a little*, before I go hence and be no more seen." So far was he from looking to the grave itself, as a place wherein he should be comforted after his sorrows.

---

* Chap. x.

Digitized by Google

David, Solomon, and Job, were not ignorant that a life awaited them beyond the grave: nor did they, through any *doubts* about this matter, throw a false gloom on the valley of the shadow of death. Had they been ignorant, they would have been silent; the Holy Spirit would not have lent His sanction to their errors; and allowed the words of inspiration to be mingled and contaminated with positive falsehood. For if the soul of man, when in Hades, is in joy and felicity beyond that of earth, *it is* wholly false to represent the grave as a land of forgetfulness, and where God's truth is not manifested, nor His righteousness known.* Though Solomon knew that God would "bring every work into judgment," and David foresaw the resurrection of Christ, † and trusted that he would be "shewn the path of life;" and Job expected "in his flesh to see God," none of them, we have seen, expected to enjoy God's presence *before* they were raised from the dead.

The use of the word "sleep" for death, by these and other inspired writers, would alone go far to prove that it is a state of darkness, silence, forgetfulness, unconsciousness. Thus it is written of the profligate and idolatrous people of Babylon, "In their heat I will make their feasts, and make them drunken that they may rejoice, and sleep a

* The question concerns not dead corpses, but dead men. It would be preposterous to say that *the body*, when in the grave, is ignorant of God's truth and righteousness: which *never were* known at all, except by the soul.

† Acts ii.

Digitized by Google

perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord."* And of the resurrection at the Last Day, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, and shall come forth, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." † The same word is frequently used in the New Testament, and in the same sense, in passages which will be considered hereafter. The strongest passage in all the Bible, however, is perhaps that in the fourteenth chapter of the book of Job. "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease, though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time and remember me. If a man die shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait until my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire unto the work of thine hands." Here it is asserted, that when

* Jeremiah li. † Daniel xii.

Digitized by Google

man expires, he is as completely gone, and does as entirely disappear, as the flood which, after the rainy season, is dried up by the sun and wind. That in him there is no stock that may sprout again, no surviving principle of life, which, under more favourable circumstances, may again exhibit its dormant energies. He shall indeed be remembered by the Almighty, he shall then awake and answer the call of God, but till then he is asleep and kept secret, "hidden in the grave," bearing no part and discharging no functions among *living* beings. Few indeed, if any, of those persons who believe in an intermediate consciousness could bring themselves to utter this ejaculation of Job. What meaning could *they* attach to the prayer, "Oh that thou wouldest *hide* me in the grave, and *keep me secret* till the judgment day," who expect a still nearer approach to God, than when they abode in the flesh, and, in many instances, even look for an immediate introduction to the "innumerable company of angels," and to the "spirits of just men made perfect?"

This passage of Job receives valuable illustration from Isaiah.* "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that *dwell in dust*, for your dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself, as it were for a little moment, until

* Is. xxvi. 19, &c.

Digitized by Google

the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." Here, having first proclaimed a joyful resurrection for God's people, the prophet calls upon them, in the name of the Lord, to enter without fear the chambers of the grave; and there abide until the indignation be overpast, i. e. according to Job, "till the heavens be no more." Till then they were to be "hidden in the grave," and kept secret." But shall the interval seem long and dreary? Far from it. "Hide thyself, my people, AS IT WERE FOR A LITTLE MOMENT."

Let us now consider the language used in a time of trial by one of the most faithful of God's servants of old, Hezekiah, king of Judah. He lived in intimacy with Isaiah, and was visited by the prophet on what he deemed to be his death-bed. After his recovery he wrote, "I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in *the land of the living*, I shall behold man no more, with the inhabitants of the world." "For the grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot *hope for thy truth*." No pretence similar to that of Dr. Watts can be here maintained for a moment. To "hope for the truth of God" is an exercise of thought peculiarly fitted for the state of disembodied spirits, if they be really conscious.

Digitized by Google

And why should this our present world be termed "*the* land of the living," if life, equally energetic, awaited the disembodied spirit?

Nor can it be said that it is the body only, which goes down into the pit. Hezekiah did not grieve because his *body* could not hope for the truth of God when in the grave; but because *he himself* could not: i. e. because the grave extended its dominion even over those faculties of the mind of which hope is an exercise.

One other passage should be added to these, which will nearly complete our Old Testament evidence. "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see, that they themselves are beasts. 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. All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward,* and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" To which we may add the words in the latter part of the same book, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit

* Or, according to the Septuagint, "Who knoweth if the spirit of a man goeth upward," etc. And this seems to be a fair translation of the Hebrew.

Digitized by Google

return to God who gave it." Bishop Bull was so little pleased with the language of the Preacher in the first of these passages, that he chooses to put the greater part of it into the mouth of an unbeliever! Solomon, he says, "introduces an Epicurean (if he may be so called by anticipation), deriding the notion of the soul's immortality." Yet what is said here that differs from the sentence—Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return? What is implied in the return of the dust to its parent earth, and of the spirit to God the Creator, but that each shall be as before the creation of the man? * Not that this would render death a total annihilation. He who created, and unmade again, can as easily renew his work; and can restore the soul of man, when he raises his body from the grave, by breathing again into his nostrils the breath of life.†

But *until* God shall thus manifest His power and glory, and fulfil His promises, for the happiness of his creatures, man, say the Scriptures of the Old Testament, is not in a region of glory, but in a land of darkness; not in the presence of

---

* For the spirit or breath, when detached from the body of a living being, is often said to be not theirs, but God's. "When God gathers unto Himself *His* spirit, and *His* breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."

† In truth, however, *far more* than this will be done for the new creature; as is shown in 1 Cor. xv. The "second man" will be endued with that "quickening spirit" of immortality which was not conferred on the first, on him that was "of the earth, earthy." Of this more in the next chapter.

Digitized by Google

God, but hidden in secret chambers; not employed in glorifying Him, but buried in sleep; "*not hoping for His truth*," but "in a land where all things are forgotten." Whoever disbelieves this, must hold that by "the dead" is meant only "dead corpses," that the grave is called a "land of forgetfulness," because these corpses cannot then exert the (mental) power of memory; and finally, that by "those who cannot hope for God's truth, nor know His lovingkindness," are intended—the carcases of saints in glory! Suppositions these so utterly preposterous that it is impossible that men could ever have believed in the consciousness and glorification of the dead, had they not utterly disregarded the import of the language of the Old Testament; and rested either on the suggestions of their own minds, the *authority* of a prevalent opinion, or, at best, on some (misinterpreted) passages occurring in one portion only of the inspired books. But whatever the New Testament may appear to some persons to declare, its language must, if possible, be reconciled with that of the Old; and unless the former should expressly and unequivocally declare that the dead are all alive, and the sleeping saints fully awake, we may safely rest satisfied with the faith of David and Solomon, of Isaiah, Daniel, and Job; and with their blessed hope that, though for a little moment they should sleep in the dust of the earth, they should yet "awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament for ever."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE CONTINUED.

IT is now to be inquired whether the Books of the New Testament, which contain the Gospel that brought life and immortality to light, remove aught of the gloom with which, as we have seen, the earlier Scriptures enveloped the grave; and disclose to us any brightening of the realms of Hades through the death or resurrection of Christ?

In the New Testament, even more frequently than in the Old, the state of the departed is termed "sleep." For the disciples of Christ, strong in their hope of immortality, dwelt more on the future restoration to life, than on the intermediate gloom: which they described by a word not *necessarily* implying a return to consciousness, but perfectly consistent with it, and when coupled with express promises of resurrection, calculated to lead men to look forward without dread to their departure into the unseen world. Thus St. Paul says of the unworthy partakers of the Holy Communion, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep;" and bids the Thessalonians "sorrow not, concerning them which are asleep in Jesus." And thus our Lord himself said of the daughter of Jairus, "The maid is not dead but sleepeth," *merely* to signify

Digitized by Google

that she would be restored again to life. Merely for this end; since, when His disciples misunderstood His saying, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth," "then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead."

It has been often supposed that the *soul* is altogether free from the dominion of this "sleep," and that the word is employed in Scripture in order to denote the rest of the body in the grave, and to remind us that that rest will be temporary only. But does the word sleep, in its *usual* acceptation, refer solely or chiefly to the body? Most certainly not. It is usually understood to mean a state of unconsciousness, either total or partial. In ordinary language a man is said to be awake, whenever he is *conscious* of what is going on around him, or is exercising any control over the current of his own thoughts, though he may be lying motionless and with closed eyes, in the usual posture of sleeping persons. And to walk "in one's sleep" is to walk in a state of *unconsciousness*. Both these instances prove that the word is commonly used of the mind, and the mind alone. Similarly, a limb is said to be "asleep" when it is benumbed, insensible, unconscious, *dead*;* and further, if sleep did not denote in-

* In sleep, unaccompanied by dreaming, consciousness does not exist; at least there is not the slightest proof of its existence. We are therefore justified in asserting that real sleep is a temporary metaphysical death.—*Macnish on the Philosophy of Sleep.*

Digitized by Google

sensibility but repose, we should find it frequently used to signify the rest of inanimate things. But how is it that when a forest is felled, or a city has fallen into ruins, the trees or stones are never said to be sleeping? Plainly because they are not in a state of suspended consciousness; they were never awake. And why is it that a tree, when erect, living and growing, cannot even be conceived to sleep or wake? Simply because it has no *consciousness* which can come or go. The word "sleep" does not necessarily denote a state which shall be followed by restoration to life or consciousness. It was not so used when God said of the Babylonish idolaters, "they shall sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake," nor by the Epicurean philosopher who termed death "a long unbroken never ending sleep." It must be kept in mind that the question here is not whether the body of a man can in any intelligible sense be said to be asleep, but whether, when *the man* is said to be asleep, his mind is not supposed to be wrapped in slumber.

Much stress has been laid upon the fact that the Greek word κοιμασθαι, which is used to express the sleeping the sleep of death, literally signifies *to recline;* and seems therefore to refer to a state rather of the body than of the mind. But it was not so understood by St. Matthew, when in his account of our Lord's Crucifixion he wrote "the graves were opened, and many bodies of the Saints which slept arose and came out of the graves, after his resurrection." For in the

Digitized by Google

original the expression is literally "many bodies of the sleeping saints;" the word rendered "sleeping," (κεκοιμημενων—recumbent, reclining) being that which it is sometimes pretended refers to the body alone.

Again, what is to "awake," but to be restored to life, consciousness and activity? And why should we confine to the body alone the meaning of such expressions as these, "All men shall rise again *with* their bodies," "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall wake and shall come forth," "when I wake up after thy likeness I shall be satisfied with it," "he shall rise again," "I will raise him up at the last day." And in what way can we best reconcile such expressions with the language of the Old Testament writers concerning the grave? Surely not in alleging that they relate only to the body. If the soul of a saint departed were already raised to glory, and exerting its energies in a much more perfect manner than before, that saint would not be said to be in a land of forgetfulness, merely because his soulless body was so. But we have seen that the grave was called a place of darkness and silence, a land of forgetfulness, a hiding place from God, a land in which there is no knowledge, and where all things are forgotten?

To these passages have been opposed others which, since they declare that the "life" once kindled within the souls of believers by the grace of God is "eternal," and that they *already have* this "eternal life," seem to imply that there can

Digitized by Google

be no interval of unconsciousness. But when our blessed Lord would confirm to any one this promise of eternal life, he did so, as we find in many instances, by reminding and assuring them *of a resurrection.* Thus having declared, "he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is* passed from death unto life;" he thus confirms his words, "Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is,* when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live."† The same connection is exhibited in a preceding passage—"As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." And again in the following chapter—"This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which believeth on the Son may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

And then, when the believer is thus raised up,

---

* So that the interval between the first and second Advents, though of tens of centuries, was in *some* sense inappreciably short. For it does great violence to the context, to understand our Lord to speak of the regeneration of those that were dead in sin. Our Lord appears to speak of an universal restoration to life. *All* the dead,—not the elect only—shall hear and live.

The Son indeed "quickeneth *whom he will,*" which may seem to imply a selection; but his work is represented as commensurate with that of the Father, who raises *all* that are in the graves. And the Son doth select,—in granting to whom he will a resurrection unto life.

† John v. 24, 25.

Digitized by Google

he will rejoice in the presence of Christ: then, and *not before*. Yet to many persons St. Paul has appeared to say the contrary. "I am in a strait betwixt two," he says, "having a desire to *depart and to be with Christ*, which is far better. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." And shortly before, "to me to live is Christ, and *to die is gain*."* And again,† "we are always confident, knowing that while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord;—and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord." But let St. Paul himself explain his own meaning. He thus continues the passage last quoted. "Wherefore we labour, that *whether present or absent*, we may be accepted of him. *For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ*, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." St. Paul then hoped to be accepted of Christ, *whether absent from him in this world, or present with him in the world to come;* and through this hope desired to depart; disregarding altogether his brief plunge into darkness, his "momentary hiding in the grave."‡ The whole context also shows this to have been his feeling. He daily hazarded his life, in confident hope of the time when he himself, and all his disciples, being together raised from their

---

* Philipp. i. 21. † 2 Cor. v. 6.

‡ Isaiah xxvi. 20, quoted above.

Digitized by Google

graves, should be admitted into the presence of God and of Christ.—"Knowing that He which raised up Jesus from the dead, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall *present us, with you.*" Παραστησαι, properly signifies to "introduce," or "present," (i. e. before the Father's throne), and is again used by St. Paul in another epistle, in exactly the same signification. Christ gave himself for his Church, he says, "that he might present it unto himself a glorious Church;" and this surely at the Last Day, when the bride shall be brought unto the King; and with joy and gladness enter into his palace.* This *presentation* of all the redeemed together, and especially of his own disciples, unto Christ at his second coming was the reward, the "weight of glory," for which St. Paul laboured. "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing," said he to his Thessalonian converts. "Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ *at his coming?*" And he looked, he said, "for invisible things, which also were *eternal.*" "For we know," he continues, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God; a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan,

* Psalm xlv. We have additional proof that St. Paul hoped to be "present with Christ" at the Last Day, in 1 Cor. i. 7-9. Where he exhorts them to wait for Christ's coming, who should "confirm them to the end, that they might be *blameless* in that day:" and might be fit to form part of the Church which should then be found "without spot or wrinkle."

Digitized by Google

earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." "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." Here St. Paul expressly declared, that he *desired not* an intermediate happiness for his soul alone, but to be clothed in a glorified body, in which he should find acceptance when presented to Christ. When therefore he immediately afterwards, almost in the same breath, expresses his wish to "depart and be with Christ," we cannot doubt that the object of his hope was an entrance, at the Last Day, into eternal glory.*

Indeed throughout the apostolical epistles, and in more places than can be referred to in these pages, the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. *Nothing, even in comparison of this present world.* The Christian is not taught to look forward to it, even as a period of repose from the miseries of this life! When Christians suffered persecution, what could be more natural,—if there were indeed a conscious repose in the grave,—than to remind them of it; to remind them that, though they could not at once receive their final reward, yet a partial relief, an intermediate reward, should instantly be given to their disembodied souls?

* The reader is most earnestly requested to peruse the latter part of 2 Cor. iv. and the former part of the chapter following.

Digitized by Google

But when St Paul would give encouragement to the Thessalonians under a heavy persecution, he promises them *no rest whatever*, until Christ's second coming. "It is a righteous thing for God to recompense tribulation to them which trouble you, and to you who are troubled *rest with us*,—*when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of his might."* The "rest" here spoken of,—in the original ανεσις, —is simply *a cessation of trouble*; precisely that kind of repose which, according to many (uninspired) persons, the grave itself is calculated to afford.

There remaineth indeed "a rest for the people of God:" a rest not in the narrow house, in the chambers of the grave; but in the heavenly Canaan, the new Jerusalem, the prepared mansions: a rest from labours reserved for the blessed dead who have died in the Lord, *from that time forth*, when the Apocalyptic Babylon has fallen, and the ripened harvest of the earth is cut down by the sickle of Almighty wrath.†

Until the Lord shall be revealed from heaven, his saints are to look for nothing at his hands

---

* And similarly in 2 Cor. i. 9. "We had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in *God which raiseth the dead*." And Philip. iii. "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."

† Rev. xiv. 13, 14, 15.

Digitized by Google

but that he should keep them secret, intending at his set time to remember them, and that "their spirits and souls *and bodies* should be preserved,"* before God, unto that day. Thus it was that Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;" even as Jesus himself, when expiring on the cross, voluntarily resigned his spirit to his Father's keeping, to be restored to him again on the third day. Thus St. Paul's consolation, in the prospect of death was, "if we be dead with him, we *shall* also live with him; if we suffer with him, we *shall* also reign with him."† He hoped not to reign, neither did he hope to *live*, before the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He looked to receive a crown of righteousness, which the judge should give him *in that day;* and sought no other reward.

Many of his expressions also tend to show, that *life itself*, as well as reward, was to be future. "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly:"‡ bear it, according to St. John, when Christ shall appear, and we shall "see him as he is; all which is in perfect accordance with those expressions of our Lord above referred to, wherein the gift of "eternal life," or immortality, is connected with that of resurrection of the body. But nearly the whole of the remarkable chapter to which we have referred, deserves attentive consideration; inasmuch as the subject of the resurrection is there

* See 1 Thess. v. 23. † 2 Tim. ii. 12. ‡ 1 Cor. xv.

Digitized by Google

not merely alluded to, but made the subject of a formal dissertation. "If Christ be not raised, they which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished.*" If these words do not amount to a proof of intermediate unconsciousness, they at least show, that but for the resurrection of Christ the grave *would have been* the destruction of all who entered its dark portals;—that man is naturally mortal. But they may well be understood to declare the far more important doctrine, that all the departed are *now* slumbering in the unconsciousness of death, and can never be reanimated, unless Christ have indeed risen.

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." The force of these words can be evaded in no other way, than by maintaining that Christ gives life to the body only;—that it is not through *His* power that souls are saved alive. But if it be true, that Christ restores to the *soul* that life which was forfeited through Adam; and if St. Paul declares that it is *at Christ's coming* that the forfeited life is restored, then it is plain that the power of death prevails over the soul unto the Great Day. The latter part of this remarkable chapter strengthens this conclusion. For it allows to the first or natural man,—by whom is here intended the Christian, in that state in which he dies,—no portion whatever in, nor benefit from, the life which Christ is afterwards to bestow. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual

Digitized by Google

body." * * "As we have born the image of the earthy, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly." It is not till the last trump has sounded, that we can hope to "put on incorruption." Will it be said that this refers only to our receiving in that day an imperishable body? What then can be meant by the further expression—"this mortal shall put on immortality?" How could the possessor of an immortal soul, which, whether embodied or not, would live in glory and bliss through all eternity, be called mortal until the resurrection? Observe that St Paul is not here speaking of the body only, but of *the man*. He is replying to the two-fold question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" And it is not the body of the first man, but the FIRST MAN HIMSELF who is earthy, mortal, corruptible. His corruptible, mortal frame does not "put on immortality;" for "thou sowest not that body which shall be;" but it is exchanged for a body of a different kind. The man, or the soul of the man, is invested with immortality; it is the man therefore, or the soul of the man, which is previously mortal.

And the interval between the putting off the one body, and assuming the other, between the sowing of the seed, and the rising of the new creature, is passed over as if it were nothing.

The whole of this doctrine of intermediate unconsciousness derives strong support from the

Digitized by Google

noted passage of St. Paul to the Thessalonians,* wherein he beseeches them not to sorrow for the dead, even as the rest (the heathen) which have no *hope*. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For * * we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven; * * and the dead in Christ *shall rise first*. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; *and* so *shall we ever be with the Lord*. Wherefore comfort ye one another with these words." St. Paul here declares that the dead in Christ shall meet one another, and meet also their friends who were alive at Christ's coming, on the Last Day, and not before. But it has been said, "The Thessalonians deeply regretted the loss of their friends: St. Paul assures them of the certainty of a re-union. They thought the day of Christ was at hand: then, if so, St. Paul tells them that Jesus would bring with him their deceased friends; and, if they died previously, St. Paul does not deny that they would see him previously."† The words "bring with him" might, it is true, lead us to some such view as this. But did St. Paul intend them to believe that their sleeping friends were actually with

* 1 Thess. iv. † Whytt on Disembodied Spirits.

Digitized by Google

Jesus; that *they which were asleep would prevent (or anticipate) them which were awake!* This would be completely to destroy the force of his own statements made in order to prove that the converse of the proposition was untrue. He prevents the Thessalonians imagining that they who lived to see Christ's coming would be before-hand with those that were asleep, by assuring them—that *the dead would rise first;*—and that *all*, quick and dead, would be caught up *together*, and would, at one and the same time, meet their Lord.* "Think not, he says, that your friends departed are lost to you, lost to life and light, as the heathen think. They shall be blessed at the coming of Christ: yea, and be blessed as soon and as fully as yourselves. When you lift up your heads and behold your redemption drawing nigh, know that their redemption also is at hand. The trump of God shall call, and they shall answer; the voice of the archangel shall summon them from their graves: they shall not be forgotten, nor left behind, but gathered from the four winds by angels of God, they shall take their places, first or last, in the joyful procession that goeth to meet the Bridegroom. Though the minds of all men naturally abhor death: though all would find much comfort (and inclination leads many to *take* comfort), in believing that their departed

* Similarly, in the next chapter, he says "Christ died for us, that *whether we wake or sleep*, we should live together with him. Wherefore comfort yourselves together."

Digitized by Google

friends have already, without resurrection, or ascension, entered into their glory. St. Paul attempted not to console the Thessalonians with *such* words. "When Christ cometh with clouds," he taught with St. John,* then "every eye shall see him;"—then, and not before. "Him the heavens must receive until the restitution of all things,"† and into heaven the dead who die in the Lord have not as yet ascended. He is gone to prepare a place for them, and *when he cometh again* he will receive them to himself, that where he is, there may they be also. Their souls are now, with David's, left in Hades; there to continue till they put on incorruption:‡ but "when Christ, who is their life shall appear, *then* shall they also appear with him in glory."§

The foregoing passages show that the apostles expected, and therefore we are to expect, *no* rest, *nor* glory, *no* vision of Christ, *nor* conformity to his image, *no* victory over death and the grave, till the blissful hour of resurrection. They prove, that between death and resurrection there is an interval, so unimportant in a Christian's eye, that it may be passed over as nothing. They show that whoever, in the spirit of St. Paul, desires to "depart and be with Christ," longs for liberation not from the burden only of the

---

* Rev. i. 7. † Acts iii. 21.
‡ Acts ii. 34. § Col. iii. 4.

Digitized by Google

flesh, but from that dominion of mortality, which shall endure till the Last Day. They therefore prove, that if there be a state of intermediate consciousness, it certainly is not so desirable a state for the redeemed, as it is commonly represented to be; and they moreover contain nothing to contradict, but much to confirm the language of the Old Testament, which pronounces the dead to be in a land where all things are forgotten, where God's truth is not manifested, nor His righteousness known, nor His holy name praised; but where men are "hidden for a little moment," while they "know not any thing," but "all their thoughts have perished."* Even by their omission of all mention of the intermediate state,—of the sojourn of the soul in Hades, in places where we should naturally expect them to speak of it, if it were indeed a state of life and consciousness, of hope or fear, joy or sorrow, they strongly confirm the testimony of the Jewish Scriptures; but in fact the New Testament is far from being *silent* on this point. It often expressly speaks of Hades,†—the place or state of the departed.

The first passages are those which relate to

---

* The reader is again referred to the passages from the Old Testament quoted above, pp. 249 to 256.

† In the authorized English version correctly rendered Hell; from the Saxon "Helan," to cover; and therefore signifying an obscure, as Hades signifies an invisible place. The future place of punishment is in the original Greek Gehenna, which word, unhappily, has not been retained in our version. Hence the

Digitized by Google

Capernaum, — and to the Church of Christ. "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to Hades." "On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." By the *gates* of Hades is intended the power of Hades,—in other words, the power of DESTRUCTION. It has indeed been asserted, that the gates of Hades signify the power of Satan; but since Hades is not interpreted to mean Satan, or the realm or dominion of Satan, in any other place in all the Bible, it ought not, as it need not, to be so interpreted in this. Capernaum was not said to be exalted to heaven, because the city was admitted into God's kingdom above, but because she was then great and flourishing, and flushed with the "pride of life;" and she was to be brought down, not into Satan's realms, but to desolation and destruction. Satan already reigned over her; she needed not to be brought low, to fall into his hands; for he is not the Prince of the power of the grave, but the Prince of the power of the air; and if he be a Ruler of Darkness, it is the darkness of *this* world. Unlike Capernaum, the church of Christ, according to the prediction of its

---

prevalent notion that the flames of hell—Gehenna—are *now* burning beneath the earth, and that devils are now occupying it: and hence the more deplorable error of the vulgar, who often suppose that our blessed Lord descended into the place of torment.

It were best to reject the word "hell" altogether, and substitute for it Hades or Gehenna.

Digitized by Google

Founder, was never to be destroyed, but to stand firm alike against the assaults of Satan, and of unbelieving men.

On the supposition that Hades is a region of life, and not *necessarily* either evil or good, our Lord's promise to his church becomes without meaning. As well might it have been said, "the *power of resurrection* shall not prevail against the Church;" inasmuch as resurrection implies a change of state, and is not *necessarily* either a good or an evil: or as well might our Lord have said,—if Hades be a region of life—"My church shall never pass into a disembodied state." But His words plainly declare, "An evil and destroying power shall not prevail."

Let us now turn to St. Paul.* "The trumpet shall sound; the dead shall be raised incorruptible; this mortal shall assume immortality. *Then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting, O HADES, where is thy victory!" Here the apostle exults over Hades and Death together, because God, he knew, would on his appointed day rescue the souls of men from their dark dominion; and make an utter end of those evil powers, who, in the strength of sin, had reigned for a time over mankind. And it would appear from his language that the victory of Hades over the soul is as complete as that of death. But if there be an intermediate con-

* 1 Cor. xv.

Digitized by Google

sciouness, and for the redeemed an interval of most blissful rest, *Hades has no victory at all.* Death may conquer the body, but Hades, so far from subduing the soul, would actually liberate it from a heavy burden and bondage, and promote "the glorious liberty of the children of God." St. Paul however declares that Death and Hades now reign together: nevertheless, knowing that they shall hereafter be cast together into the "lake of fire," and that an interval of death and unconsciousness, to be terminated on the last Day, is but a momentary decease, and scarcely to be regarded as an evil, he anticipates the final triumph, and exults over them as already subdued. For Hades may be deemed to have no captives, unless she can bind them in everlasting chains.

Departing saints are sometimes known to triumph, in the hour of dissolution, as if their victory were already won. And Christians who "have fought the good fight" are certainly not forbidden thus to triumph, although it be not till the Last Day that Death is swallowed up in victory. For the interval will not be felt; no train of thought will disturb the deep sleep of the dead, sickening the soul with hope deferred: but they shall find that Scripture realized to them, "It is appointed unto men once to die;—and after this *the judgment.*"

Death and Hades however are still permitted to reign; and are destined to exert their destroying power till the end of the world. At the opening of the "fourth seal," in the Apocalypse,

Digitized by Google

St. John "beheld a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and *Hades* followed with him. And power was given to them over the fourth part of the earth, to *kill* with sword and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth." Here is Hades painted as one going forth to devour and destroy, in league with death. In the same book they are again coupled together, in their present subjection to the Son of Man, and in their final fate. "He hath the keys of Hades and Death," to unlock their dark gates on the predestined day; and when he executes the judgments committed to him, they shall be together cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death," and be themselves destroyed. Shortly before this, in the vision of St. John, the "sea gave up the dead that were in it, and Death and *Hades* (the supposed abode of *living* souls) delivered up the *dead* which were in them.

Still more numerous are the passages of the Old Testament, wherein death and Hell,—in the Hebrew Scheol, in the Greek Hades,—are mentioned together, not as if Hades were a pleasant place of refuge for the disembodied souls, the victims of death, but as if the two were conjoined in the work of destruction.*

It cannot be pretended that Hades is the place or state of the body merely—or indeed of the body at all. While the body moulders into dust

* See Job xxvi. 6. Prov. xv. 11, xxvii. 20. Hab. ii. 5.

Digitized by Google

and is scattered to the four winds, the soul is in Hades. "Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in Hades, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption," was David's prophecy concerning Christ. If in any passage of Scripture the body should seem to be in Hades, it is because a locality is given to Hades which does not in strictness belong to it; and it is then placed *in the grave*. Thought can have no locality: "one might as well say of a disembodied spirit that it is hard or heavy, or a cubic foot in dimensions, as to say that it is here or there." Hades has no more locality than has Death; though both are in Scripture occasionally localized, or personified. But because the body descends into the grave, and will rise again from the grave, the man, body and soul, is said to do the same. "All men shall rise again, *with* their bodies;" and before resurrection the dead are said to "dwell *in dust*;" to "sleep *in the dust of the earth*." Yet it is plain, that the instant that mysterious tie is severed which connects the body and soul, all that gave locality to mind is wholly lost. When therefore it is said, that on the return of the body to the dust, "the spirit returns to God who gave it," we ought not to imagine, as some do, an ascent of the spirit towards the skies; but simply an assertion of the fact, that the spirit, which when given by the Creator, and detached, as it were, from Him, constituted a living creature, has now reverted back to him who gave it, and become, not by change of *place*, but of *ownership*, His property again.

Digitized by Google

Yet there are some expressions in the Scriptures, which, while one more than ordinarily fanciful writer places Hades in the sun, have led others to give it a locality in the centre of our earth. For Samuel was "brought up" when he appeared before Saul; and the woman of Endor who raised him "saw Gods ascending out of the earth;" and Samuel said to Saul, "why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" These expressions are the more remarkable, because we are not told, nor have we reason to believe, that the image of Samuel, or of the spirits who were seen to ascend out of the earth with him, were actually embodied. What then, it may be asked, did "ascend," if not the spirits or souls of Samuel and those that were with him? The question may be answered by asking, What was *seen*, if not the actual bodies of Samuel and the others? Certainly not their incorporeal and therefore impalpable and invisible spirits: but some image or *phantom*, some shadowy likeness of forms of flesh and blood, which they were empowered to assume for the time, in order that they might be seen by human beings. And as they put on *the appearance of* forms of flesh and blood, so did they also rise, like bodies which had been buried below. And let us not overlook the fact, that from whatever place or state the spirit of Samuel came, it was from a quiet so profound as to be disturbed even by that solemn appearance to Saul: not from a bright region of joy and activity; but from darkness, silence, and slumbers of depth unfathomable.

Digitized by Google

Our Lord declared that as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should he himself be three days and nights in *the heart of the earth.* Here the *heart* of the earth is simply put in opposition to the belly of the whale, and the words do not differ essentially from those of the more usual prediction that our Lord should be three days in *the grave.* We read also that our Lord "descended into *the lower parts of the earth.*" But no stress can be laid on this, inasmuch as it is not evident that *the earth itself* is not intended, which in comparison of heaven is termed, *the lower* (parts or regions,) τα κατωτερα της γης: as where Isaiah says, "Sing, O ye heavens; shout, ye lower parts of the earth."*

The mention that is occasionally made in Scripture of an abyss, deep, or bottomless pit, as the abode of certain spirits, and of the soul of Christ during its separation from the body, deserves consideration in relation to this point. This abyss appears to be the same as Hades, and to be a place wherein spirits are *confined.* Hence proceeded the locusts of the Apocalypse, and perhaps also Apollyon their king, and hence also the beast, on whom sat the Babylonish idolatress. It is probably a place of confinement for spirits, wherein they are prevented from all exercise of

* Ephes. iv. 9. Isaiah xliv. 23. St. Paul, it may be observed, is speaking of Christ's ascension from the earth, not his resurrection from the dead.

Digitized by Google

their powers. "I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on * * Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut him up and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more." And it is the same as Hades, for this fate of Satan seems to be precisely that of the rebellious angels of St. Peter and St. Jude.* Moreover we know that our Lord descended into Hades; and St. Paul writes, "who shall descend into the deep,—the *abyss*,—that is, to bring up Christ from the dead."† That it is a place of confinement would appear also from the entreaty of the Legion of demons to our Lord, that he would allow them to go into the herd of swine, and not command them into the abyss.‡ Now the confinement of a spirit seems to be the same as the destruction of all its consciousness; if the mind be reduced to inactivity, all its thoughts perish; activity being of the very essence of *thought*.§ But this imprisonment in Hades, whether of the human soul, or of an evil spirit, need not be local, inasmuch as thought is not local. Strictly speaking, the spirit or soul or life of man neither moves

---

* See Jude 6, 1 Peter iii. 18, and the latter part of the appendix to page 288.

† Romans x. 6. ‡ Luke viii. 31.

§ Thus in Rev. xvii. 8, it is written, "The beast which thou sawest was, and *is not*, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition." Now if by perdition is meant everlasting punishment in the lake of fire, everlasting consciousness,

Digitized by Google

upwards to God and heaven, nor downwards to the grave. The union of mind with matter alone can give locality; and it is this union, imagined or foreseen, that has occasioned those Scriptural expressions—to "dwell in the dust,"—to "rise again with their bodies."* But these expressions would not have been used, this union during the intermediate state would not have been supposed, unless the condition of the disembodied soul harmonized with that of the body, so that, when the one was buried, the other also could be said to sleep, and to be in "a land of darkness."

Again, we may learn something concerning Hades, from the fact that our blessed Lord himself descended into it, and on the third day rose again *from the dead.* It is evident from Scripture, that the death which our Lord endured did not wholly terminate with his passion on the cross. God raised him up, "having *loosed the pains of death*, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."† And the heart of Christ was to rejoice, and his flesh to rest in hope, *because* the Father would not "leave his soul in Hades, nor suffer His Holy One to see corrup-

---

it would seem that there is no consciousness till the beast passes from the abyss, and goes into perdition. The expression, "is not," may however merely signify, "is no longer upon earth."

* And to that remarkable passage above quoted—"Many bodies of the sleeping saints *(recumbent, reclining saints)*, arose, and came out of their graves."

† Acts ii. 24.

Digitized by Google

tion." Now inasmuch as it was an infinite condescension in our Lord to take upon him our nature, and subject himself to the burden of the flesh, what were THE PAINS OF DEATH to him, what the triumph of his resurrection, if death had merely relieved him of the burden of the flesh, and enabled his liberated soul to pass into rest and glory? How was corruption obviated by his reassumption of that body of flesh which he had laid down on the Cross? Even through this fact —that Hades was to his human soul a region of death, a state in which he was *still* suffering under the burden of human sins. Some are accustomed to say, that the glory of the resurrection of the saints at the Last Day will mainly consist in the investiture of their souls with glorified, spiritual bodies. But Christ took again the body in which he suffered. Again, "Christ being risen from the dead, it is said, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Death then had dominion over him, *until* he "rose again from the dead." But for this resurrection the Holy One would, like David, have seen corruption; corruption would have had dominion not over a mere frame of flesh, but over that holy soul in which was no sin. Christ laid down on the cross all that life, which his Incarnation and Nativity had given him,—his human body and soul. "I lay down MY LIFE: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."

And what signify those sublime words, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*, and behold I am

Digitized by Google

alive for evermore."* And, "in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Shall we make them mean, "I lay down my body; I have power to lay it down, and resume it." "I am he that am embodied, and was disembodied, and behold I am embodied for evermore." "In that he parted with his body, he died unto sin once, but in that he hath it again, he liveth unto God." Rather we should believe, that our blessed Lord parted with his human soul; parted with *that life itself, whereby* he now liveth. If his resurrection from the dead had been merely the taking his body again, it would have been no more a victory over death, than was his incarnation; or at least no more than was the creation of Adam from the lifeless dust of the ground. But Hades grasped a human soul; and that was wrenched from her dark dominion.

And so glorious was this victory over Hades, that in reference to this Christ is spoken of as the Son of God. He is termed "the first begotten from the dead;" he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead;" and we are told that "God hath fulfilled his promises of mercy, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is written in the second Psalm, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.'" Thus also, "they who are accounted

---

* Rev. i. 18. Ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. "I am the living one, and I became one-that-is-dead, and behold I am living for ever."

Digitized by Google

worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more, and are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection:" and are said to "groan within themselves, waiting for *the adoption*,—to wit, the redemption of the body;" for "the manifestation of the Sons of God."

Had the victory been gained on the cross, our Lord's last words would have been those of exultation; sounds of joy and triumph would have filled the heavens, as at the nativity; and angels would have bidden the disciples to weep no more, cheering them as they did on the third day. And the bodies of the saints which slept need not have been detained in their graves until after his resurrection; but at once appearing unto many, might have testified to the subjugation of death.

Some persons are inclined to believe, that our Lord, when he entered the realms of Hades, entered as a conqueror; bringing into these desolate shades a light and life not their own; nay, proclaiming in them that gospel which his apostles afterwards preached on earth. They refer to the words of St. Peter,—"Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; by the which also he went and *preached unto the spirits in prison*, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." But all that St. Peter asserts is, that our Lord

Digitized by Google

preached to the spirits in prison *by the same spirit* by which he was quickened; not by any means that he preached while he was numbered among the dead. And indeed, if there be meaning in words, the quick are not to be confounded with the dead; but to be "quickened" is to be raised again from the dead; which happened to our Lord not on the cross, but on the third day after his crucifixion. *Then* it was that the quickening spirit of immortal life, which utterly abhors and is incompatible with the state of death, visited and reanimated his mortal soul.

Let us consider too by what means Christ triumphed over death. Even by first submitting to death. He "tasted death for every man;" and "through death subdued him that had the power of death." He drank this bitter cup, and drained its very dregs, that the vials of wrath might not be poured out upon guilty men. Whatever gloom then there was in Hades before the advent of Christ, into that gloom he entered; whatever were the "pains of death" for the worst of sinners, those pains he underwent; nay, whatever *would have been* the utmost tyranny of Hades and Death over men, but for his mediation, to that Christ for a time succumbed. By no less a sacrifice could he have accomplished his great design of subduing death, by first submitting to death.* To suppose that the grave was a more

* The death to which Adam became liable through his transgression is said to be temporal, spiritual, and *eternal*, the latter

Digitized by Google

lightsome place to him than it is, or would have been, to the worst of sinners, is to forget the price which was paid for redemption; and to leave room for the conscience-stricken sinner to dread lest he should be excluded from the benefits of the resurrection, since so dark a death as *his* had not been undergone by the Saviour. By first enduring all, Christ overcame all. Not in descending into the abyss, but in ascending up on high, he led captivity captive. Hades did not acknowledge him as a conqueror till on the third day he broke her bonds asunder, and cast away her cords from him; and mounted his eternal throne on "the holy hill of Sion."

No more inappropriate season for preaching could possibly be imagined, than that which is arbitrarily chosen for the publication of the gospel to the "imprisoned spirits." That they were in Hades at the time we have indeed ample reason to believe; but they were then as it were in the condemned cells, beyond the reach of reprieve, and waiting till they should be summoned from the bottomless pit, to go into perdition.*

The doctrine of redemption through Christ's

---

being sometimes held to include the suffering of eternal fire. But erroneously, for not only is the latter punishment a consequence of *resurrection unto damnation*, not of death; but, had this been a part of the original curse, our Lord, we may venture to believe, must have descended into the flames of Gehenna itself, in order to rescue man, by "tasting of death for him."

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

suffering of death, as well as the express language of the New Testament concerning Hades, confirms that testimony of the Jewish Scriptures which makes of Hades a land of darkness, and where all things are forgotten; a place wherein (while "the living know that they shall die") the dead "know not any thing." Spirits condemned and under confinement,—the souls of men while subject to the dominion of death,—and the proud city that was to sink to utter ruin and desolation, are alike said to be cast down to Hades, because they are all alike subjected to the Power of Destruction, have gone into darkness, silence, and death; and have become as though *they were not.** But still their souls are safe, still they live unto God, who have died in faith; even in the faith of Abraham, whose belief was "*in God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were.*" †

---

* We may be permitted to indulge in the speculation, that possibly spirits in Hades are conscious, though the souls of men are not so. For they are of an angelic nature; of that nature which men shall partake of *after the resurrection;* and, though fallen through sin, it may perhaps be true of them, that "they cannot *die* any more."

And possibly also, they who are raised unto damnation may continue in being, unable to die any more, through their receiving the spirit of Satan and his angels into their souls;—even as the redeemed are immortal, through the good Spirit of God.

† Romans iv. 16, 17. The second, the spiritual creation shall in this respect resemble the first, the material creation. God, who formed the earth out of nothing, and called unto the as yet uncreated light, saying "LIGHT, BE, and the light was," shall again send forth His Spirit, to brood over the abyss of

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE CONTINUED.

IT yet remains for us to consider some passages of the New Testament which have been much relied on in proof of an intermediate state of consciousness. Our Saviour thus exhorts his disciples; "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell;" that is, "in Gehenna." "What," asks an eminent divine, "can be more clear? If the soul had such a necessary dependence on the body, that when this dies itself must needs die with it, then he that kills the body would with the same stroke murder the soul too. But our Saviour tells us that this is impossible for man to do, the soul remaining even after the death of the body, and being out of the reach of any created power, that is able to destroy it. If it be said that this is meant only of the utter destruction of the soul, which no man is able to effect, God having promised a resurrection to life again, this will appear to be only a wretched shift to avoid the force of the plainest text. For in this sense

---

Hades, and cause it to "bring forth abundantly;" shall command life to be, where as yet there is no life, making the deaf hear His voice, the blind see His glory, the dumb speak His praise.

Digitized by Google

our Saviour might as well have denied that it is in the power of man to kill the *body* of another man, that is, to destroy it utterly and finally, because God will raise it again at the last day. But our blessed Lord grants, that the body may be killed by man in the same sense whereby he denies that the soul can be destroyed by him, and therefore speaks not this only with reference to the resurrection."

It may nevertheless be fairly maintained, consistently with the view of the future states which has been advocated above, that our Lord is here speaking with reference to the resurrection only; and wholly passes over without notice the interval between death and judgment. Shortly after, in the same discourse, he prepares his disciples to bear persecution, by a similar mode of encouragement. "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." And in another place, to exactly the same purpose, "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." These passages sufficiently explain what is meant by "not able to kill the soul." Dr. Bull believed that the soul of the renegade, as well as the soul of the martyr, *lives* after the death of the body. But if so, what is meant by "he that loveth his life *shall lose it?*" Even on Dr. Bull's supposition, it *must* signify, not the loss of life in the intermediate state, wherein good and bad men alike live, but the destruction of the soul in Gehenna. Because

Digitized by Google

man cannot effect this, it is said that he is unable to "kill the soul." Agreeably with that doctrine, implied in almost every page of the New Testament,—" it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment,"—they are said to lose, or to keep their lives, in reference to the destruction which will be inflicted, or the immortality which will be conferred on the soul, on that awful day.

St. Luke reports the words of our Lord somewhat differently. " Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear Him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into Gehenna; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him." Here there is no allusion to an interval between death and judgment; and not only they who have killed the body have no more that they can do, but God himself, it appears, doth nothing, until the day arrive for the execution of his judgements. Throughout all these passages the things contrasted are, life temporal, and life eternal; death temporal, and death eternal,—and we are not to fear them which kill the body, or inflict temporal death; but Him only who can kill the soul, or inflict eternal death.

Dr. Bull however maintains, as we have seen above, that since the bodies of the wicked *rise again*, men can no more be said to be able to kill the body than to kill the soul; except in reference to the different states of the soul and

Digitized by Google

body before resurrection. If the resurrection of the wicked unto damnation were in Scripture represented as a temporary return to *life*, this argument would be unanswerable. But the bodies even of saints are in Scripture termed mortal bodies, and may be killed: though the Almighty can and will at the last day quicken them by His spirit. The temporal life of a sinner being taken away, nothing remains but for him to be "cast into hell;" while the temporal life of the righteous being lost, he still "hath eternal life," in that he has the promise *not given to the sinner*, "I will raise him up at the Last Day." And so St. Paul laboured;—"if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."*

"That the soul is alive after our death," says Jeremy Taylor, "St. Paul affirms: 'Christ died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should *live* together with him.' Now it were strange that we should be alive and live with Christ, and do no act of life." Strange indeed: but Christ died for us, and rose again, that we through *death and resurrection* might have that eternal life. Then, when we rise, he will "come again and

* Whatever obscurity and difficulty there may be in the subject here treated of, it arises from the singular use in Scripture, of the terms life and death. To kill the body, and send the soul into Hades, a suffering which may be inflicted on the righteous as well as the sinner, and to destroy the body and soul in the flames of Gehenna, are both called in Scripture, Death. The temporal existence common to all, no less than the spiritual and eternal existence of saints in heaven, is termed Life.

Digitized by Google

receive his disciples to himself, that where he is, there may they be also: *then* shall they, and not before, "ever be with the Lord."

That there is an intermediate consciousness has sometimes been collected from the account of the translations of Enoch and Elijah, and the appearance of the latter, with Moses, at the transfiguration of our Lord. The former of which facts, it shall nevertheless be said, does most strongly point to a conclusion directly opposite, which the difficulty concerning Moses cannot reverse, but at the utmost merely neutralize or obscure. Enoch, we are told, "walked with God; and he was not, for *God took him*," and this St. Paul explains by saying that Enoch "was translated, that he *should not see death*." Here to be taken to God, and to die, are represented as directly opposite things. Enoch was saved from Hades, from the power of corruption, from the state of "the dead who cannot praise the Lord;" and admitted to his presence in heaven. Of Elijah we learn that he likewise "was taken up into heaven," without seeing death, without any dissolution of the body, or banishment of the soul to Hades. In both of these cases, undoubtedly, the translation to heaven was a great and a singular reward for singular piety and devotedness. Yet if, apart from resurrection and ascension into heaven, it be, as some believe, a great privilege to be delivered from the burden of the flesh; a privilege involving nearer communion with God, what advantage had Enoch or

Digitized by Google

Elijah? And how can it be said, that *God took them*, rather than any other departed saints? It may be said, that they were at once admitted to that *superior* blessedness which God will confer on all his saints when their bodies are raised in glory at the Last Day.* But the account of Elijah's appearance at the transfiguration precludes this idea. It is true that our Saviour's appearance at that time was such as to give the three favoured disciples some conception of his future glory. For it was the fulfilment of his promise made a week previously, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." And St. Peter says in reference to the wonderful scene, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye witnesses* of his majesty." But still it is plain that his full glory and majesty was not then revealed, even to the chosen disciples. For St. John writes, "we know not what we shall be; but we know that when Christ shall appear, we shall be like him, *for we shall see him as he is*." And this though St. John had beheld Christ not only at his transfiguration, but also in those greater splendours which he records in the book of Revelation; and though St. Paul, who

* Not that this is exactly in accordance with Scripture, which represents their privilege as consisting specially in *exemption from death.*

Digitized by Google

had ample intercourse with the other apostles, had been favoured with repeated visions of Christ. It is plain then that though the glorious appearance which our Lord put on was, in conjunction with the voice of approval from heaven, a *sufficient* proof and manifestation of the glories of his future kingdom, yet it was not a full display of them. Jesus indeed "was not yet glorified;" he had not as yet "ascended into heaven that he might fill all things;" nor testified that "all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth." It is not to be supposed then that they who appeared with him had as yet received *their* full glory. It would therefore be difficult for those who believe in an intermediate consciousness to say in what respect these persons were in a more favoured state than other departed saints. And though any one is at liberty to conjecture that some superior degree of blessedness was conferred on Enoch and Elijah, the declaration concerning the former, "He was not, for *God took him*,"—seem to imply a difference not in degree but in *kind*, between the fate of Enoch and that of the rest of the dead. For if it be contended, that God "took" Enoch and Elijah, without death; but that this does not forbid us to believe that he "takes" others, to a similar reward, after their death; we may reply by asking —On this supposition, how does it appear from Genesis that Enoch did not die? The children of Rachel "were not," when they were taken from their mother by death; and therefore when

Digitized by Google

it is written that Enoch "was not," this would rather show that he departed this life in the ordinary way. We can learn that he was translated only from the words, "God took him."

When however the question arises, Whence, from what blisful region did Elijah come, in what form did he appear, much, and indeed insuperable difficulty arises from the appearance of Moses with him. For Moses was not translated that he should not see death; he died upon Mount Nebo. His appearance with Elijah might indeed lead us to conclude that both came from the same world or state, and that the condition of Enoch and Elijah therefore differed not at all from that of the rest of the blessed dead, who die in the Lord. But this notion is wholly incompatible with the fact, that while the translation of the former was a reward, the death of Moses was a *punishment.* Yet how could it be a privation to Moses to be admitted, rather than to the earthly Canaan, to the heaven of Enoch and Elijah? And how can we suppose that the disembodied spirit of Moses, dwelling in Hades, enjoyed the same life (if life at all), as they, whose especial reward was that they should not see death; but who were raised, body and soul, to some heavenly region? Surely it is *probable* that Moses and Elias came from different regions; had been in different states. We are not told whether the two wore similar forms. But the power which called Moses' spirit from the grave could render him visible to the eye, for a special purpose, as was Samuel at En-

Digitized by Google

dor.* Such similarity of aspect decides nothing with respect to the condition of their souls. It is in the very highest degree improbable that a disembodied soul in Hades should be in the same state as the soul which was raised to heaven, and had never dwelt, as far as we have reason to believe, in any other than a corporeal habitation.†

If however any one is inclined to conclude, *from his appearance at the transfiguration*, that Moses was honoured after death with translation into the heaven of Enoch and Elijah, this will by no means render it probable that other departed saints enjoy a similar blessedness to that of these distinguished servants of God.

This conclusion is strengthened by the accounts which the Scriptures have given us concerning the miraculous raising of the dead. For nothing can be collected from these accounts to show, or even faintly suggest, that the souls of the persons raised were summoned from a world of consciousness. They appear to have awakened as from a profound and dreamless sleep. If they had been

---

* "The soul separate from the body is not an object of sight (since at a man's death all that was formerly visible of him remains before our eyes in the corpse), so that nothing can be inferred respecting a separate state of the soul, from the visible appearance of Moses and Elias, which the apostles witnessed."—*Lectures on a Future State.* That is, nothing can be inferred from the fact of their visibility; though we may nevertheless draw conjectures from the fact of their then consciousness.

† "The spirit of Moses was probably made visible only by an assumed vehicle for that purpose." Dr. Watts' Essay towards the proof of a separate state of souls.

Digitized by Google

recalled from the heaven of Enoch and Elijah, would they have foreborne to speak of it; to reveal somewhat concerning this glorious state or place of the dead? Yet tradition, full of fond and vain fictions as it is, does not even profess to record a revelation of this kind; nor even offer us as genuine one single testimony, by any of these persons, in proof of an intermediate consciousness.

Further; it would be hard to imagine in what way resurrection could be a blessing, or indeed how it could be other than a severe trial and affliction, except on the supposition that the dead are, literally, "in a land where all things are forgotten." Let us turn to the case of Lazarus. He "slept;" and our Saviour proceeded to Bethany, to "awake him out of sleep." Did this mean, to summon his soul from the lower heavens; nay, as some would suppose, from the society of angels, and just men made perfect, and bring it back to reoccupy its frail tenement of clay in this world of sorrow and sin? Surely this would be consistent neither with the words, nor the gracious design of our Saviour.

If it be objected that St. Paul has said, "to die is gain;" this can be equally well explained either on the supposition of an intermediate consciousness, or of a momentary hiding in the grave until the indignation be overpast: while, on the other hand, the apparent discordance between the the words of St. Paul, and the fact of our Lord's raising the dead, is certainly the less, when we

Digitized by Google

adopt the supposition that they were raised from a state of mental torpor.

We will now turn to a passage on which great stress is laid by nearly every writer upon the subject of the intermediate state, though they do not all agree as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. In order to confute the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, our Lord asks, "As touching the dead that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err."* "Our Saviour's argument," says Dr. Jortin, in his Doctrine of a Future State, "in the opinion of several, seems rather directly to prove a future state, or another life, or rather the permanency of the soul, than a resurrection by which a dead man shall become a living man again. But as the Sadducees, who denied a resurrection, denied also that the soul was a living principle distinct from the body, our Lord, say they, by proving the permanency of the soul, or of the person, overset the foundation of their pernicious doctrine. But it seems most probable† that our Lord intended to convince the Sadducees of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; and it

* Mark xii. 26, 27.

† Might he not have said, It is most certain?

Digitized by Google

was a good *argumentum ad hominem.* Abraham, in your opinion, is dead and perished; but God calls himself the God, that is the protector and rewarder of Abraham, after he was dead; therefore he will raise him again to a state of happiness. What could a Sadducee have replied to this? He could not say that God might reward the *soul* of Abraham, without raising him from the dead. By doing so he must have given up [*part of*] his own system.

"This argument of our Saviour, *though it will not prove an intermediate state of happiness*, yet, on the other hand, will not prove the sleep, or insensibility, or non-existence of the soul during that interval."

This candid avowal of Jortin's has proved by no means satisfactory to most other advocates of an intermediate consciousness. Dr. Bull says "the Sadducees denied the subsistence of the spirits of men after death, and therefore denied the resurrection of their bodies: and if they could have been convinced of the former, they would readily have acknowledged the latter also." And this view has been generally adopted by writers on the same side who hold, as Dr. Jortin has stated, that our Lord's argument proves rather the permanency of the soul, than the resurrection of the body.

Yet nothing can well be more plain, than that our Lord's argument was intended to prove the resurrection of the body; and even if we were meanly to consider it merely as an *argumentum*

Digitized by Google

ad hominem, intended for the Sadducees alone,* it would be totally inconclusive, if it went to prove the consciousness of the dead;—if they were to be regarded as experiencing God's protection,—as being in fact *not* dead but living.

It is absurd to say that the Sadducees would allow that their antagonist,—for as such they esteemed Jesus,—had proved the resurrection of the dead, by proving the permanency or consciousness of the soul. The permanency of the soul was matter of popular heathen belief, as well as a favourite philosophical tenet; and yet it "seemed a thing incredible with them, that God should raise the dead;" a thing which merited to be received with mockery.† Men who have just been defeated on one point, are not therefore the more likely to yield another, which is not necessarily dependent on the former.

The words which God spake to Moses at the bush afford, as we maintain, no proof whatever of resurrection, except on the supposition that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and other departed servants of God, are *not now* experiencing the truth of God's assurance that He would be their God. For if this promise be realized to them

* That it was by no means intended only for the Sadducees may be fairly gathered from the fact, that it proved convincing to the common people; who were "astonished at his doctrine;" as well as to certain of the scribes, who would scarcely have deemed Jesus to have "spoken well," had not his argument been convincing to their own minds.

† Acts xxvi. 8, and xvii. 32.

Digitized by Google

now, their resurrection can be in nowise necessary to its fulfilment.* If we believe that the Almighty, in order to verify His words, not only took the disembodied souls of those patriarchs into His especial keeping, but also conferred on them such consciousness and bliss as to prove to them that he was still as truly their God as before, we entirely lose our proof, "as touching the dead, *that they rise.*"

---

* "To a faithful Jew," says Mr. Isaac Williams, "such an express intimation of God's love and care would convey a stronger conviction of a future state, than any mere texts of Holy Writ which declared it; as the whole of it depended on practical conviction, not on speculative proof. It was *the uncertainty of the proof* on which the greatness of their faith depended. The higher the faith of the patriarchs was, the more thoroughly would they have reposed on any expression of God's favour; thinking not, and perhaps not caring for any distinct explanation of *the mode* in which that favour would be conferred on them."—*Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 155.

Firm faith must have a solid basis. The greatness of faith is shown in relying on that which is *certain in itself*, in spite of *attendant discouragements:* in steering boldly amid darkness by the polar star. But if it were uncertain whether the star were polar, the mariner might be pardoned for doubting of his course. The Sadducees were culpable, because God's word, with sufficient plainness, "told them, and they believed not." But even admitting that it is the glory of faith to rest on uncertainties, (to *believe*, rather than *know*, on what we have believed) it does not follow, that our Lord would prefer an uncertain text; for the error of the Sadducees was most strongly condemned by those which were *plainest.*

And to say that the faithful Jews thought and cared nothing about the *mode* in which God's favour should be conferred on them is just to admit that they thought and cared nothing about, i. e. did not, on any grounds whatever, believe in, the resurrection of the body.

Digitized by Google

There would never have been any dispute about the import of this "famous passage," had not men been perversely bent upon discovering in it a demonstration of that intermediate consciousness to which it is decidedly hostile.

Our Lord's argument is evidently this: All dead men (or at least all who have died in faith) will rise again from the dead. For those dead men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will rise from the dead. For God has declared himself to be their God,—their shield, and their exceeding great reward,—and he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. *Now* Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are as yet numbered among the dead: but they must surely *live* again, to rejoice in the God of the living: or else the word of God would be unfulfilled. And to live again, they must *rise* again. To maintain that He is the God of those dead men who are departed out of this world, would not only completely destroy the proof of the resurrection, but confound the distinction between the dead and the living, invariably maintained in Scripture, and nowhere more plainly than in this passage at the bush. When the disciples came to seek Jesus at the sepulchre wherein his body had been laid, the angel of the Lord said unto them, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but he is *risen*:" implying that until Jesus rose he was not living. And so Isaiah said long before, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they *arise*." But it is needless to multiply examples.

Digitized by Google

It may perhaps be said that the words of our Lord recorded by St. Luke do remove the distinction just contended for, between the living and the dead. "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for *all live unto him.*" If we suppose this to mean, that in God's sight there is no such thing as death, we again lose our proof of the resurrection from the dead. "Unto him," with whom a thousand years are as one day, and all future eternity is present, all they may well be said to "live," who, when their momentary hiding in the grave is past, will live for all eternity. They may for a while be unconscious of God: but God is not unmindful of them. He has appointed a set time, at which he will remember them, and have a desire unto the work of his hands. Their unconsciousness, for however long an interval, does not falsify the divine word. If our Lord was the God of Abraham, while he slept through one night in unconsciousness, He is the God of Abraham no less, though he sleep through ten thousand years.* "O God, Thou art *my God*," the faithful Jew might say, "*for ever* will I trust in Thee! Thou wilt not leave

* It should be observed that, for aught we know, a few moments of unconsciousness *may* occur not unfrequently in the course of the waking hours of every one. There are some mental and nervous affections in which consciousness is suspended for considerable intervals, and yet, when consciousness returns, the current of ideas flows on as if no break had taken place. Yet God ceaseth not to be the God of these persons. Bishop Butler and others admit that the mind may be unconscious for a time.

Digitized by Google

nor forsake me. But shall Thy loving kindness be shown in the grave, Thy faithfulness in destruction? Not so: for thou art not the God of the dead. Thy power, Thy truth, Thy faithfulness, shall be manifested in redeeming my soul from the grave; and then wilt thou be indeed my God, when thou hast given this mortal immortality."

And wherefore did God please to declare himself Abraham's God? "Here," says St. Paul, "we have no continuing city, but we seek that which is *to come*." Abraham too, "sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And these patriarchs, we read, died in faith, "desiring a better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called *their God*, FOR he hath prepared for them a city."

The admission of Abraham, and of all believers into this city is as yet future; for God hath not built it in Hades below, in the present dwelling-place of the dead, but prepared it in heaven above, for the blessed and merciful who shall inherit the kingdom at the Last Day. When the heavens and earth have passed, it shall come down out of heaven from God, who will then, and not before, have His tabernacle with men, and dwell among them. Then, and not while

Digitized by Google

they are dead, "God himself shall be with them; AND BE THEIR GOD."*

We may now turn to the consideration of a passage on which far more stress is laid, than on our Lord's confutation of the Sadducees,—and certainly with much better reason: the parable of Dives and Lazarus. The entire weight of the argument in favour of an intermediate consciousness, to be derived from this parable, depends of course upon the supposition that it is intended to contain a *revelation* concerning the unseen world. But it is an objection to this at the outset, that *no other* of our Lord's parables contains a revelation, except in respect of its secondary meaning. The parable, for instance, of the wheat and tares conveys indeed a revelation, in respect of the gathering of the elect, and the fiery destruction of the wicked; but none whatever concerning husbandry. It might be urged however with truth, that in the parable of Dives and Lazarus even the primary meaning relates to the unseen world, to spiritual things, which is not the case in any other parable; and that to suppose it to convey a revelation is merely to suppose that, in common with all or most other parables, it conveys in its primary meaning, a statement of actual, or at least of possible events. All the other parables, it must be admitted, contain state-

* See Rev. xxi. 1, 2, 3.

Digitized by Google

ments of possible events: but it is nevertheless highly improbable, and it is not generally believed, that they speak of actual facts. The mode of instruction by parables was customary before it was adopted by our Lord; and it is employed in Syria at this day, without any intention of conveying information otherwise than by the secondary meaning: and if the parables are in general true also in the primary meaning, this is merely because parabolic illustrations are best borrowed from the most common and familiar events available for the purpose.

We are then reduced to the alternative of supposing, either that this parable contains *far more* than any other,—in conveying a revelation in its primary meaning;* *or somewhat less*, in speaking of things which could not happen, where other parables speak of things which very probably did not happen; and concerning which things, (whether they had happened or not) our Lord had no intention to convey any new information whatever.—Which of the two should we prefer?

Some have preferred the former, because the Jews, as they maintain, must necessarily have so understood the parable; inasmuch as, in our Lord's time, they commonly believed that "the souls of the faithful, when they die, are by the ministry of angels conducted to Paradise."† "If

* It may be fairly questioned, whether a passage thus conveying, as is supposed, *a double revelation*, ought to be called a parable.

† See Bull's Sermons. On the Doctrine of the Middle State.

Digitized by Google

this had been an erroneous opinion of the Jews," says Bishop Bull, "doubtless our Saviour would never have given any the least countenance to it." But let us consider whence the Jews derived this notion of a Paradise, or Garden of Eden? Nothing is said in their Scriptures of any such place—except that from which Adam was expelled. Either they expected a return to this, as is most probable; or to some place, answering to the Elysian fields of the Greeks,—and *as unreal.* But the Paradise of Adam, and the Paradise of the Book of Revelations, is the fit place of abode, not for mere spirits, but for actual living men, for embodied souls.

And we must consider the details of the parable itself; in order to judge whether our Lord intended to confirm the cabalistic notions of the Jews, and authenticate them as containing a doctrine worthy of general acceptation.

Whatever expectations we might have been inclined to entertain before-hand, the parable *cannot* contain a revelation. For it is altogether inconsistent with what we know both from Scripture and observation, concerning the intermediate state,—and also with what is revealed concerning the Day of Judgement. In the intermediate state men are disembodied. How then can we literally understand the petition of Dives, that Lazarus might "dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool his tongue?" *Whence* the water, the finger, the tongue? Are we to go the length of supposing that men are to occupy temporary bodies

Digitized by Google

before the resurrection? and that on their departure from this world they shall have a local, as well as mental, existence? And how can we place *all* the righteous *literally* in Abraham's bosom? Yet the parable makes this the position of Lazarus! Dives "seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom;" and beholding him there (and, as it appears, seeing no one else) begs Abraham to send him to his aid.

Whence too the solicitude of Dives about his brethren, when in "the land where all things, (*at least* all *earthly* things,) are forgotten?" How can Dives pray to Abraham for help, when in the land, wherein is no work, nor device, nor knowledge?

Dives we are told was in hell, called Hades, indeed, but represented as a place of torment and of flame. But are the flames of hell, whatever kind of torment the words may portend, *already* burning? Is there another hell besides that to which the wicked shall be consigned, when, as we are told in a passage not parabolical, the words shall be uttered, "Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*," inquired the evil spirits of Jesus. *Their* time then has not yet arrived. And the "angels that sinned" are simply enchained in Hades, and reserved for the judgement of the Great Day. Is there a *separate and previous* hell, for the wicked of human birth? At the end of the world, we know, they will be

Digitized by Google

punished along with evil spirits, in the fire prepared *for the latter*. Let us rather believe that the meeting of the blessed with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with the general assembly and church of the first-born, and with the spirits of just men made perfect, and with an innumerable company of angels; and the meeting also of the cursed with legions of evil spirits, will take place at the end of the world.

From the occurrences which will *then* take place, the imagery of this parable is borrowed; being merely, as it were, ante-dated, for the sake of the moral application. Its import will be best understood by considering the moral lesson which it is intended to convey. If men hear not Moses and the prophets, (and still more, if they disobey Christ and his apostles,) neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead. No more forcible method of inculcating this truth could well be imagined, than by supposing a dialogue between a tormented sinner and the father of the faithful, concerning the sending a messenger back from the grave. If we are to accept the parable as a revelation, we must accept every part, every detail. We must suppose it to contain a precisely accurate description of Hades, and a correct historical narrative. We must believe that all the wicked are tormented in flame, before the Judgement Day; that they have tongues which burn with heat; that they see Abraham and the rest of the righteous very plainly; that they (occasionally at least) are

Digitized by Google

ignorant till Abraham informs them of it, of the great gulf between the regions of happiness and misery; that across this gulf they can converse with ease, etc.! and all this, though they have "gone down into silence;" and are in "a land of darkness, as darkness itself."

Some persons may reply, that the accounts which scripture has given us of the world to come contain imagery of different and indeed opposite kinds: but that notwithstanding this, instead of *rejecting* those accounts, we are to understand them, in general, as literally as we can. An objection more specious than just. For though this principle of interpretation is to be applied to mere general descriptions, it is inapplicable to *narratives* like that in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, in which the details cannot be true at all, unless in a literal sense. Several passages of Scripture represent the wicked as suffering from fire; which when literally understood, implies the probable presence of light; while other accounts represent them as in outer darkness, as involved in "the blackness of darkness for ever." But there is no difficulty in reconciling these accounts by understanding the former to speak of the *sufferings* of the wicked, the latter of their being wholly cut off from Him who "is light," and in whom is "no darkness at all." But the tip of the finger, the water, the tongue, the flame, etc., in the parable, are either wholly imaginary, or are literally existing in Hades.

Digitized by Google

St. Paul's declaration that "we are come to the New Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, and to the *spirits of just men made perfect*," has sometimes been held to indicate an intermediate consciousness. Thus Dr. Watts argues, in his "World to come." "The Gospel or the Christian state brings good men into a nearer union and communion with the heavenly world and the inhabitants thereof, than the Jewish state could do. The inhabitants of this upper world, this heavenly Jerusalem, are here reckoned up: God as the prime Lord or Head; Jesus the Mediator as the King of his Church; the innumerable company of angels as ministers of his kingdom; the general assembly of God's favourites or children, who are called the first-born;—which may perhaps refer in general to all the saints of all ages past, and to come, whose names are written in the Book of Life in heaven; and particularly to the spirits of just men who are departed from this world, and are made perfect in the heavenly state. * * * It has been objected," continues Dr. Watts, "that the spirits of the just are *not yet* made perfect in heaven, because the apostle says, 'These all,' *i. e.* the saints of the Old Testament, 'having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises; God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.' Now these had been dead for many generations, yet they received not the promises, nor were made perfect. Thus saith

Digitized by Google

the objection. But the evident meaning is, that they lived and died in the faith of many promises, some of which were to be fulfilled, after their days, here on earth, but were not fulfilled *in their life-time:* they did not enjoy Gospel blessings in that perfect manner in which we do since the Messiah has come, and, by offering himself, 'perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'"*

In the sense which Dr. Watts has here given to the word, just men now on earth are as truly "perfected" as those spirits which he imagines to be so in an intermediate state. When it is said that they who are sanctified are "perfected," it is plainly meant that (though they are still required to go on unto a further "perfection,") yet in as far as their redemption depends on, or rather *consists in*, the shedding of the blood of Christ, it is a work perfectly accomplished. But in general they are said to be "perfected," who have received their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory;" who have obtained *all* that God has promised to bestow. In this sense, as the context proves, the spirits of the just will be found to be perfected, when we, who are now emulating them on earth, are admitted, at the Last Day, into their joyful society. For the *promises*, which they are not to receive without us,† are as yet future; are *not* to be realised, as Dr. Watts maintains, either on earth, by those

* Heb. x. 14. † Heb. xi. 39, 40.

Digitized by Google

who live under the gospel dispensation, or by disembodied spirits in the intermediate state; but by the saints of the old, not without those of the new dispensation, in heaven itself, after the Great Judgement-day. For St. Paul is plainly referring to that *rest*, (in the heavenly Canaan, the New Jerusalem,) which yet "*remaineth for* the people of God;" a rest, promised to the Jews, but to them in common with the whole Christian community of believing children of Abraham. In this view he says, shortly after, "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the *promise*. For yet a little while, and *he that shall come will come*, and will not tarry."* We then who are now living by faith, under the Gospel dispensation, have not received the promises, nor are as yet made perfect, nor shall be perfected until Christ comes.

It is indeed *abundantly* plain that the "promises" spoken of in the epistle to the Hebrews are all to be realised at the resurrection. The thing promised is "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And this city does *not* mean, as Dr. Watts supposes, that Christian Church, or that Gospel dispensation, which was established by the Messiah at his first advent. For they who died in faith, not having received the promises, sought (not merely spiritual privileges such as might be enjoyed in common by just men made perfect in earth, with just men

* Heb. x. 36, 37.

Digitized by Google

made perfect in heaven, but) emphatically, a "*heavenly* country." Their hope was "to obtain a happy *resurrection*:" to enter and enjoy "a kingdom which cannot be moved" *after* the removal of the present heavens and earth. Here they had not, nor have we, any continuing city; but we are still to seek, even as they sought, one which is "*to come*."

In the same view said St. Paul,* I sacrifice all things, "if by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection of the dead*. Not as though I had already attained, either were already *perfected*."† But he pressed forward, that he might obtain the prize, even that crown of righteousness which the Last Day should bring him.

We are come to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to the other concomitant blessings, in this sense—that we are invited now to realise by faith and hope, as far as we may, the blessedness to be experienced in the future world. Even now we are to act as if in the visible presence of our Judge, and of the myriads of attendant angels; as if the heavenly Jerusalem had already come down from God; as if in the society of all those blessed spirits who shall by regeneration receive their perfect consummation and bliss. In the same sense also are we come to Jesus the Mediator, and to the blood of sprinkling. The benefits of His mediation and atonement are as yet received by us only in part, as far as we may

* Phil. iii. 12. † So in the original.

Digitized by Google

receive them by faith and hope; for we have not yet obtained our promised joint-inheritance; our "crown of *righteousness*" is as yet laid up; our "kingdom that cannot be moved" still awaits the promised shaking of the earth.

It is remarkable that St. Paul mentions both the church of the first-born, and the spirits of the just made perfect. He appears to be viewing the same persons under two different conditions, first, as members of the invisible church *on earth* * in all ages; and secondly, as perfected in heaven. To the former we are already come in part; our communion with the latter is reserved for another world.

"To this end," says St. Paul, "Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Hence Calvin argues, that the dead must be in a state of consciousness;—"for he cannot be Lord except of those who are in being." But God is not the God of the dead; and St. Paul's words point rather to the resurrection. Christ is Lord of the dead, just as He is Lord of Death. He has the keys of Hades and Death, but has *not yet* unlocked their dark gates, nor disenthralled the souls in bondage to their power. "All power is given unto Him in heaven and earth;" but He has not yet "taken unto Himself His great power

* Else why does St. Paul say that their names are enrolled in,—or, as it were, *booked-for*—heaven?

Digitized by Google

and reigned." We must not judge our brethren, says the apostle; seeing that we are to live and die unto the Lord alone, before whose judgement seat both quick and dead shall stand.*

"A testimony against them [who hold the sleep of the soul] is borne," says Calvin,† "in heaven, before God and His angels, by the souls of the martyrs, who with a loud voice cry from under the altar, 'How long, O Lord, dost Thou not avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth. And white robes were given unto 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, were fulfilled.'‡ What, O slumbering spirits, are white robes to you? Are they cushions on which you may repose in sleep? The white robes suit not sleep. They must needs be awake who are clothed thus. Doubtless the white robes signify the commencement of that glory which Divine Goodness confers on the martyrs, while they await the judgement-day."

Probably Calvin is perfectly right in this. And these martyrs are the same with "those that came out of great tribulation, and had washed

---

* *See* Romans xiv. 5 to 13. It may be observed, that Christ is Judge of quick and dead: and yet it cannot be said, "the dead are conscious *now*, because Christ can judge those only who are in being."

† Psychopannychia. ‡ Rev. vi.

Digitized by Google

their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; * and the same as "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God; * * who sat on thrones, and had judgement given unto them, and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." † And Calvin is probably correct also in his opinion, that St. John "sets forth a twofold resurrection; one of the soul, before judgement, the other when the body is raised." For it is expressly said that "*the souls* of them which were beheaded, etc., *lived* and reigned with Christ; and that "the *rest of the dead*" (*souls* surely?) "*lived not* until the thousand years were finished." And what is a resurrection of the soul before judgement, or a soul's living with Christ while the rest of the dead *live not*, but a restoration to life and consciousness?

Some have maintained that "the first resurrection" is corporeal: but even admitting this, it cannot be admitted, that, when souls are said to live, it is meant that *bodies only* are restored to life, and that the souls were alive before: and also that, when it is said, "the rest of the dead lived not," *corpses only* are intended. But in order to obtain from the above passages a proof of intermediate consciousness, continued from the time of death, we must further believe that the first resurrection includes *all* the dead, who die in the Lord: whereas the Scripture speaks of

---

* Rev. vii. † Rev. xx.

Digitized by Google

martyrs alone.* *They* will live, i. e. their souls will live, for a thousand years before the rest of the dead are restored to life: but there is no ground for supposing that the souls and *bodies* of *all* the redeemed will enjoy a millennial reign; supervening upon an indefinite period of hopeful consciousness. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this *the judgement;*—not two protracted states of intermediate life. The martyrs indeed shall be in a state to cry unto God, and receive white robes, *for a little season before* that judgement on their persecutors; on which, as it appears, the millennial reign of Christ shall ensue. But we need not expand this little season even in their case, much less in that of others, into untold thousands of years.

Strange it is, seeing that death and judgement are in Scripture brought so near each other, that there are many who have familiarized their minds to the belief that two states must be passed through, and each of great length, before the deceased Christian encounters the final judgement seat, to "receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad." Many expect to be in great bliss and glory, emancipated from the bondage of the flesh, and with Christ, immediately

* It has been observed that to those that were slain for the witness of Jesus are added those "which had not worshipped the Beast;" or *as many as* (οιτινες) had not worshipped. But these also are martyrs; for "as many as would not worship the image of the Beast were killed." Rev. xiii. 15.

Digitized by Google

on their departure from this world; and hope to exchange this wholly spiritual state for a Millennial reign with Christ upon the present earth, before the second resurrection. And this their millennial state, in which the body is, as they suppose, re-united to the soul, is of course expected to confer on them an addition of happiness and glory. But let them consider well, what *further* bliss they reserve, in their imaginations, for their fourth state, after the judgement, when heaven and earth have passed away. In truth, they practically reserve none: but appropriate to themselves, in their second or third state, every particular form of blessing which God has promised to confer *at, and not before* that time when the "blessed of the Father," having been finally judged, "inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Nay, in too many instances, they actually apply to their supposed third state all the magnificent language in which the closing chapters of the Apocalypse describe the *new post*-millennial heavens and earth!

But since the minds of many *are* familiarized to these expectations, it may not be labour thrown away to point out to them briefly some of the reasons which may be assigned for expecting that the restoration of Israel to God's favour will be post-millennial; and that the millennial reign itself does *not* take place on earth.

It must be admitted that there are many pas-

Digitized by Google

sages in the Jewish Scriptures, which *seem* to point to a restoration of the Jews to the earthly Canaan, in fulfilment of the promises originally made to their nation. But we are certain nevertheless, that the patriarchs did not look for transitory promises; not to an inheritance on this earth, though of a thousand years duration. God was the God of Abraham and his seed, *because* they looked further, to a heavenly country, to a city which cannot be moved, which cannot pass away, as an earthly Jerusalem must needs pass, with the present heavens and earth. And *on what* were these expectations founded, if not on those very words of God, to which some give an earthly meaning? It cannot be said, that these expectations were founded upon mere general promises of a resurrection and another life. The *Canaan*, the *Jerusalem* which they expected, were heavenly. They *did not* hope to rise from their graves to enjoy an earthly country, to be afterwards exchanged for some heavenly state.

Further, it is abundantly plain, that the promised restoration of Israel is frequently connected with and involved in predictions of the shaking and removal of the present heavens and earth, and the establishment of the new—with the general resurrection,—the final judgement,—the punishment of sinners. Job says, the saints of old "shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep, *till* the heavens be no more." Now, if the millennial reign of Christ be on the present earth, which is not to be removed until after the thousand

Digitized by Google

years are finished, how is it possible to reconcile these words of Job with the belief in a general resurrection of saints *before* the millenium? It is too much to say that there will be a *double* renovation: first a renewal of the face of the present earth, sometimes indicated by predictions of the passing away or removal of it, and afterwards an exchange of this earth for another. "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away, the earth be burned up; nevertheless we look," says St. Peter,* "for *new* heavens and a *new* earth:" for this, and nothing but this.

Full of hope of the city which hath foundations, David† "would not fear though the earth were removed, and the mountains were carried into the midst of the sea." "There is a river," he continued, "the streams whereof shall make glad the City of our God, * * God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." No, not though "the kingdoms were moved," and at the voice of the Lord "the *earth melted.*"‡ So also in another place, "The Lord reigneth, the hills *melted like wax* at the presence of the Lord; Zion heard

---

* 2 Pet. iii. 10. When the *elements shall melt* with fervent heat.

† Justus, et tenax propositi.

‡ See Psalm lxviii. which, relating primarily to the removal of the ark in search of a resting place, is prophetical of the removal of God's church militant on earth to its resting place 'eternal in the heavens."

Digitized by Google

and was glad." And it seems that the Psalm following contains Zion's song of gladness before the presence of the Lord: wherein she, while the hills melt before Him, rejoices and cries, "He hath *remembered his mercy and truth towards the house of Israel!*"*

Isaiah also shows in many places the expectation of the believing Jews that God would restore them when he came to judge the world, to burn up the earth. "The windows from on high are open, the foundations of the earth do shake: the earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly; the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it, it shall fall and *not rise again.*† And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high,‡ and the kings of the earth upon the earth. Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord God shall reign in mount Sion and in Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously."§ This glorious description is introduced immediately after a striking picture of the misery

---

* See Psalms xcvii. xcviii. and civ.

† It shall not recover; therefore Isaiah does *not* allude to any temporary judgements inflicted on the land of Judea, previous to a millennial restoration; but to the final condemnation of the earth.

‡ Probably the powers of that spiritual wickedness which is "in high places."

§ Isaiah xxiv.

Digitized by Google

and desolation of the land of Judea, such as we see realized at the present day: and is evidently intended as a promise of the happy change which shall befall Israel, when, shortly before the dissolution of the earth, and reign of the Lord, the repentant people "cry aloud from the sea, and sing for the majesty of Jehovah."

The next chapter is yet more express. "In this mountain [Zion], will the Lord make unto all people a feast,—*swallow up death in victory,—wipe away tears from off all faces*, and take away, (then and not before) the *rebuke of his people*." "In that day,"—as soon as the coming of the Lord is visibly drawing nigh,—shall a song be sung in the land of Judah, containing these words, "O Lord our God, other gods beside thee have had dominion over us,"—so that their penitence and emancipation seem to have commenced *just before*,—"but by Thee only will we"—in future—"make mention of thy Name. * * * Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. * * Behold the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall *no more cover her slain*." It appears then that the slayers and their innocent victims shall together meet the reward of their deeds, at the general resurrection, when death is swallowed up in victory, the rebuke of God's people taken away, and they themselves delivered from serving them that are no Gods.

Digitized by Google

At the close of another chapter* we find language which, were its meaning not controlled by the comment of St. Paul, the believers in a millennial reign on earth would undoubtedly appropriate to themselves. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by Myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength," etc. "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory." Here is no promise of a millennium, when all men shall bow before Jehovah, and Israel rule the world; but of *the general resurrection.*†

Again, "Hearken unto me, my people, and give ear to me, O my nation; for the Lord shall comfort Zion, he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; My righteousness is near," etc. Lift up your eyes unto the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath, for the heavens shall *vanish away like smoke,* and *the earth shall wax old* like a garment, but my salvation shall be for ever." * * I am the Lord thy God. I have put my words in thy mouth, and covered thee with the shadow of mine hand, *that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundation of the earth, and say unto*

* Isaiah xlv. † See Romans xiv. 10.

Digitized by Google

Zion, Thou art my people."* And in close connexion with this, further on, "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee. * * *For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed,* but my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor the covenant of my peace be removed. O thou afflicted, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and thy foundations with sapphires."†

These are strong testimonies to the truth, that the restoration of the Jews will be *after the millennium;* and if this be admitted, no ground is left for the expectation of an earthly millennial reign. St. John declares that *the souls* of the martyrs lived and reigned with Christ; and in believing in their spiritual reign over the earth, and in the temporary suspension, for the same period, of the power of the Prince of Darkness, we believe *enough:* enough, without claiming for the saints of the millennium the surpassing glories of the New Jerusalem; nor for all departed Christians in their ante-millennial state, that life of the soul, and that reign with Christ, which is the especial privilege of martyrs, and which will endure for ten centuries only.

There yet remains one important passage,

---

* Isaiah li.

† Isaiah liv. See Rev. xxi. 19, where this city, planted *after* the millennium, is more fully described.

Digitized by Google

which is commonly held to convey the most direct proof, not of consciousness merely, but of peculiar happiness and glory, during the intermediate state. To the believing robber on the cross, who prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom," our Saviour replied, "*To-day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Beyond dispute, the reward promised was *not* one that might be conferred at the general resurrection; for thus Jesus would merely be remembering the suppliant "when he came in his kingdom;" though in what it actually consisted is less evident. But be it what it may, nothing can be more presumptuous and unwarrantable, than to expect the same reward, or even any reward like it, for all believers in Christ. As well,—nay, *less* presumptuously—might we expect that all who "walked with God" should be translated with Enoch and Elijah, and never see death. For as far as we can judge, the faith of the penitent robber* exceeded theirs; as it exceeded that of the apostles, and probably of *every* follower of our Lord.† When the enemies of Jesus, to all appearance, prevailed, when he submitted to stripes, insults, and finally the most ignominious death, the triumph of the unbelievers was complete, and the last hopes of his followers seem to have faded

---

* Not thief, but robber, or bandit,—of the same trade with Barabbas. In ill-governed countries men of this class are often popular, as in Italy and Spain at this day.

† See the "Lectures on a Future State."

Digitized by Google

away.* One of them had betrayed him, another repeatedly denied him, the rest forsook him and fled. His enemies exulted in the proof which, to their minds, his degrading death afforded, that he could not be the anointed of God; saying, If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross and we will believe: that he should save himself was the only way they could imagine of his making good his pretensions. And accordingly one of his fellow sufferers reviled him in the same terms, "If thou be the Son of God, save thyself and us." Then it was that the other malefactor not only rebuked his companion, and bore testimony to the innocence of Jesus, but acknowledged him as a triumphant sovereign about to enter upon his kingdom. * * His faith stood a trial before which that of all the other disciples was shaken. Having once, on good and sufficient grounds believed on Jesus as the Christ, he remained unshaken in his trust, even at the moment when the enemies of the crucified King were filled with triumph, and his disciples with doubt or despair. * * Whether any of us does actually possess faith equal with this man can be known only to the All-wise God. But we may be sure that none of us can *display* equal faith with his, because the circumstances are such as can never occur again. To those therefore, who

* Our Lord's leaving his mother to the care of his beloved disciple probably confirmed their apprehension, that they should see Jesus no more in this world.

Digitized by Google

do not claim for all Christians a faith equal to that of the penitent robber, it must be a matter of comparatively small moment to attempt to determine what is meant, by being with Christ in Paradise.

In all probability however the Paradise intended is *the same as is mentioned elsewhere* in the New Testament. "To him that overcometh," our Lord declareth by St. John, "I will give to eat of the tree of life, that groweth in the midst of the Paradise of God." This is evidently a promise of a reward after the general resurrection,* when the redeemed shall be permitted to eat of the precious fruit mentioned in the last chapter of the Apocalypse.—The same place of bliss was beheld in vision by St. Paul, who was "caught up into Paradise," and there heard unutterable words. Into the same place the believing robber was probably admitted as soon as Jesus himself entered it. But notwithstanding the weight due to the expression "to-day," it may be questioned whether our Lord entered Paradise before his ascension, or at the earliest, before his resurrection. For was he in the place to which St. Paul was "caught up,"—in a region belonging to those new heavens which are eventually to "*come down*

* For the other rewards for those who overcome, are not immediately consequent on death. The departed saints have not yet received "power over the nations,"—to break them in pieces at "the end,"—nor attained that consummate glory of "sitting with Christ on his throne."

Digitized by Google

from God,"—at the very time of his descent into Hades? Was he,—was his human soul,—at once above earth and below it, of whom St. Paul says that he who ascended "*first* descended into the lower parts of the earth?" This seems improbable; and therefore, if a strict interpretation of the expression "to-day" be contended for, there is no alternative but to place Paradise below, in that *Hades*, into which our Lord's human soul most certainly descended. But this alternative would probably be found no less inconvenient: for it is hard to believe that our Lord's human soul was in Paradise *both* when he was in Hades, and also when he left it; or to place it in the Hades which shall eventually be "cast in the lake of fire." Paradise is *probably above*, and was entered by our Lord at his ascension. The question is certainly obscure; but whatever may be understood by Paradise, it can never be shown, that Christians in general have a better claim to be admitted to the privileges of the robber, than they have to be translated or transfigured with Enoch, Elijah, and Moses.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE CONCLUDED.

THERE is another point of view in which the intermediate state may be regarded, which opens questions of vast extent, and which from their importance demand a serious and cautious investigation. If there be any consciousness immediately after death, it is reasonable to suppose that it owes its existence to the same causes, (if we may so speak in reference to the counsels of the Most High) the same causes which will produce the Resurrection at the Last Day; and the final state of happiness or misery:—that the intervening worlds are rather *anticipatory of resurrection, than consequent on death:* that (even if the interval be occupied, as some imagine, with recollections of the world left behind, as well as with anticipations of a world to come,) the soul must nevertheless be in an introductory state, not a state conclusive or consummatory: just as the imprisonment of a criminal before trial, however notorious his offence, is enforced and sanctioned by the law, solely from its relation to a future day of trial and judgement. It is in the fact that a man *will live*, when the last trump has sounded, not in the fact that he *has lived* for threescore years

Digitized by Google

and ten, that a reason must be sought for the belief in a consciousness beyond the grave.

But here a difficulty presents itself which may at first sight appear insurmountable and distressing. It has been just assumed, that the proper consequence and effect of death is, total insensibility; that any mode of consciousness, any modification of life, which takes place after death, must arise from the power of Christ, exerted in *overcoming* death. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." It must be taken for granted, that the assumption of humanity by Christ, His Passion and death, his Resurrection and Ascension to the right hand of the Father, and his promised second Advent with power and great glory are not merely the accredited signs and pledges of the resurrection of all men from their graves, and the admission of the faithful into immortality, but have actually wrought out, and are the *causes* of that resurrection and that immortality. And if the causes of the resurrection of the good, and of their entrance into eternal happiness, then also the causes of the resurrection of the wicked unto damnation, and their banishment to the "furnace of fire, where shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth:" and the causes no less—of whatever consciousness there may be, between death and the resurrection.

What then, it might be asked, was the penalty originally imposed upon Adam, and entailed on all the offspring of his fallen nature? If it was nothing worse than a liability to pain and sickness

Digitized by Google

and sorrow, to be terminated by an event which multitudes of the heathen look forward to as a blessing,—by a total cessation of existence mental and corporeal, a dissolution of the body, and dreamless sleep and torpor of the soul, what are we to think of the mediation of Christ? Did the Son of God come down, and will He revisit the earth, not only to save a chosen few, (for though many are called, *few* are chosen) but *to add infinitely to the punishment of the rest?* To recal to existence those enemies of God, who had been else blotted out of creation;—to rend the strong chain of slumbers which but for His Omnipotent hand must have bound them fast for ever; to compel them, in an agony of fear, to wait for the coming judgement; and finally to consign the victims of his indignation, imploring in vain to be permitted to return to Hades, and even claiming nothingness as their birth-right, to a dungeon of sleepless despair? Will the Sun of Righteousness shine,

> "To waken flesh upon the rack
> Of pain anew to writhe"

which had else been eternally concealed beneath the curtain of oblivion?

And for the chosen heirs of salvation; *from what* shall they be saved? Can it be said that Christ will rescue them from the everlasting fire; when, but for his resurrection, they had never risen from the dust?

To these questions, which in their very form

Digitized by Google

and language seem, if not to impeach the justice, at least to derogate from the mercy of God, a more comprehensive view of the nature of the Christian dispensation, and the wide extent of its bearings, furnishes a sufficient check, if not a satisfactory reply. It must become evident, that the supposition of a fall of man, and a penalty of death, *without* an advent of Christ to accomplish the redemption, is altogether extravagant and inadmissible into our human reasonings. Unless we choose to suppose the ways of God to men, to be *not* the ways of perfect wisdom and justice and goodness, or unless we can imagine two widely different, nay, contrary administrations of the world to be both equally consistent with the perfection of these attributes, we must conceive the creation of human and peccable creatures, without the redemption, to be a thing impossible. And this, not by any means because we presume to judge beforehand what the Almighty can, or cannot accomplish, but because we are told that both are parts of ONE DIVINE SCHEME; and we therefore conclude that they are literally, in the nature of things, which is nothing else than the will and ordinance of God, inseparable. It is always dangerous, and generally unprofitable, to indulge in speculations founded on a different system of things from that which divine wisdom has established. We have not faculties for the task.

We cannot positively know whether even the most trifling occurrences in the *material*, as well as moral world are not controlled by a strong neces-

Digitized by Google

sity, such that none of them could possibly have been otherwise than as it is,—seeing that every act of God is right; every thing, even when evil in itself, being permitted by him, is rightly permitted. We are assured in Scripture that offences must come, though woe be reserved for the offender; and we shall seek in vain to become wise above that which is written; and devise for ourselves some other dispensation than that of mixed good and evil, which prevails in this nether world.

It would be idle and fruitless to indulge in any speculations as to the consequences which would ensue, if the reasoning faculties of man had been more acute, or if any particular propensity were added to, or taken from, the human mind. For *no* consequences are properly assignable on such suppositions; we may assume any that we please. We may as well alter according to our capricious fancies the *sequence* of events, as alter the *relations* of events which are cotemporaneous.

Still more unreasonable is it to speculate on the consequences which would ensue, if one part of a great moral scheme, (which, by the established nature and course of things,—that is, by the unchangeable perfection of the Divine wisdom and goodness and justice and power,—is necessarily connected with the other) were retained, and the other part rejected. And we may be certain that Creation and Redemption are thus intimately connected; are parts of one divine scheme. For Christ is held out to us as the "Lamb slain *before the foundation of the world*;"

Digitized by Google

slain to atone for the sin which man, it was foreseen, would introduce on the earth was about to be.* It was not *after* nature had begun to groan and travail, but even before she came forth, innocent and undefiled, from her Creator's hands, that the fountain of living waters was opened, which should wash away her stains, and remove her griefs. If man could have continued sinless, he would have remained in Paradise :—but lo ! even *before* his fall were heavenly mansions made ready ; "prepared from the foundation of the world." No sooner had Adam transgressed than a prospect of the *pre-ordained* cross of Christ was opened to his view. He had been told, indeed, that he should return to the dust ; but his flesh was to rest in hope ; his seed would bruise the head of the "old Serpent," who had caused his miserable fall.

To inquire then what would have happened, but for the Mediation of Christ, is extravagant and absurd. It is to suppose the Deity to stop short, as it were, and only half accomplish a scheme of inscrutable and infinite goodness and wisdom. Christ shall wake the dead, both evil and good, from the slumbers of "the first death," as it is called in the Apocalypse ; but not from slumbers *which else would have been final :* no

* So in 1 Peter, chap. i. "A lamb without blemish and without spot ; who verily was *fore-ordained* before the foundation of the world."

Digitized by Google

such a supposition may be entertained; the resurrection, with all its consequences, was ordained and prepared for, before the creation of man. "The questions, whether God could have saved the world by other means than the death of Christ, consistently with the general laws of his government? and, Had not Christ come into the world, what would have been the future condition of the better sort of men? have been," says Bishop Butler,* "rashly determined, and, perhaps with equal rashness, contrary ways. Neither of them can properly be answered without going upon the infinitely absurd supposition, that we know the whole of the case. And perhaps the very inquiry, *what would have followed if God had not done as he has?* may have in it some very great impropriety; and ought not to be carried on any further, than is necessary to help our partial and inadequate conception of things."†

Questions may perhaps be raised,—whether the condition of souls in Hades was not *changed for the better* by the first advent of Christ? or whether the partial victory over death, obtained through His death and resurrection, *operated before the event*, so as to render the conquest of death, over the souls of those who died before our Lord's coming, less complete than it would otherwise have been? Both inquiries are important

* The Analogy, Part II. Chapter v. note.
† See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

in reference to the question of an intermediate consciousness. If such consciousness be, as has been maintained above, altogether anticipatory of resurrection, not necessarily or naturally consequent on death, they who died before Christ's coming must have been unconscious, (at least *until* His coming,) unless His resurrection operated by way of anticipation. And that it did so operate is more than can be proved from Scripture. To Adam was given the promise "Thy seed *shall* bruise the serpent's head." The victory was ordained, but not accomplished; the Old Serpent Satan did not immediately feel his deadly wound. The liberation of the souls which were to pass into Hades was also ordained; but it does not follow that the power of the grave was then impaired, and "the gates of hell" shaken, and that the fetters forged by Death for souls yet unborn were then wrested from his hands.

And if Christ's resurrection did not operate *before* the event, neither did it immediately afterwards.* "The whole creation," says St. Paul, "groweth and travaileth in pain together *until now*:" that is, "up to this present time," long after the ascension of the Lord. It groaneth

* Except perhaps in the case of the comparatively few "saints which slept," who arose and came out of their graves after Christ's resurrection, manifesting *thus*, (and not by any mere change in their disembodied souls,) His power who now held the keys of Hades: and who, as there is reason to *conjecture*, never returned to the tomb.

Digitized by Google

thus, every creature groaneth, waiting for the "manifestation of the sons of God," at the resurrection. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ *shall* all be made alive, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Certainly this passage is unfavourable to the belief, that the death originally introduced through Adam is in *any wise* removed through Christ, excepting at his second coming, at which the "dead men shall live."

Again, it deserves to be considered, that since our blessed Lord himself, as has been argued above, "tasted death for every man, and through death overcame him that had the power of death," he must, as it appears, from the very nature of the case, have partaken of the full unmitigated penalty of death;—tasted of death, such as, but for His coming, it *would have been* to the soul of every child of Adam. If this be so, it follows that death is, to the soul of every Christian, what it would have been, but for Christ, to the souls of all men; unless we prefer to believe that the faithful followers of our Lord have, as we are nowhere informed, a *better* passage through the dark valley than their Lord himself!

But rejecting this supposition, we must needs conclude that death is now both such as it ever has been, and such as, (allowing the supposition) it would have been, but for the Advent of Christ: not being changed *as yet*, in any degree, either in its nature or power, by his first coming, either

Digitized by Google

at the time of his resurrection, or before that event: but still reigning over every deceased soul, forbidding it,—since the God in whom we live and move, and have our being, is not the God of the dead,—to live, to move, or to be.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT.

HUMAN philosophy, both natural and moral, has been proved by experience as unable to approach the truths revealed in Scripture concerning the Day of Judgement, as to decide the fate of a disembodied soul. It can indeed furnish some reasons for conjecturing that our present earth shall finally be broken up and ruined, if not actually annihilated; and some—most feeble and insufficient—reasons also, for supposing that the whole human race shall finally be gathered, one by one, as they depart this life, into two permanent worlds; but that their present world shall pass away before the commencement of the final state even of the first-born of the race; and that in its fall and ruin shall be involved that of, as far as we know, *the whole* material universe, are truths beyond the reach of man.

It lies indeed within the province of reason to determine, that the world is not the work of

Digitized by Google

chance, or of any blind power; but of a Designer and a Deity, by whom the whole was called into being, wrought up, arranged, set in motion, organized, animated. And it is evident that the same Power who created can likewise, either gradually or suddenly, uncreate; nay, that His might only can sustain; that His is the breath of life in the nostrils of all creatures, and the strength of the hills is His also; and that the universe, if no longer upheld by the word of his power, must vanish away like smoke. And we may further conjecture that the chief end of the creation of our earth was to afford a fit abode for the human race: that, as other races, of plants and animals, have been permitted to become extinct, so also our own race may have its term, and our mansion either be pulled down when its tenants are gone, or be brought in ruins on their heads, when the Mighty One who upholds the pillars of it, has decreed their destruction.

The observations of astronomers also seem to indicate that the hand of the Almighty is *even now* at work, creating or destroying worlds. Stars as splendid as the sun have opened their light in regions previously dark; others have been blotted out from the heavenly scroll, and their place has known them no more: whence the eventual extinction of our own sun, and the consequent destruction of the human race, at some perhaps all but infinitely remote period, is not an improbable event. And as we cannot but believe that there was a time when no part of the

Digitized by Google

visible universe (or of that all but boundless system, in comparison of which the part visible to us is probably small) as yet was called into being; so we may conclude that a time will come when all shall have ceased to exist. But that all shall be *together* abolished, that one period shall be the fulness of time for all, is contrary to every anticipation. "The day of the Lord," nevertheless, shall come as a thief in the night, suddenly as the deluge; and the *heavens* shall be rolled together as a scroll, the *elements* shall melt with fervent heat, and *all things* being on fire shall be dissolved; the *earth and heavens* shall flee away from before the face of God, and no place be found for them. So it is written, so it is decreed. Philosophy never dreamed of such a consummation; nor dared foresee "the end of things created."

Nay, it is disbelieved by many who, while they profess to acknowledge the authority of revelation, would suppose that its language is metaphorical; or that the heavens intended are merely the atmosphere encircling our own globe. Let such persons consider our Lords own words;—"The *sun* shall be darkened, the *moon* shall not give her light, the *stars of heaven* shall fall, the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in *the clouds*."* At our Lord's ascension "*a cloud* received him out of the sight" of his disciples. Beyond dispute we are to take that account literally: and so also

* Mark xiii. 24.

Digitized by Google

when it is said that Christ will come in *the clouds of heaven*, we are to understand the material clouds of the visible heavens: of the heavens to which the redeemed will be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air" at his coming. How then can we understand the words "sun, moon, and stars," otherwise than literally? Of that type of the Second Advent, the destruction of Jerusalem, it was prophesied, "nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences, and *fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven:*" and profane history records the literal fulfilment of every part of the prophecy. How then can we suppose the language metaphorical which tells us "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; *and upon the earth* distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring?" And what portion of the material created universe shall be saved, when the stars fall, and the powers of heaven are shaken? what portion does St. Paul except, when he speaks of the "removal of those things which are shaken, as of *things that are made*, that the *things which cannot be shaken* may remain?"* By the powers of heaven seem to be intended those invisible forces by which the whole material universe, the whole system of "things that are made," is maintained in being.† These being shaken and removed, the sun, moon,

* See Heb. xii. 26. † See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

and stars, must fall in ruin, must vanish away like smoke. They pervade *the whole* visible universe, to the furthest bounds of the space cognisable by man; and would scarcely be said to be "removed" merely because their agency was suspended as regards this speck of earth, or the sun to which it belongs. If these powers fail, *all* the things created must fail with them, and pass away together on the "Dreadful Day."

Then also shall take place that *common* judgement of mankind, and that *first entrance* into celestial bliss or eternal punishment, which to the heathens was wholly unknown, and which no philosophy can teach. Ante-dating the events of the Last Day, and distributing them over a long period, the heathen philosopher placed the throne of Pluto, or of some similar power, in the shades below, and supposed him to hold a perennial sessions for the separate trial of each soul summoned before him by Death; and to assign each to its appropriate place of bliss or bale. Many who in modern times would be wise above that which is written have indulged in the same natural error; and not contented with the Day of Judgement, Heaven, and Hell, have insisted on a previous adjudication, and on preliminary states of happiness or misery.

The principles upon which judgement shall be executed on that Day, are yet more remote from human conjectures than is the universality of the judgement. That our earth and all visible worlds

Digitized by Google

shall on one and the same day be abolished utterly; that nevertheless the human race, even all in whose nostrils has ever been the breath of life, shall in bodily form survive that awful period; that new heavens and a new earth shall be created, not to be destroyed, but to endure for all eternity; these are truths which, one and all, baffle the researches and should humiliate the pride of human philosophy. But it is a yet greater wonder, (and an apparent *evil* too, more extensive and more desperate than any which philosophy can detect; and which in all our inquiries concerning the origin of evil should be carefully kept in sight,) that A FEW ONLY of mankind shall rejoice in the restitution of all things; A FEW ONLY shall receive the gift of life eternal; while the many, not being rescued by the Redeemer from their natural fate, shall go away into ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, and suffer a SECOND DEATH.

Many writers on the origin and sufferance of evil have laboured to prove that it has been permitted only *for a time*, for the sake of eventual good. But unless we are to term that eternal death of a sinner, which God willeth not, *no evil*, evil will never be abolished. If however future punishment be esteemed no evil, then it would be difficult to show that those present sufferings are evil, which are all of them consequences of sin,—which presently punish the wicked,—and work for the good of the righteous. We should become lost, in seeking, as we imagine, to vindicate Him whose thoughts and ways are not as ours, we

Digitized by Google

should in fact vindicate only our own inventions.

On this subject of future punishment, both as regards its duration, and the number of those to whom it will be awarded, God's revelation far surpasses our conjectures. For His dealings with man partake of His own infinity. No moral reasonings, no alarms of a guilty conscience, could enable a heart unvisited by the grace of God to draw so broad a line of distinction, to divide the human race into classes so unequal in amount, and whose destinies should differ infinitely. The actual extent of human depravity and guilt, and consequently the severity of punishment, would not have been known, but for revelation. That all had so far erred, and altogether become abominable, that a superhuman sacrifice was necessary to atone for their guilt, and a supernatural impulse upon their hearts to enable them to please God, are truths beyond reason, yet on which turns the whole history of man, both present and future: and by which alone can be explained the wide distinction which shall be made hereafter. With God there shall be no neutrality, for man no middle state, less blissful than heaven, more tolerable than hell; for none shall be accepted but through the Redeemer: for the rest remains only a "fearful looking for of judgement and fiery indignation."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FUTURE STATE OF PUNISHMENT.

ALTHOUGH the Scriptures abound in allusions to the future punishment of the wicked, little or nothing is distinctly revealed concerning it. While the Christian is allured by a view of the splendours of the heavenly Jerusalem, the glories of the Divine throne, the delights of the Paradise of God; there is no opposed sketch of a City of Destruction, no locality for the mansions of the wicked, no defined image amidst the "blackness of darkness" which shall be their portion for ever. The very mode of their existence is as yet a mystery. Writers philosophical and pious, may teach us that all men are alike immortal; but the Bible declares that the fate of the majority,—the fate of all who are not rescued by Christ—is DEATH. The words life, eternal life, immortality, etc. are always applied to the condition of those, and those only, who at the Last Day shall enter into the joy of their Lord. And inasmuch as death signifies either the ceasing to be, or at least the ceasing to live, we should be led to conclude that sinners will either be punished with annihilation, or will exist in a state inconceivable to us, which is the *direct opposite* of life. It surely was with some good reason that the Holy Spirit has not permitted

Digitized by Google

his messengers to call this state "life;" but has invariably employed the opposite term; and it cannot be safe to overlook this distinction. It naturally tends, and has led, to extensive mischief. It caused even a Christian philosopher to say boastfully, "There is within us an immortal spirit:" whereas God alone hath immortality, and giveth it to whom He will. And how rashly he builds on this foundation of error! "Though the body, he says, moulders into dust, that spirit which was of purer origin returns to its purer source. What Lucretius says of it is true, in a sense far nobler than he intended:

> Cedit item retro, de terrâ quod fuit ante
> In terram; sed quod missum est ex ætheris oris,
> Id rursus, cœli fulgentia templa receptant.

'What was from earth returns to earth; what was sent from heaven, is taken to heaven again.'"

"Of *purer* origin?" Is such philosophy the handmaid of divine truth? Does not every Christian know that the soul of man is naturally corrupt and impure, and utterly unfit for communion with the Deity? The words of the poet are indeed true, but of the Christian only, in a sense far nobler than he intended. What was "from the earth and earthy," namely the whole of the "first man," the child of Adam, shall return to the earth out of which Adam was taken, and shall inherit corruption; what was sent from heaven, namely the whole nature of the regenerate and new man, quickened by the Spirit, the child of God, shall

Digitized by Google

be caught up from the earth, and shall inherit immortality. But Dr. Brown unhappily includes in his predicted immortality and return to heaven, all mankind alike; even those who shall never "see God," but shall be punished with "everlasting destruction from His presence."

This is the deplorable consequence of overlooking the Scriptural distinction: on the other hand, these contrasted terms life and death, while they forbid us to believe that the mode of existence of the righteous and the wicked will be the same, must not hastily be understood to imply that the latter shall altogether cease to be. In all ages and countries, it has been observed, "life," and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied, in ordinary discourse, to a wretched life, no less than to a happy one. "Life" therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest and of the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue for ever in a state of misery. And yet to their condition the words "life" and "immortality" never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose the hearers of Jesus and his apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (unless they were taught anything to the contrary), that the condemned were really and literally to be destroyed, and *cease to exist*, not that they were to exist for ever in a state of wretchedness. For they are

Digitized by Google

never spoken of as being kept alive, but as forfeiting life; as for instance, "Ye will not come to me that ye may *have life*:" "He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."* These considerations would have great weight, did it not appear, from our Lord's own words, and from the language of Scripture in many places, that the life which the Son of God gives is not a mere continuation of natural life, but is, in part at least, a distinct and more excellent gift;—a spiritual life, not a natural life;—dependent not on the possession of a "living soul," but of a "quickening spirit." The word life then ought not to be understood in its received sense; which is applicable only to this present world.

We have now seen that the contrasted terms life and death, while they forbid us to expect a common mode of existence for all, prove neither that the wicked will cease to be, nor the contrary. Their "death" may either be, the loss of spiritual life, or the loss of being. They may continue to exist, though they are not said to live. Yet there is a great mystery in this. They will *not*, it appears, have their present natural life restored to them, after the resurrection of the body: for this would seem to be incompatible with the "destruction both of body and soul in Gehenna;" and with the assurance that "he that loveth his life (i.e. his present and earthly life) *shall lose it;*

* Lectures on a Future State. By the Archbp. of Dublin.

Digitized by Google

while he that hateth his life (or soul) in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.*

Every one certainly would *wish* to believe, were it possible, that the future state of the unrighteous, their "second death," was an utter destruction, a total cessation of being. The mind naturally shrinks back appalled from the bare conception of hopeless eternal misery. And it has been observed, that many of the images employed in Scripture to pourtray the future punishment are such as would lead us to expect an annihilation. Thus the wicked are called "wandering stars, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever;"—who shine, as it were, with baleful light for a time, to be extinguished for eternity. The image most commonly used is that of fire. Now fire both causes acute pain, and destroys or consumes that which is exposed to it. In which sense then is it used in Scripture? Is "everlasting fire" a flame that torments for ever,—or a flame that utterly destroys? There are certainly some reasons for preferring the latter sense. When, at the end of the world, God shall gather his wheat into his garner,—to be preserved, "He shall burn up the chaff with

* He who, through the grace and Spirit of God, is ready to deliver up his soul for Christ's sake, shall through the same indwelling and quickening spirit, be raised, soul and body, unto immortal life. Soul and body are mortal in themselves, but both through Christ's energy shall be raised incorruptible, changed, subdued unto His Spirit, which shall be their life, and the source of every impulse that sways them.

Digitized by Google

unquenchable fire;" with a flame which cannot be extinguished, till the chaff has been utterly consumed. Such shall be the case also of the "tares," and of the "unprofitable branches." In like manner, as it would seem, God is called "a consuming fire." The Gehenna then, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," may mean, it would seem, a place of destruction, into which whatever is thrown shall be utterly devoured. Again, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah are said to be "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire:" where is certainly intended that fire which the Lord rained upon them of old, and which destroyed them utterly. Not the future "everlasting fire," for these cities, and their past fate, are "set forth for an *ensample*;" as a warning to the ungodly of what they are to expect hereafter. The expressions "eternal death," and even "everlasting punishment" might be interpreted, did the language of Scripture in other places allow it, in a similar manner. "They may mean merely that there shall be no deliverance, no revival, no restoration of the condemned."* It is hard to imagine any stronger words to express annihilation, than "whose end is destruction," "*destroy* both body and soul in hell," "everlasting destruction from the presence of God."

Again, when it is said that some shall be beaten with few stripes, and some with many, we are led to expect future punishments differing not in

* The Archbp. of Dublin on a Future State.

Digitized by Google

degree, but in *extent*. But were they all alike infinite in duration, the stripes could not, it would seem, be described as "many," and "few."

It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah, than for some other cities, *in the day of judgment*. Here also we can, if we please, look for punishment of limited duration, beginning and ending on that fearful day.

Again, it has been argued above, that the "death which passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," whose dominion endures, and whose sting remains, till mortals, at the Last Day, put on immortality, is an universal punishment, only on the supposition of its being a state of unconsciousness;—and that therefore *it is* a state of unconsciousness. Whence we should expect the "second death" to be also a state of unconsciousness. Were it a state of perpetual *pain*, wherein, it may be asked, would be its likeness to the first; if the first be a *blessing* to all good men; and be, in itself, neither good nor evil? There is, however, some likeness between a first death,—a state of unconsciousness, and a second death,—a state of perpetual torment. In both there is a penalty, a separation from God, a cutting off from the source of life. The likeness, however, is not so great, on this supposition, as if both deaths be supposed to be states of unconsciousness.

In other words, the first and second deaths most nearly resemble each other, if both be states of unconsciousness. There is a considerable resemblance however between them (which we

Digitized by Google

should tremble to contemplate), if the former be a state of unconsciousness, and the latter one of perpetual pain; there is little or none, if the former be a state of consciousness, and of delight to some, of misery to others; and the latter be a state of consciousness, and of unmixed misery.*

The chief arguments against the supposition of eternal suffering, have now been briefly set forth. But let us beware of hastily adopting the conclusion to which they would lead. There are passages of Scripture which cannot well be explained away; containing awful denunciations of eternal woe, from which human ingenuity can find no shelter. The mind naturally longs for unlimited life; while it prefers the thought of annihilation to that of eternal torment. But God's word frustrates man's expectations; it gives no hope of life, except through Christ the Saviour;—and it may be found also, to give no hope of reprieve from suffering to such as reject his name. We may recoil from a sentence so tremendous; but we should remember that we can no more fathom God's infinite holiness and wrath, than his infinite mercy and love. If we ask, "Can the sins of a few short years deserve eternal suffering as their punishment?" it may be replied—"Would you venture to call it unjust, if the atrocious crimes

* There is a fourth supposition, but it does not deserve to be considered: viz. that the first death is a state of consciousness, the latter the reverse.

Digitized by Google

against God of ten millions of years were punished with permanent misery as a penalty?—Yet there is no essential difference." If again it be said; "Mercy may be infinite; but justice must be limited in its punishments;—God may confer undeserved blessings of infinite amount and extent, but not undeserved punishments;" it may be asked—"Where then will you place your limit? If the sufferings of sinners were an expiation for their sins, there might be a limit:* but Christ is the only expiation, and he has been rejected and trampled on. "Thou shalt by no means come out, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." And thou canst not redeem thy soul with itself; thou, a sinner, canst not "make thine own soul an offering for thy sin."

Let us now turn to the book of Revelations, and consider God, as He is there represented, in the character of an Avenger of Sin. "The devil that deceived them, (i. e. the nations of the world, after the expiration of the thousand years), was cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet were before; and THEY SHALL BE TORMENTED DAY AND NIGHT FOR EVER AND EVER."† Here the word is the same, it may be

---

* Thus the Romanists, who believe in expiatory sufferings for certain offences, place a limit to the pains of Purgatory.

† Supply "were before" rather than "are" as in our version. Βασανισθήσονται, (*they* shall be tormented), ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Digitized by Google

observed, in the original as where it is written, "his lord was wrath, and delivered him to the *tormentors*, till he should pay all that was due to him." The same also as when the devils, struck with terror, said to Jesus, "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"

The fate then of the Arch-enemy of God and man will plainly be everlasting pain. Will ours be the same? The passage does not indeed actually involve man; but it nevertheless deprives him of one resting place; it proves that to inflict everlasting pain, as the punishment of sin, is not inconsistent with the attributes of God. And all sinners will be cast, along with Satan, into "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." But by this passage, it must be admitted, man's condemnation is not sealed. For Death and Hades, we read, shall be cast into the same burning lake: whereby it seems plainly to be meant, that an utter end shall be made of them. The great enemy Death shall *be no more;* the gates of Hades shall come down, and the Power of Destruction be destroyed. What then will be the fate of the condemned? Will they be destroyed, with Hades and Death, or tormented, with Satan and his angels? Let us consult the prophecies again. "Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of *a man.*" And this man, we know, shall be tormented day and night, along with Satan, for ever and ever. Again, let us hear our Lord

Digitized by Google

saying "Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire prepared (not for Hades, but) for the devil and his angels."

Further; wherefore should we believe that they who are of their father the devil, who serve him, and do his works, will receive a different kind of wages from their master? That his punishments will be endless, theirs only for a time? If Satan is to suffer eternal pains, why not man? The transgressions of both were but for a time. Satan's rebellion has been permitted to continue for untold thousands of years, man's but for threescore and ten; but there is no essential difference here. We have some reason to believe, since it is said that Satan "abode not in the truth," that he was originally, like man, created upright; and this would bring nearer the resemblance between them; but whether originally pure or not, his existence had a beginning, he has transgressed only *for a time*. Had he his will, he would transgress and rebel to all eternity; and who will say that the children of the Wicked One, if they had their will, would not follow his example? Where then is the injustice of their being punished for all eternity, *according to their intentions:* punished for the rebellion in which they would persist for ever, did not the Almighty Avenger arrest their course, afford them time no longer, but finishing on the Day decreed, the mystery of his toleration of sin, at length take unto Himself His great power and reign. But whether we can comprehend, or not, the justice of God's future

Digitized by Google

dealings with wicked men, no sinner can show cause why the like judgement as shall befall Satan should not be executed upon himself. In declaring that Satan shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever, the Almighty God has revealed to us that such punishment *is* wise and just; and who is he that shall reply against God, if they who do the works of Satan participate in Satan's reward?* What if they who fall into the hands of the living God should be as the bush in which He revealed Himself to Moses,—the bush which burned with fire, and yet was not consumed?

That this fearful punishment, whatever its nature, awaits the larger portion of mankind, (since of those who are called, few are chosen, and we dare not believe that of those *not* called, a larger proportion can be saved,) this awful truth must surely place in doubt the soundness of those arguments by which moralists usually seek to prove the natural immortality of man. All human excellence, if merely *of* the earth, shall perish *with* the earth. Though it enable man to measure the sun, and trace the winds, and subdue all elements and all animals to his will, it gives him no power to lay hold on eternal life. Moral reasonings may lead us to hope that good will be produced

* If the imagery of the parable of Dives and Lazarus be, as has been argued above, in part that of the Day of Judgement, we may venture, without treating the parable as a revelation, to gather from it thus much,—That the sufferings of the wicked are torments of indefinite duration.

Digitized by Google

out of the evil: but the revelation which more than confirms this hope as respects some men, yet declares that the fate of the rest is not immortality, but everlasting death.

Here we may leave this subject. We know not what that state will be, which is *punishment but not life;* but the Christian is rather concerned with the state of immortality; and should aspire to be governed by his hopes of heaven, and that perfect love which banisheth all fear.

CHAPTER IX.

THE NEW HEAVENS AND EARTH.

IN theological compositions, as well as in ordinary discourse, the kingdom which the heirs of salvation shall enter at the Last Day, to dwell and reign therein through all eternity, is said to be "in heaven;" which is commonly understood to signify some place above this earth, and the peculiar abode of the Most High. Scripture appears to confirm this notion. For Christians are taught to pray to their father who is in heaven, and to believe that after death they shall be with him: and our Lord speaks of his coming down from heaven, and "ascending up where he was before," and "going to the Father." And St. Paul informs us that after the resurrection of

Digitized by Google

the body, the true followers of Christ, the adopted sons of God, shall be "caught up from the earth, and meet the Lord in the air." Hence chiefly it has happened that a large proportion of Christians confound together in their thoughts "heaven," when employed to signify the place of happiness and the abode of the holy angels, with "heaven" in the other sense,—the visible heavens, otherwise called the sky;—all, in short, that is removed from this earth and appears above it, such as the clouds, the sun moon and stars, and the like: so that when they think or speak of going to "heaven," as to a place of happiness, they in some degree connect this in their minds with the idea of some nearer approach to those heavenly bodies, as they are called, which appear over our heads.

This notion has been frequently, but unphilosophically, blended with, and confirmed by, the common belief that the soul, no longer confined to earth by its union with the body, is still local, and *moves* upwards to heaven. Unphilosophically for many reasons. The "heaven" which will be the Christian's reward at the Last Day should not be confounded with, nor imagined to be the same place with, the region of disembodied souls, even had these souls locality. But locality they have not, nor can they move in any direction, when parted from matter. The notion is moreover unscriptural, as has been already urged. It was not from the cross, but from Mount Olivet, that our Lord "ascended to his Father." The

Digitized by Google

belief therefore, that a Christian's heaven is locally above, in the sky, must stand or fall by Scripture alone: it has nothing to do with any sort of philosophical conjectures about the place or state of a disembodied soul, which, whatever its condition, certainly is *not* in "heaven."

A little consideration of Scripture will make it evident, that the material heavens which encompass our earth, and extend immeasurably beyond it, although they certainly are sometimes represented as the peculiar seat of the Divine power, are not the highest heavens, not the "*true heavens;*" but are only figures or symbols of them. The air, winds, clouds, lightning, and fire, and thunder, burning and shining lights, are all symbols and appointed signs of the Presence of God; of Him who caused the bush to burn with fire before Moses, who led His people by a cloud in the day time, and a fiery pillar by night, —who descended in fire on Mount Sinai, and the smoke thereof ascended as a furnace, — who covered the tent of the congregation with a cloud, and filled the tabernacle with a glory,—at whose voice speaking from heaven the people that stood by and heard it said that it thundered,—who came down from heaven with a sound as of a mighty rushing wind, and in cloven tongues as of fire,— who was received up into a cloud, and shall again return with clouds,—who maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind; —they are signs and symbols of the true heavens

Digitized by Google

and of Him who dwells therein, but are not those heavens themselves.

A symbol is something more than a sign; for a sign may be altogether arbitrary; a symbol must have a real analogy with the thing symbolized. The Arabic numeral 5 is the sign of a number; a hand with the fingers extended is a symbol of that number. The sacrifices of animals in the Jewish ritual, were symbolic of the sacrifice of Christ; the cross is merely a sign of his Passion. The material heavens appear evidently to partake of a symbolic character. The hand of God can indeed be discerned every where; on the earth beneath, in the waters under the earth, as well as in the heavens above; but on earth he works by a variety of means, often of a material and palpable kind, in the observation of which our faculties may be absorbed and buried, till men forget the Great Author, and First Cause: but the powers of the air, though undoubtedly subject to the control of general laws, seem to be governed more directly by the will of the Invisible One. By celestial influences;—by the alternations of cold and heat, light and darkness, by pestilences and blights, floods and hurricanes, God awakens men to His existence and power; and by the ordinary operation of some of the powers which produce these phenomena,—such as heat, electricity, gravitation,—He doth in an especial manner, uphold and govern the material world, and reveal His presence and attributes to those who contem-

Digitized by Google

plate them seriously. These "powers of heaven" therefore, so extensive in their operation, so inscrutable in their influences, and which frequently produce appearances so magnificent, lovely, or terrible, may rationally be regarded as fit symbols of His Spirit and presence who employs them.

Scripture discloses a further relationship. The true heavens are the abode of numberless intelligences and powers, myriads of angelic creatures, who behold their Father's face, and minister to His will, by whose agency moreover he himself acts and "does all his pleasure" in the lower and material heavens. David adored the Almighty "who maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh on the wings of the wind, who *maketh the winds his messengers, and the flaming bolts his ministers.*"* For such undoubtedly would be the natural rendering of the latter verse, taken in connection with the former. But St. Paul understands the passage in a far higher sense, and quotes it,—"*who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flaming bolt;*"† who commands the intelligent agents of His will to *enter* the blast and lightning flash, to identify themselves, as it were, with them; and thus clothed with might, yet in perfect subservience to Him,

> "To execute their airy purposes,
> And works of love or enmity fulfil."

The Jewish tabernacle and temple, with all their

---

* Ps. civ. † Heb. i.

Digitized by Google

principal parts, were formed so as to be symbolic of things in the true and spiritual heavens. "Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them. According to all that I shall show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of *all the instruments thereof*, even so shall ye make it." And after a minute description of some of the chief contents of the tabernacle it is added, "Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee on the Mount;" i. e. on Mount Sinai, where Moses beheld "the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man;" into which Christ entering, entered into *heaven itself*, and the immediate presence of God. Now the graven images* of the Cherubim, between which the Divine glory dwelt in an especial manner in the tabernacle and temple, must evidently represent some high order of spiritual creatures, whose place in the "heaven of heavens" is probably not less honourable than that of their images on earth. But they are in Scripture identified, as it were, with mere mate-

* "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor *the likeness of anything in the heaven above.*" To this law the Cherubim were an exception sanctioned by the lawgiver Himself: and it does not appear that the Jews, with all their idolatries, ever worshipped these images. But it is probable that the Gentiles paid divine honours to the Cherubim, and sculptured them in forms not unlike those of the Jewish temple. See the Introduction to Kirby's Bridgewater Treatise, where the symbolic nature of the heavens is beautifully treated, and which has suggested many remarks in this chapter.

Digitized by Google

rial clouds; and thus we are again led to conclude that the material heavens, no less than the temple and tabernacle, are figures of the true and spiritual heavens. The Lord, it is written,* "rode upon a Cherub and did fly, and came flying upon the wings of the wind,"—as *the clouds* are beautifully and poetically termed. Since the word Cherubim has been conjectured to signify *powers* or *forces*, and since the Cherubic images typified creatures in the spiritual heavens, of which again the material heavens are symbolic, and since the clouds are signs of the presence of the cherubim in these material heavens, we may perhaps justly consider these mysterious beings to be high spiritual intelligences, to whom the Almighty has delegated the task of upholding and controlling the material powers or forces that prevail in the inferior heavens, and of whose presence the clouds are an appointed sign.

Though clouds are nothing more than aggregations of vapours raised by the sun, and the motions of the wind and the electric flash are regulated by certain strict laws of equilibrium, yet there is nothing to offend *reason* in this occupation of the material heavens by spiritual intelligences. For our knowledge of the essential conditions of corporeity, of the mode of connexion between mind and matter, is little better than complete ignorance: and it cannot with any show of reason be pretended that an aggregation of

* Ps. xviii.

Digitized by Google

aqueous vapours, or a blast of air, is less fitted to become the abode and instrument of intelligence and will, than are the structures, scarcely more permanent in their component particles, of bones and flesh and blood.

And no theory of nature can be more beautiful, or more attractive to the *imagination* than this, which peoples the (so called) inanimate spaces of creation with intelligences more exalted than man; and sees in the daily and familiar phenomena of the universe, not only the power of the Supreme Ruler, but the agency of innumerable angelic creatures, who take delight in his service, and glorify him by their obedience. Regarded simply as material things, "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work;" but how much more gloriously sounds the hymn of praise, when we conceive it uttered by the angels, who rule in the expanse of heaven.* How lofty an import may then be

---

* Man has been made a little lower than the angels, yet is "crowned with glory and honour." (Psalm viii.) But in what consists this glory? "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet." And the superior glory conferred on the angels may consist in a more extensive dominion over the world: and in a power of controlling human wills also, analogous to man's power over the inferior animals.

St. Paul however applies the words to the Son of Man, who, having humbled himself, has been crowned with all authority and power. The passage is probably fully true in both senses: and may apply, in the spiritual sense, to all who shall hereafter reign with Christ.

Digitized by Google

attached to the words of the ancient Canticle, that calls not only upon the "angels of the Lord" and on the children of men, but also on "all the Powers of the Lord," on the Winds of God, on the Lightnings and Clouds, bidding them bless the Lord, praise him and magnify him for ever! How sublime appears the thanksgiving heard by St. John in the Apocalypse, when, in addition to countless thousands of angels, "every creature in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as were in the sea," were heard to ascribe blessing and glory and honour and power to God!

But how glorious soever these material heavens may appear in this point of view, it must not be forgotten that there are other heavens beyond and above them, and that the chorus of adoration from the earth is but a faint echo of the celestial song. God is indeed every where present throughout the material creation, in the depths as well as the heights; and the earth is as properly His footstool as the heavens are his throne: but the material creation is finite, and the "heaven of heavens," by which here seems to be meant the highest of the material heavens, can no more contain him than could the temple of Solomon, though it has pleased Him to indicate his presence both in the sky, and in the temple by special manifestations.

This Deity, who is every where present, so that in the infinite regions of space, there can be no

Digitized by Google

place where He is not, does also in another and equally plain sense, exist *nowhere*. As our minds, which to a certain extent control our bodies, and are conscious of the changes that happen in them, are said to occupy those bodies, and yet thought, being immaterial, cannot have a local existence, so the Great Spirit, who in a much more perfect manner occupies and governs the material universe, exists also, as it were, within Himself, independently of place. And though we may reasonably believe that God does in some peculiar manner occupy the material heavens, and may imagine them to be, *at present*, the proper habitation of myriads of angelic creatures,* his ministers and agents, yet these heavens cannot possibly be the place of *future human* happiness; for with the earth shall they also "*pass away*, and no place be found for them."

Where then shall be the place of the future kingdom,—of the prepared mansions? Place, as it seems, they must have; since the spirits of the

* It is probable that these heavens are occupied also by *evil* spirits. St. Paul urges his converts (Ephes. chap. vi. 12.) to put on the whole armour of God, that they may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood; but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness *in high places*." And it is likely that the ministering spirits "sent forth to minister unto them which should be heirs of salvation," would not leave the enemies of God and man in undisturbed possession of any of those "high places," from whence an influence, whether malignant or benign, can be exercised over the hearts of the elect.

Digitized by Google

blessed will not be divested of corporeity, and the world they inhabit must therefore, like themselves, be local,—"meted out," as the present heavens are, "by compass and by bounds." Let St. Peter give the answer. "We look for new heavens and *a new earth*, wherein (that is, according to the original, in both of which) dwelleth righteousness. And it seems evident, that the proper abode of man will be, *not in the new heavens, but* ON THE NEW EARTH.

For St. John writes, in a place before quoted, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming *down from* God, *out of* heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband! and I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them." And it is *in* this holy city, which shall come down from heaven to the new earth, with all its mansions prepared from the beginning, that the spirits of the just shall dwell. They shall find its gates open, its houses ready for their reception, and the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb as a temple in the midst.

The language in which this new Jerusalem is described is necessarily metaphorical, since it is only in those particulars in which the celestial city bears some resemblance to things on this, the first earth, that it can become an object of

Digitized by Google

our conceptions. The Scriptures have not been written for the gratification of curiosity, but for instruction in matters of faith which may become motives of practical exertion in this life; and very little has been said which can afford us any guidance in forming a notion how far this new earth will resemble the present. But to the little that has been said, it is worth while to give our attentive consideration.

It seems to be at least evident, that the future earth will bear the same sort of relation, in its structure and composition, to the glorified bodies of its inhabitants, that the present earth bears to the grosser frames of flesh and blood. "There is a natural body, says St. Paul,* and there is a spiritual body. Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." "The body is sown in dishonour, and raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, and raised in power."—"The first man is of the earth, earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven." And† "we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." It is evidently impossible for us, with our present faculties, to form any adequate notion of what is intended by the expression, a spiritual body. But must we not imagine a spiritual existence, in some incomprehensible manner restricted to place,

* 1 Cor. xv. † Phil. iii.

Digitized by Google

and confined within certain dimensions, though not encumbered with any earthly and material particles? It is not unlikely, indeed highly probable, that a glorified body may be capable of far greater rapidity of motion than our present powers admit of, or our present limited sphere of action requires, and the dimensions and form of the celestial bodies may be capable of great and rapid changes, from dilated to condensed, from bright to obscure, so as to be capable of executing with the speed of thought, the mandates of the Father of Spirits. To fill all space at one time must be the prerogative of the Deity alone: and perhaps to exist independently of place is likewise his only: all finite creatures being limited in their powers, not merely by an essential inferiority in the purely spiritual part of their nature, but by being made subject to certain limitation as to time and space, nearly resembling those which matter now imposes. By the new earth then, and the heavenly Jerusalem, the future place of abode of the followers of Christ, of *all* who shall have attained unto "immortality," we must not understand a merely spiritual world, or state; but, literally, a *place* of happiness, and (perhaps it may not be incorrect to say), a *substantial* seat of bliss.

It does not seem at all necessary to infer, that *matter*, in any forms, or modifications, or combinations, or however exquisitely refined and sublimed, and purged clear of all grosser particles

Digitized by Google

and every tendency to corruption, and reduced to a "quintessence pure" impalpable as light itself, shall enter into the constitution of the glorified bodies, or of the earth which they shall inhabit. It is true that we derive all our notions of space and extension, at present, from material things, and it seems that we cannot form any perfectly abstract notion of these, into which no material image, or idea derived from sensation, shall enter; yet it would be unsafe to assume, while a passage of Scripture asserts the existence of spiritual corporeity, that *no* similar limitations are possible, without the aid of some modification of matter.

The ingenious Author of the Physical Theory has however, in a passage which has been previously quoted, expressed a different opinion. "The blending of mind and matter," he says (Chap. ii.), "in the bodily structure of the sentient and rational orders, we may be assured, is a method of procedure, which if it be not absolutely indispensable to the final purposes of the creation, subserves the most important ends, and carries with it consequences such as will make it the general, if not the universal law of all finite natures, in all worlds."

Upon principles merely physical this opinion is perhaps the most rational and sound that could be formed, and was therefore adopted without hesitation, or qualification, as a position that could not safely be disputed, in a discussion *based upon those principles*. Yet, when we learn from

Digitized by Google

Revelation, that a change shall be effected in the bodies of the saints at the Last Day, in which every thing that is of the earth and earthy,—the whole nature, as it would seem, of the first man, a creature of dust—shall be rejected; and that on the same Great Day the elements shall be dissolved, the earth burned up, and the whole material heavens, including even light, apparently the purest, and most imperishable of material things, shall be utterly abolished, there is much ground for doubt whether anything partaking of the nature of matter will be suffered to remain: if indeed we may not hold the abolition of *all* matter for certain, since "all things that are made," and "which can be shaken" will be removed at the Great Day. And perhaps nothing has been revealed concerning the future state of the blessed, which more strongly shows the spirituality of their condition, than this abolition of material light. The city they shall inhabit shall enjoy, without the aid of the solar heavens, a perpetual day.

> "Nor sun nor moon they need, nor day nor night,
> God is their temple, and the Lamb their light."

It is difficult to suppose that any thing resembling the emanation of material rays is intended, though such a notion is encouraged by the appearance of Christ at his transfiguration, when "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light;" (Matt. chap. xviii.) and without some supposition of the kind, the vision

Digitized by Google

of the heavenly Jerusalem fades completely from before the eye of the imagination.

On the other hand, there is little or no ground for supposing that matter has any inherent imperfections, such as would necessarily render it unfit to be employed in the construction of a world from which all evil was excluded. We know not whether even such forms of matter as exist upon this earth, are necessarily sources of physical imperfection; and it would be just as easy to imagine the "new earth" to be composed of such, did not Scripture discountenance the supposition, as to conceive it *limited in any way*, yet without imperfection. Our first parents were created peccable indeed, (and so far, we may perhaps venture to say, less perfect than any of the inhabitants of the future heavens and earth, wherein will dwell nought but righteousness), yet without the stain of actual guilt; and it is not clear that *matter* was at all in fault, and that the original transgression consisted in indulging in any forbidden *sensual* gratification: on the contrary, the offence appears to have been wholly of a spiritual nature;—the indulgence of a desire after the knowledge of good and evil; the "mortal taste" of which effected first a spiritual ruin and corruption, and then, through the mysterious union of body and soul, rendered Adam and his descendants liable to corporeal dissolution also.*

* If the corruption of his fleshly nature was not rather caused in the same manner as the *sterility of the ground;* which was not corrupted *by* Adam, but "cursed for his sake."

Digitized by Google

And Christ the second Adam put on the whole nature of man, sin except; in that nature He succumbed to death, and in that nature he *triumphed over Death:* and it therefore can scarcely be doubted, that those who shall hereafter resemble him might, without necessarily retaining any corruption of nature, retain some portion at least of their materiality. Among the innumerable worlds which modern science has opened to the contemplation of man, surely there must be some, besides this speck of earth, inhabited by rational and responsible creatures; and yet, though not less material than the inhabitants of earth, entirely sinless, and enjoying, through the whole of their perennial existence, the favour and presence of God. And while we may conjecture that there are material worlds pure from the stain of sin, we *know*, at the same time, that there are immaterial beings, who are utterly fallen and corrupt; and who, whether they take delight or not in the material impurities which they can and do tempt men to commit; have at least no such repugnance to them, as cannot be overborne by their hostility to the Source of all good. Yet it may be necessary to the fulfilment of some to us unknown ends of God's government, that these beings also, should be transferred to a different and more spiritual world. Christ, to effect man's redemption, took upon him the seed of Abraham; but by the sacrifice in that nature performed by him, he reconciled unto himself *things in heaven* as well as things in earth, and will, probably by

Digitized by Google

virtue of the same mysterious sacrifice, subdue all things to Himself at the Last Day.

The future existence of the blessed then will be, not in the present visible heavens;—for these, though they constitute the material throne of God, and are the stage and proper sphere of the agency of many angelic beings, are but symbols and figures of the true, and will at a destined period pass away and give place to *new* heavens; nor will it consist simply in a spiritual communion with the Father of Spirits, without any certain locality;—for men will still be embodied, and enjoying a certain corporeal proximity to Christ, after the likeness of whose glorious body they will be fashioned, having "spiritual bodies," and whether with any remnant of materiality we know not—but their future life will be ON THE NEW EARTH AND IN THE HOLY CITY.*

With respect to this holy city one question yet remains to be considered. We are informed by St. John, that it shall "come down from God out of heaven." Is it not then now *actually existing in heaven?* or will it be created at the time when "all things are made new?" Both suppositions are probably true in part. For Christ has already in bodily form ascended into heaven, and is glorified now, sitting at the right hand of God, as the saints shall be glorified hereafter, when they

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

are enthroned with him. Whatever idea of *locality* then we attach to the New Earth and the Holy City, regarded as the abodes of embodied spirits, we must attach the same idea to those now existing heavens, in which Christ dwells with the Father, beyond and above the material heavens—"high throned above all height." And the tabernacle of God which shall be with men, is it not the same tabernacle which was shown to Moses in the Mount as a pattern, the tabernacle which the Lord has already pitched, and not man; and into which two thousand years ago, Christ entered? The mansions which the redeemed shall occupy in the New Jerusalem were prepared from the foundation of the world; made ready long ago for the reception of the guests, who, having obtained their white wedding garments, shall enter to celebrate the marriage feast, and chaunt "the inexpressive nuptial song." To such a *place* of happiness St. Paul seems to allude, when he bids his disciples set their affections on *things above, where* Christ sitteth, at the right hand of God.*

In the city shall be, moreover, a "pure river of water of life, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was the tree of life, which bare twelve kind of fruits, and *yielded her fruit every month*, and the leaves of the tree were for the *healing* of the nations."

* Coloss. iii. 2.

Digitized by Google

These things, whatever we are to understand by the description here given of them, are now existing in heaven, whence they shall come down to the new earth. "To him that overcometh," says the Spirit to the Church,* "will I give to eat of the tree of life, which *is* in the midst of the paradise of God." In the prophecies of Ezekiel, chap. xlviii. is contained part of a minute description of a new Jerusalem, seen by the prophet during the Babylonish Captivity, when he was brought in the visions of God into the land of Israel, and set upon "a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city on the south." "Waters issued from under the threshold of the house"—"and on the back of the river were very many trees on the one side and on the other."—"And it shall come to pass that every thing that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, *shall live:*" "and by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the leaf thereof be consumed: it shall bring forth new fruit *according to his months*, because these waters issued out of the sanctuary: and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for *medicine*." In this remarkable vision is evidently described the Church of God now on earth, which, like the temple of Solomon, is formed after the patterns of *things in the heavens*, and of that "Jerusalem

* Rev. ii. 7.

Digitized by Google

which is above," (Galatians chap. iv. 25.) and which St. John, who most strikingly coincides with Ezekiel "being carried away in the spirit to a great and high mountain," saw descending out of heaven.

That this Holy City, of which God shall be the temple, and shall set his *throne* therein, is above and separate from the material heavens, seems to be implied in some of the visions of Ezekiel. He beheld four "winged creatures" (cherubim—powers of the material heavens) which "ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning,"* and a "firmament," that is, an *expansion*, such as "*divided* the waters from the waters" in Genesis, was "stretched *out over their heads*." Above the firmament was the "likeness of a throne," and on the throne "as the appearance of a man," and a brightness was round about him,—"the likeness of the glory of the Lord." Ezekiel chap. i. And in chapter x, in the firmament *above the heads* of the cherubims there appeared as the likeness of a throne. Afterwards (vv. 18, 19, 20.) "the glory of the Lord departed from off the threshold of the house, and stood over the cherubims." "This," he continues, "is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar; and I knew that they were the cherubims." In the Book of

* This cannot but suggest the "cherubims and *a flaming sword which turned every way*," to guard the path to the tree of life; placed at the eastern part of Eden.

Digitized by Google

Revelations however, where a similar vision is described, (chap. iv.) the cherubic creatures were not *under*, but *round about* and *in the midst of*, the throne. And while in Ezekiel there was a firmament resembling crystal *above* the living creatures and *under* the throne, St. John places his "sea of glass like unto crystal *before* the throne. But whether there be at present any "firmament" interposed between the material heavens and the Holy City which is above, or not, a time, we are assured, will come, when there shall be no separation, but the heavenly city shall be upon the new earth, and the new heavens be extended over it.

Nor is this the only change which shall take place in the Great City. To a certain extent it also shall be made new. "We are come," says St. Paul,* in a passage before quoted, "unto mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men, made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant." He seems to be here describing both the church and kingdom *now on earth*, which he is contrasting with the first, the Mosaic dispensation, and the future church-glorified also. For the reward of the "first-born, whose names are written in heaven"

* Heb. xii. 22.

Digitized by Google

is evidently in great part *reserved;* kept in store for them against the Great Day: when, according to the latter part of the same chapter, God shall "shake not the earth only but heaven," and "remove" (or put aside) those things which are shaken, as things *which are made*, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.*

May we not then be permitted to conjecture, that the Great City shall become THE ABODE OF ALL LIVING BEINGS: not only of angelic creatures and of the redeemed from the present earth, but of *the rational and beatified inhabitants of all now existing worlds?* And that its foundations shall extend, beyond the "flaming walls of the world" that now is, through spaces immeasurable by mortal man? For the New Jerusalem shall not, like the old, occupy a small part of the earth, but rather, like the Christian Church, as foreseen by Isaiah, when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters that cover the depths of the sea,"† it shall be co-extensive with the plain on which it stands. All abominable and condemned things shall be not *without* Jerusalem, yet *upon* the earth, like the Gehenna of the Jews, where the dead and the

* Similarly in Matthew. Chap. xxiv. v. 29. The stars shall fall from heaven, and "the powers of the heavens shall be shaken;" caused to rock, to reel, to totter. All those forces, as we may venture to interpret the words, which sustained matter, and *in which it had its being*, shall falter, fail, and pass away.

† So in Lowth's translation.

Digitized by Google

filth of the city were consumed with fire; but beyond both, far from the Divine presence. Yet shall the immense tracts of the new earth be traversed with ease by the gloriously embodied spirits that inhabit them, for "there shall be no more sea,"—nothing, it may be, to impede the interchange of happiness and intimate communion of saints; and they, wandering where they will, even to the uttermost parts, shall still be led by the hand of God, still bask in the full splendour of "uncreated rays," still be "sitting with Christ in his throne, even as he also is set down with the Father in his throne." "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."*

To how vast a height above the speculations of philosophy have we now been led! Our comprehension of Scripture may be imperfect indeed, our view of the celestial glories obscure and dim, but that which we feebly grasp and dimly see, is real, and substantial; bearing the same relation to the future scenes imagined or invented by men, that a landscape seen through a mist bears to the splendid but transient visions of a dream. The resurrection of the body being a truth undiscoverable by reason, nay, seeming rather to impede than to forward our conjectures respecting a future state, it has been commonly put out of sight even by those who acknowledge the autho-

* See Appendix.

Digitized by Google

rity of Scripture, and they have busied themselves in painting scenes of bliss and glory for the "immortal soul," in some fantastic world above; in some dazzling regions of the present heavens, which are even now waxing old, and are ready to disappear. A poor exchange for the soul, to transfer it from earth only to that upper world which shall be abolished on the same Day!

It would seem that some minds have even an aversion to the belief in embodied existence beyond the grave. How commonly do men speak, for instance, of a soul being, at death, "sent naked and shivering into the presence of its Judge." Whereas the Bible and the Creed tell them simply that "men shall rise again with their bodies, and give account of their own works;" that "the time of the dead that they should be judged" is at the end of the world. The New Jerusalem is to descend out of heaven: yet scarcely in one instance in a hundred do men expect to be in God's presence otherwise than by ascent to Him. A new earth is to be prepared for the reception of the redeemed; yet the heavenly Canaan and new Jerusalem, which will then and there be established, are either forgotten altogether, or placed on the present earth during a millennium; as if the final state of man, being "heavenly," would not admit of them! Errors which would soon be corrected, if imagination were consulted less, and Scripture more: parti-

Digitized by Google

cularly if that decree were acquiesced in, which does not exempt the children of Adam from death, but leaves their souls in Hades, and suffers their thoughts to perish, until God shall see it good to quicken them, and clothe the mortal in immortality.

CHAPTER X.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

SINCE man fell from his first estate, and brought himself under sentence of death, the unextinguished love of His Creator has manifested itself chiefly under the form of *compassion*, in devising compensations or remedies. But it happens not unfrequently that men, too easily counting on the ample provision which God's mercy has made, forget from how dark a doom they have been delivered, and by how great a sacrifice. The entire gospel is to them summed up in the words "There is now no condemnation." They remember not that all divine favour is mercy shown for His sake who died on the cross; and go on their ways complacently, their eyes half closed both to the deadliness of sin, and the inestimable value of the Atonement. That sect which, calling itself Christian, denies the divinity of Christ, has gone furthest in this course of error: maintaining that it is even *unjust* in

Digitized by Google

the Almighty to condemn those who, among them, are esteemed good men; inasmuch as their virtues more than atone for their failings, and they deserve heaven for their own goodness sake!

An error not unlike this is committed by those who, presuming upon God's promises of conferring immortality, yet consider not the means by which eternal life has been procured, nor the conditions upon which it is offered. Their doctrine of a future state involves a denial of the value of Christ's interposition; being founded on the assumption that immortality is the birthright of every man. Whereas man is no more naturally immortal than he is naturally sinless; and cannot recover life, except through Him who, "on the third day, rose again from the dead." And therefore their attempt is worse than useless, who endeavour to disarm death of its sting, and overcome the grave, by philosophical arguments. It involves a double error; it dishonours both God, and his word. It substitutes reason for revelation; and ascribes that to the inborn vigour of the soul, which is the office and prerogative of the quickening Spirit of Christ. Not only must man, if without the gospel of Christ, have remained *ignorant* of immortality, but without the death and resurrection of Christ, *destitute* of immortality. The slave of Sin, and Death, and Satan, he cannot traverse, nor bridge over, the fearful gulf that separates earth from heaven.

Digitized by Google

It was the Son of Man who, returning thither, clad in the spoils of Hades,

> "Paved after Him a broad and beaten way,
> Over the dark abyss."*

If any one should object to this view of man's mortality, that Adam's sentence included *eternal* death; and that therefore he must have been originally created imperishable,—whether in happiness or in misery, whether embodied or disembodied,—the answer is obvious. Eternal death is the consequence of that *resurrection unto* damnation, which is, no less than resurrection unto life, the consequence of Christ's victory over the grave. The eternal misery of the wicked cannot therefore be termed a consequence of the sentence passed on Adam (and still less a part of the sentence), unless we may connect, by way of *consequence*, the fall and the redemption of man. It has indeed been argued above, that we ought to consider the fall, without the redemption, to be impossible; but this wholly on the ground that the Almighty, whose power we presume not to limit, *has in fact* joined them together, and we know not what we should violate in putting them asunder, nor can venture so to do, though our minds can trace no necessary connection between them. "We are greatly ignorant how far things are considered, by the Author of nature, under

* Paradise Lost. Book II.

Digitized by Google

the single notion of means and ends, so that it may be said, this is merely an end, and that merely means, in His regard."* The Almighty is bound by no rules but such as He hath made: He can employ what means, and appoint also what *consequences* He will; or rather nothing should be esteemed merely a consequence or means; since to Him *no* means are indispensable, *no* consequences unavoidable; but all causation and instrumentality whatever are but the results of His absolute decree. We must ascribe then the "second death" to the power of Christ, not regarding it as inflicted in part execution of Adam's sentence, the "first death," the whole of which will be abolished, along with Hades, at the time of the end. The first death was the consequence of the departure of beings till then innocent from the law of God their Creator; the second will be the consequence of the rejection, by fallen beings, of the mercy of God their Redeemer. That all had been redeemed from death shall be proved by the resurrection of all; while punishment shall be inflicted on many, because they had been redeemed in vain.†

To recount now the chief conclusions to which

---

* Butler's Analogy. Part. II. Chap. IV.

† None can be exempted, we may venture to say, merely on account of ignorance of the Gospel. For all have experienced the mercy and long-suffering extended to man for the Redeemer's sake. Even in shutting their eyes to the "Power and Godhead" displayed in the works of creation, in not observing

Digitized by Google

the foregoing pages are intended to lead:—endeavours have been made to prove,—that the natural end of human existence is the "first death," the dreamless slumber of the grave, wherein man lies spell-bound, soul and body, under the dominion of Sin and Death,—that whatever modes of conscious existence, whatever future states, of "life" or of "torment," beyond Hades, are reserved for man, are results of our blessed Lord's victory over sin and death,—that the resurrection of the dead must be preliminary to their entrance into either of the Future States,—and that the nature and even existence of these states, and even the mere fact that there is a futurity of consciousness, can be known *only* through God's revelation of Himself in the Person and in the gospel* of His Son.

And the leading object and design of the whole work has been, to *exhibit the value of this revelation of God;* by showing that man, without Christ, is a creature of dust, a worm of the ground; and by pointing to Him whom the gospel reveals, "who only hath immortality," who

---

Him who "sendeth rain and fruitful seasons," men were guilty of insensibility to that mercy of God, which is, in truth, altogether *redeeming* mercy; since every provision for the support or comfort of man's life is furnished by One who, for the Redeemer's sake, "would have all men come to repentance."

* That being included under the term "gospel," which was "preached before unto Abraham," and unto Adam, and beheld as "promises" by the faithful, though not as yet "received" by them.

Digitized by Google

only "hath life in Himself," and through whom only we can have "eternal life abiding in us."

With the same object it has also been maintained, that Scripture represents man to have been, even before his fall, a mortal being; formed indeed *for* Paradise, but not *in* it, and of merely an earthly origin; supported, while in Eden, by the Tree of Life, and falling, when banished thence, by natural relapse, to the dust whence he was taken; and becoming (but for His interposition who obtained a probationary respite before the execution of the sentence, and converted death, through the promise of resurrection, into sleep), even as before he was called from nothingness. And it has been further urged, that they who savingly believe in the Redeemer receive, in this life, His quickening Spirit; yet that neither their bodies nor souls are exempted from the (temporary) dominion of death, although they have in that spirit an earnest and pledge that they shall be preserved in both body and soul, unto Christ's coming; and that they shall not cease to "live unto God," though they, with all the rest, go to one place, and for a period which appears but as a little moment, are unconsciously awaiting the trumpet-call of God.

It cannot be denied that these conclusions, if true, are of much importance. They must necessarily lead the mind that will embrace them, to take a darker view of the deadliness of sin, and a more humbling view of humanity; to value revelation more highly, and reason less, to feel

Digitized by Google

more dependent on God, ascribing both future happiness and future *being*, to the Redeemer of the world, and the Giver of Life; and to realise more fully the speedy return of the Lord, from whom we are parted only by a few brief earthly years, and a momentary slumber in the grave.

But these conclusions are opposed by a numerous array of current opinions, natural feelings, and popular arguments; and the writer who encounters such, however good his cause, must be contented with but partial success. Our nature shrinks from death: tender affection is unwilling to believe that departed friends are, even for a time, *altogether* gone, that earthly ties are *completely* sundered: and they who have not submitted to the severe training of the gospel of truth, and learned to fix their affections and hopes *beyond* the tomb, upon the second coming of their Lord, will reluctantly forego their belief that in a few short years they will rejoin those whom they loved, in some intermediate region of blissful repose. But God, by disappointing it, will more than realize their expectation, if they be faithful to Him. He will restore them both to those whom they hoped to meet, *and to those whom they had left behind*, and bless them at once with the consummate happiness of heaven itself.

There is much also to flatter the pride of intellect, and to gratify a curious mind, in the popular arguments which advocate a belief in the immortality of the soul. But the infallible testi-

Digitized by Google

mony of Scripture proves all such search to be vain, for in Adam all die, and the dead know not anything. And a better philosophy proves all such search to be vain; for the unassisted moral faculties can only lead us to a faint though anxious hope, that the almost Unknown God may show favour to the more virtuous of mankind: and if revelation in one sense confirms this hope, it contradicts it in another, by declaring that no favour will be extended to man, in reward, simply, of unaided human virtue; but that "the whole world has become guilty before God," and would have been condemned, but for that unspeakable mystery of compassionate love, which the heart of the "natural man" cannot conceive, and which to the most enlightened of men,—nay, even to the angels of light—is still unfathomable. None then can "by any means redeem his brother;" no, nor show *how or why he should be redeemed*; but must "let that alone for ever," unless he have recourse to that gospel revelation, which discovers to perishing man—THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

Page 11.

The Divine Unity not discoverable by human reason.

THAT belief in the unity of the Supreme Power in the universe, if indeed it ought not rather to be termed a conjecture, which was entertained by some of the philosophers of Greece, affords no sufficient proof that the doctrine of the unity is discoverable by human reason. It is certain that much of the earlier Greek philosophy was derived from Oriental sources, and based upon ancient traditions,—or, in fact, upon divine revelation. And there can be little doubt that the simple primitive creed continued to influence the systems of the rival teachers of knowledge, long after the origin and authority of the creed was forgotten.

But even granting that a belief in the Divine Unity was in some instances the spontaneous produce of philosophical reasonings alone, it was still little better than *a conjecture*, far preferable indeed, to any of the cumbrous and corrupt systems of polytheism, but neither deeply rooted, nor established by solid arguments.

And it seems that reason can never make a nearer approximation to the truth than this,—that the whole constitution and administration of the universe has been appointed and is conducted *as it were*, as it *would be*, by One Mind. Surely it is not inconceivable that there should have been from eternity more than one being of perfect wisdom and goodness, and of infinite power: we may say infinite, because whatever was the will of one such being must, we may suppose, be the will of all the rest. This does not seem harder to believe than are some of the mysterious truths concerning the Godhead which have been partly revealed to us. To the

Digitized by Google

doctrine of the Divinity of the Son of God there have been "oppositions of science, *falsely so called:*" but Scripture plainly declares, against all opposers, the God-like Majesty of the Son of God, and His co-equality with the Father. The Christian who duly feels the depth of this mystery will do well to receive with hesitation any pretended *à priori* philosophical proof in matters so far above his ken.

Page 13.

Natural Religion not necessary to the support of Revelation.

Lord Brougham has said† "It is a vain and ignorant thing to suppose that Natural Theology is not necessary to the support of Revelation. The latter may be untrue though the former be admitted.....But Revelation cannot be true if Natural Religion be false; and cannot be demonstrated strictly by any argument, or established by any evidence, without proving or assuming the latter." He observes, that even if a messenger, known to be not of this earth, were to work miracles before our eyes, in proof of his (pretended) mission, we should still be entitled to disbelieve every word of his story.

Though this be admitted as a general statement, as long as the character of the miracles worked, and of the story told, are excluded from consideration, it still deserves to be inquired, Whether in the instance which has actually occurred, Christ being the messenger, Christianity the message, there was not enough to satisfy a candid and philosophic mind of the existence, the power, and the will of God; without any aid from Natural Theology. The wonderful acts of Christ displayed something more than supernatural power: they indicated in many instances a knowledge equal to the power; and in nearly all a benevolence which our moral nature will hardly

† Natural Theology, p. 204. 4th. ed.

Digitized by Google

allow us to think compatible with an intention to deceive; a benevolence shewn both by the immediate effect and apparent end of the miracles,—to relieve present suffering, and by their professed object,—to authenticate a new revelation of the divine counsels. If these wonderful acts, alone, be insufficient to convince, yet it seems that the miracle and the message, the attestation and the thing attested, taken together, ought to be enough. Moreover, whatever opinion on this subject we might otherwise be inclined to form, Scripture,—as will presently be pointed out,—seems plainly to declare the absolute and entire sufficiency of the miracles and preaching of Christ.

And this, not indeed without recognition of the *principles* upon which the truths of Natural Theology are deduced, but without any "assumption of those truths as *postulates*." For there is nothing in a miracle to prevent our applying to it the very principles upon which we proceed, in inferring the attributes of God from the ordinary works of nature. The mode of reasoning is precisely the same, whether the phenomena on which we reason are miraculous or not. The miracles of Christ, though *comparatively* rare,—being the exception and not the rule,—were yet sufficiently numerous and varied, and on a sufficiently grand scale, to furnish an argument of the same kind, and as conclusive, as that derived from the constitution of nature. They were calculated to impress, and did impress, the minds even of the monotheistic Jews with a belief that Christ possessed divine powers. It was difficult to assign *any* limits to the power of him, who could control material forces, and even create matter—as in the stilling of the storm and in the multiplying of the loaves—who could restore life, to the dead, compel rebellious spirits to obey him, and declare the secret thoughts of the hearts of men; who heard the apostle Thomas say in his absence, Except I see and touch I will not believe; and foretold to Peter, Thou shalt deny me thrice. In a passage of most con-

Digitized by Google

clusive argumentation, and singular beauty,* Lord Brougham himself has shown, that we ought to infer, from a *few* instances only, the existence of a Power and Intelligence, capable of *repeating the same exertion* for an indefinite number of times, and of executing *various other* acts, of a nearly similar character. "There is nothing peculiar—no limit—no sufficient reason, why the same power should not be again exercised and with the same result..... If indeed it be said that we never can be so certain of the things we infer as we are of those we have observed, and on which our inference is grounded, we may admit this to be true. But no one therefore denies the value of the science which is composed of the inferences. So we cannot be so well assured of the Deity's power to repeat and to vary and to extend his operations as we are of his having created what we actually observe, and yet our assurance may be quite sufficient to merit entire confidence.....We can no more avoid believing that the same power which created the universe can sustain it,—that the same power which created our souls can prolong their existence after death, than we can avoid believing that the power which sustained the universe up to the instant we are speaking, is able to continue it in being for a thousand years to come." All the instances to which Lord Brougham refers are, as indeed his argument required, those of natural phenomena; but the principle applies to supernatural phenomena equally well. If "we cannot avoid believing that the same power which made all the animals and vegetables on our globe, suffices to people and provide other worlds in like manner," we must needs also believe that he who fed five thousand in the wilderness (besides women and children) could in like manner provide for the whole human race: and (as is argued in the Scriptures themselves,—though this is to anticipate) that he who raised himself from the dead can in like manner

* See the Nat. Theol. note v. p. 255.

Digitized by Google

raise all men. For there is nothing peculiar here, no limit whatever:—there was food for all who required it; the men that sat down were about five thousand, "and they did all eat and were filled." If the words of Christ had ever wholly or partially failed to produce the effect intended, we might suspect a narrow limit; and liken his works to those of a magician, who requires numerous accessories to ensure success. If when "he rebuked the winds and the sea" there had been only a brief and partial lull, and the ship had hardly escaped wreck, his disciples might have been excused for littleness of faith; but "immediately there was a great calm." We may even venture to say, that a philosophical Jew, a disciple of Christ, unless checked in his course of conjectures by a knowledge of the purposes to be attained and the conditions to be fulfilled by a church *militant* on earth, might be excused for imagining that his Master was then performing only the first acts of an inchoate sovereignty, and was about to suspend *all* the laws of the material and spiritual worlds, and establish therein authorities of his own.

In the ordinary affairs of life we term that which generally happens the rule, that which seldom happens, the exception: and if such a revolution as has just been supposed were actually completed, and the commonest phenomena of the present world were permitted to take place only in a few instances, and for special purposes, they would assume, in every respect, the character of miracles. The germination of a few grains of corn in the earth, and their subsequent increase in the ear to thirty or sixty fold, would be no less a miracle, a sign, and a wonder, than a shower of manna from heaven, or the multiplication of a few barley loaves, after a blessing pronounced over them. And what should hinder men from inferring unlimited power, intelligence, benevolence, from the then uncommon event, more than now, when the seasons come round with unerring regularity, and the kindly fruits of the earth are gathered in

Digitized by Google

from myriads of fields? The fertile plains, loaded with ripening grain, bear direct testimony to Almighty wisdom and goodness. And since he who fed five thousand could feed all men in like manner, the miracle bears testimony to the being and attributes of God, in no respect differing from that of the ordinary phenomenon, *except in being more obvious.* The very same principles, which lead the natural theologian to acknowledge, when he beholds a harvest, the power of the invisible God, would have required him, had he been one of the five thousand, to recognise in Christ the power of "God manifest in the flesh."

"This, it may be said, is going too far: many have possessed the power of working miracles, in whom we do not acknowledge the presence of the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Surely Moses, who was greater than all succeeding prophets till John the Baptist,* ought, upon the principles just advocated, to have received divine honours. His miracles were upon the most extensive scale; the whole of the chosen people of God partook of the benefits they conferred. The powers exercised were always commensurate with the necessity which called them forth." The argument is not without weight; but in truth it ought to be placed on the same side of the balance with those which at first sight it appears to countervail. In *every* case, the miracle is a proof of the mission of him by whom it is wrought. Where we behold extraordinary power exercised for great and good ends, we naturally give credence to the agent, and, if he be an apostle, we bow to the name of Christ: if a Hebrew legislator, adore the One God: and when He declares His heavenly origin, we bow the knee before the Son of God: and we cannot be justly charged with credulity, by those who, though they may reject revelation, do themselves give credence to that invisible agent, by whom power is *ordinarily* exercised for great and good ends. It need not

* Deut. xxxiv. 10, and Matt. xi. 11.

Digitized by Google

be denied, that had all the miracles worked in Egypt, in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness, been to all appearance performed *solely by the power and at the will of Moses*, men would have been justified in believing him, had he declared all which Jesus declared concerning himself. Whether the end be accomplished by natural, or by supernatural means, the inference is the same. There must be somewhere an intelligent cause adequate to the production of the effect: and not once only, but for an indefinite number of times; and also adequate to the production of various other effects nearly resembling it. And if the effect be, to increase the sum of human happiness, we infer benevolence as well as intelligence and power: we recognise the being and attributes of God, without reference to any "antecedent theology."

The first converts to Christianity were Jews, who, it may be admitted, did possess an antecedent theology. But this operated, in the mass of the people, as a hindrance to the claims of Christ; and impelled them to ascribe his miracles to assistance from "the prince of the devils;" while they only who were better minded confessed, No man could do the miracles which Thou dost, *unless God were with him.* Nor does human philosophy furnish any way of escape from such a conclusion, unless by aid of the very subterfuges, by which atheists have sought to disprove the doctrines of Natural Theology.

And this antecedent theology of the Jews, from what source was it derived? Not from a contemplation of the constitution of Nature, but from traditions concerning One who had from time to time interposed in their behalf, with a mighty hand and stretched out arm suspending the natural laws. The only people of the ancient world who were in possession of those fundamental truths concerning the being and attributes of God, to which, it may be confessed, natural phenomena bear testimony, were the Jews; a rude and stubborn race,—utterly without philosophy,—slow to believe,—but among whom *supernatural* phenomena had been rife.

Digitized by Google

"The power of working miracles," as Lord Brougham observes, "does not necessarily exclude either fraud or malice. The messenger might come from an evil as well as from a good being." . . . "A being capable of working miracles might very well be capable of deceiving us." But neither does *the mere power* displayed in the ordinary operations of nature prove the absence of fraud or malice. And if we were to admit—for the sake of the argument,—the power of the Author of nature to be greater than that of Christ, in proportion as natural phenomena outnumber and outmeasure the supernatural, then it seems we should augment in the same proportion the possibility and the danger of deception.

We must judge of the moral attributes by considering the ends for which the power is exerted. And if we can clearly discern the character of the end, we may judge as confidently from a supernatural as from an ordinary exertion of power. The constitution of nature is evidently calculated to promote happiness generally—to encourage and reward virtue—to check and punish vice. And though none of these ends is *fully* attained, we do not impugn the perfection of Divine goodness. What judgement then should we form, from a consideration of the apparent ends of the miracles of Christ? There is not one of them, in which a benevolent purpose is not evident to the mind of a Christian: and the heart of that man is little to be envied, who could believe Christ *morally* capable of deception;* though he who, when the Nazarenes led him to the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong, "passed through them and went his way," and by whom the eyes of the two disciples were holden, while he, having risen, was explaining how it behoved him to rise, *could*, undoubtedly, have deceived, were such power and beneficence, as his, separable from truth.

---

* See, as a warning, Mark iii. 29, 30.

Digitized by Google

But if a being so mighty and apparently so benevolent were morally capable of deception, what assurance can Natural Religion furnish us, that this world is not under the administration of a malignant spirit, who will disappoint every hope of happiness formed in reliance on his promises, and who permits some enjoyment now, only because, for reasons unseen by us, it will be ultimately, or is in another sphere, subservient to the mischief and misery he delights in? Though the original witnesses of the miracles might justly have concluded that the *power* of Christ over nature was not inferior to that of the Author of Nature; and though they might well have believed that he would never undergo death nor leave the earth, but be present to the end of the world, with ineffable condescension instructing and healing men, they had not all that proof of his *wisdom and benevolence* which the lapse of centuries discovers to us. For experience has now sufficiently proved how wonderfully Christianity is calculated to meet the wants and promote the happiness of mankind; and there is enough in the present relative condition of the christian and non-christian countries of the world to encourage the expectation that a period will at length arrive when the total amount of *happiness owing to Christianity* (in this life only), may equal that which the constitution of the natural world and the human heart (without the Christian religion), is calculated to afford. Should that period arrive, there will be a manifest proof, independent of all assumption of the *truth* of Christianity, that the miracles and teaching of Christ originated in a benevolence and wisdom in nowise inferior to that of Him who ordained the laws of which the Christian miracles were a subversion.

But we have enough to convince us, without waiting for a happier period of the world and of the church; nay, there was enough, before even the grand and crowning miracle of the resurrection had demonstrated the truth and value of Christianity. They who were present when "Jesus wept" on his way to the tomb of Lazarus,—who

Digitized by Google

stood by and heard the prayer which he uttered for their sakes,—who saw the dead man come forth at his command,—and yet doubted, could never have been persuaded to put their confidence in God, by exhortations to observe the beauty of the lilies of the field, or the repast spread daily for the fowls of the air; and whoever can peruse St. John's account of this miracle, and see in the record no proof of the divinity of Christ, would derive no moral lesson from a proof, that the eye was not made by the blind operation of natural laws, nor honeycomb by the wisdom of a bee.

Moreover, Scripture seems plainly to declare, as has been said, the sufficiency of the miracles of Christ, to gain credence for his doctrines in all candid minds. Throughout the New Testament the miracles are treated as evidence, *in themselves*, of his divine mission. "Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet the people believed not on him." And this is attributed simply to their blindness and hardness of heart; and not to any disregard of the fundamental doctrines of religion natural or revealed, included in the Mosaic theology. When St. John in prison sent to enquire, Art thou he that should come? no other reply was given, but "the dead are raised, the blind receive their sight, the poor have the Gospel preached to them." When secret murmurs arose, at the pardon granted to the paralytic, they were quelled by the rebuke and the command—"that ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins . . . Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house." At the feast of the dedication the Jews inquired, How long dost thou make us doubt? If thou be the Christ, *tell us plainly*. Jesus answered them, "I told you and ye believed not: THE WORKS THAT I DO IN MY FATHER'S NAME, THEY BEAR WITNESS OF ME."

POSTSCRIPT.

Lord Brougham has quoted and adopted the sentence of Lord Bacon, that Natural Theology is the key of

Digitized by Google

revelation, and opens our understanding to the genuine spirit of the Scriptures, but also unlocks our belief, so that we may enter upon the serious contemplation of the divine power, the characters of which are so deeply graven in the works of creation. And he agrees with that great authority in holding it "clear that atheism is to be refuted not by miracles, but by the contemplation of nature," and admits his "distinction between revelation and natural religion, that the former declares the will of God as to the worship most acceptable, while the latter teaches his existence and powers, but is silent as to a ritual."

Undoubtedly every mind imbued with the doctrines of Natural Theology, and convinced of their truth, will be disposed to enter upon the serious contemplation of the Divine Power; and will read and rightly interpret the "characters graven in the works of creation." But the philosophic enquirer does not *commence* his perusal of those characters with a previous conviction of the existence and attributes of the Deity. It is from a suspicion, a desire, a hope that by searching he may find out God, implanted in his mind by the Creator, that he first enters upon the serious contemplation of some of the innumerable characters that declare His power, wisdom, and goodness. This contemplation it is, which when it has been carried far enough, unlocks his belief in a God, and renders him truly a natural theologian. But Lord Bacon strangely represents Natural Theology as *first* unlocking our belief, *and then* leading us to the study of nature!

And if Natural Theology were requisite to open our understandings to the genuine spirit of the Scriptures, surely either the Author of Christianity, or at least the commissioned preachers of His gospel, would have accompanied their exhortations to the Gentiles whose foolish heart was darkened, and who had become vain in their imaginations, with preliminary discourses on Natural Theology. But how different from this was the

Digitized by Google

apostolical preaching. The words of man's wisdom were altogether discarded. They sought to make One known, who had been crucified, dead, and buried, and on the third day rose again, and ascended into heaven, who had given them miraculous powers, commanded them to make known His will, and to promise eternal life through belief in His name, as they were ready to testify at the price of their lives. *In and through Him,*—whom to have seen was to have seen the Father,—by whom alone could men come to the Father, did they teach the attributes of the invisible God. And the fact that Christians have made the most correct Natural Theologians has proved the efficacy of their system.

The Israelites in Egypt were sunk in idolatry, nearly as far removed as atheists from a knowledge of the one true God. Did Jehovah, who knew what was in man, lead them into the wilderness that they might have leisure to discern His glory in the heavens, and, like the *inspired* Job, hear His voice in the thunder, and discern His providence in the "balancing of the clouds," or in the rain that satisfied "the desolate and waste places, causing the bud of the tender herb to spring forth?"* No: He forced them to acknowledge Him, by giving them water out of the flinty rock, and manna from heaven, and by visiting their relapses into idolatry and impiety with the most fearful supernatural punishments.

Lord Bacon's distinction between Natural Religion and Revealed may be admitted, without conceding the necessity of an antecedent theology to "render the message of revelation unimpeachable." For there may be such a declaration of the will of God, and of the spiritual or ritual worship He requires, as to imply and prove His existence and attributes. This is really so simple and evident that a familiar illustration of it may suffice. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer receives

* The consolation of (the Christian) Mungo Park.

Digitized by Google

a letter enclosing money from one who confesses that he has defrauded the revenue, is there any man living who would doubt the existence or the conscientiousness of the writer, or the reality of the alleged commission of fraud?

We may now proceed a step further, and not only deny the necessity of Natural Theology to the support of revelation, but even maintain that a belief in its doctrines is not likely to remove, or lessen, any doubt which might be entertained concerning the worker of a miracle. "When Christianity was first promulgated, the miracles of Jesus were not denied by the ancients, but it was asserted that they came from evil beings, and that he was a magician." "Such an explanation," continues Lord Brougham, "was not inconsistent with the kind of belief to which the votaries of polytheism were accustomed." This is true; but *the Jews also*, monotheists, and in possession of all which Natural Theology can teach, ascribes the miracles of Christ to the prince of the dæmons. The doctrines of Natural Theology do indeed "secure our belief in that Being, whose goodness they have taught us to trust," but do not prove that the worker of miracles is really a messenger sent from that Being. This must be shown, *after all*, by the character of the miracles, the messenger, the message. Christ cast out dæmons, He healed the sick, He raised the dead; and appealed to these His miraculous acts alone, without any reference to an antecedent natural or revealed theology, in testimony to the attributes of that great Being, in whose power and authority He came.

Page 21.

The opinions of the early Christians respecting the state of the dead.

"When the custom of praying for the dead began in the Christian Church," says Mr. Palmer, "has never been

Digitized by Google

ascertained. We find traces of the practice in the second century: and either then, or shortly after, it appears to have been customary in all parts of the church." "The primary intention of prayers for the dead," says Archbishop Ussher, "had reference *unto the day of resurrection;* which also in divers places we find to have been expressly prayed for." That is, according to him, the words "rest," "refreshment," "peace," etc. in the early church prayers for the dead, meant what they mean in Scripture:—rest, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed;"—peace, through escape from that "troubled sea" of fire into which the wicked shall be cast at the judgement day, to find therein no peace;—refreshment, "when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," at the "restitution of all things." "The primary intention of the Church in her supplications for the dead was," as Ussher repeats, "that the whole man, not the soul separated only, might receive public remission of sins and a solemn acquittal at the judgement of that great day."*

These supplications were perhaps not necessarily unscriptural in their spirit, not being intercessory. They may have been intended, quite at the first, merely to express a pious and natural wish that the departed might "find mercy in that day," such as was felt by St. Paul; or they may have been merely a calling upon God to make good his promises, and "avenge his own elect."

But they assumed, after the lapse of two centuries, a widely different form. They became direct intercessions for the dead; not for the whole man, but the soul separated only. And this change is a sufficient proof that the doctrine of the consciousness of the dead, (whether contained in Scripture and in apostolic teaching, or not) was not generally received through, nor did originate in,

* See the Tracts for the Times, No. 72, which has furnished all the authorities used in this article.

Digitized by Google

any oral tradition derived from the apostles. True or false, the doctrine was unknown in the early church. For it is utterly impossible that the first Christians, in making supplication for the dead, from hearts in which earthly affection was struggling for predominance, should not have prayed, and that *chiefly* if not solely, for present blessings on their departed friends, if they had supposed the soul separated only to be susceptible of such. In fact we find that as the natural but unscriptural belief in the immortality of the soul, apart from the body, gained ground, the prayers for the dead were changed from their primary intention, and intermediate blessings were continually prayed for. As Christians had formerly prayed that the dead might escape the fearful flames of Gehenna, so now, gradually perverting the meaning of the prayers, they entreated that they might be speedily relieved first from the ordeal of a purgatorial fire at the resurrection, and then from an all but inevitable flame which was imagined to await the soul, immediately on its separation from the body.

Those who had departed from Scripture, (and from that apostolic teaching which must have been consistent with Scripture,) soon departed from each other: their opinions became, as has been said, various and vague. Yet it is somewhat difficult to establish this double proposition, since expressions which may mean almost anything can hardly be proved to be contradictory or unlike. But let us endeavour to ascertain what was the most general opinion concerning the state of the dead, after the church prayers had been changed from their primary intention. Origen taught, that "such as depart out of this life after the common course of death, are disposed of according to their deeds and merits, as they shall be judged to be worthy, some into the place which is called hell, others into Abraham's bosom, and through *divers other* places and mansions." St. Hilary taught otherwise. *All the faithful*, according to him, were to be in

Digitized by Google

Abraham's bosom, while the wicked are "hindered from coming by the gulf interposed between them." Lactantius taught, that *all the souls, both of the righteous and the wicked,* should be "detained in one common custody," until the time come when the great judge doth make trial of their doings;" i. e. by exposing them to a mysterious flame which shall burn the wicked, and do service to the righteous, who have "something in them that will repel or put back the force of the flame!" And the Greek church, differing from the rest in this, taught that (according to Luke xiii. 28, 29, 30,) men entered Abraham's bosom at the resurrection. "The body is buried in the earth, but the soul goeth in unknown places, waiting for the future resurrection of the dead: in which, O gracious Saviour, make bright thy servant, place him together with the saints, and refresh him in the bosom of Abraham." We need not mention the opinion of St. Ambrose, who was not taught *by the apostles* to say that "they that come not unto the first resurrection, but are reserved out of the second, shall be burned [in purgatorial fire] until they fulfil the times between the first and the second resurrection; or, if they have not fulfilled them, they shall remain longer in punishment." Nor need we attach much weight to that of Augustine, who taught that souls went into "certain hidden receptacles," into which the souls of God's children might carry some of their lighter faults, which would *hinder them from attaining heaven;* but from which they might be *released by the prayers and alms deeds of the living.*

Let any one who maintains that these individual writers, or churches, were in possession of an oral apostolic tradition concerning the dead, state what that tradition contained, and what it did not; and inform the world how he, by the light of reason, can distinguish the truth of God, as contained in uninspired writings, from the errors of man.

Digitized by Google

Page 86.

The derivation of life from material or corporeal sources.

It may be worth while here to observe, although this point has no easily traced connection with the argument stated in the text, (and continued in book iii. chapter ii.) that it is not a whit less wonderful that sexual union, through blind desire, should produce a creature after the likeness of Adam, partaking of his corruption, and of his mortality, than that the sprinkling of water in baptism, and the eating and drinking of sacramental bread and wine, (not blindly, but with a lively faith,) should make men partakers, through the remission of sins and the sanctification of the heart, of the righteousness, life, and immortality of Christ, and transform them into His likeness, producing out of the old man, *a new creature.* Though there is no easily traced connection, there is probably a real analogy here. The feast imperfectly and typically celebrated on earth is "the Marriage Supper of the Lamb."

Page 111.

Matter regarded as points invested with mechanical forces.

"Our acquaintance with matter,* as every one knows, is nothing more than an acquaintance with its properties; or rather with those of its properties which affect our senses. But these properties of matter resolve themselves into so many species of motion—emanative or vibratory, and the motion implied in chemical combination. The resistance offered to the touch by solid bodies may seem an exception to this statement, but it is not so in fact: for the resistance of a solid surface is nothing but a *propulsion* operating within the minute sphere of that atomic force, which prevents the actual or mathematical

* Physical Theory of another Life, page 272.

Digitized by Google

contact of bodies. We know solid bodies therefore *only by the rebound*, which prohibits approximation within a certain limit. It is then a species of motion that conveys to us the idea of solidity.

"In other words, for sustaining all the phenomena of the material world, mechanical and chemical, we need suppose nothing more than an infinite congeries of mathematical points of attraction and repulsion,—attraction and repulsion of several kinds."

It is indeed perfectly true that there are no bodies known to us so perfectly hard and impenetrable as to be susceptible of no compression: nor are there many, at least upon the earth's surface, which remain altogether without chemical or internal changes of some kind or other. Even the diamond is dissoluble by extreme heat: and it is probable from analogy that even the slightest changes of temperature affect its dimensions, and produce a certain motion among its particles.

But on the other hand we can hardly entertain a doubt that the particles, or mathematical centres of attraction and repulsion, when acted upon by no external agency, chemical or mechanical, are perfectly at rest, their forces mutually balancing one another. When a weight is suspended by a chain, and is exposed to no mechanical vibrations, and to no changes of heat or of electricity in any form, there is not any reason to think that motion of any kind takes place among its particles. But *forces* are evidently exerted, and are acting incessantly in opposition to the gravity of the weight and chain.

And it is also true that our notion of *force* is altogether derived from our experience of *resistance to muscular effort*, the degree of which is known to us partly by touch: and that this resistance never takes place without some sort of rebound, owing chiefly to the elasticity of matter. But even if our own bodies, and all other bodies whatever, were perfectly incompressible, so that no rebound,—which can take place only after compression,—

Digitized by Google

could be produced by contact, we should still, by our consciousness of muscular effort, by the opposition of matter to our will, become conscious of what we term force. In fact natural philosophy gives us no reason to believe that any *new* force is ever generated among the particles or points of matter, except when organized matter, animal or vegetable, is subjected to the influence of mind. All motion in unorganized matter appears to result simply from the disengagement of forces by some action of other forces. If we were sufficiently acquainted with the laws of nature, we should be able to trace this as clearly in the devastating sweep of the hurricane, or in the sudden flash of lightning, as we can in the fall of the delicately poised snows of an Alpine mountain, when detached from their cliffs by the vibrations of a voice in the air.

According to the theory above quoted, "the visible and palpable world is MOTION, constant and uniform, emanating from infinite centres, and springing during every instant of its continuance, from the Creative Energy." According to the theory here preferred, the same world consists of a number of mathematical centres of FORCE, which are opposed, either wholly or partially by other forces, concentrated and radiating in like manner;—centres of force, which *whether at rest among themselves or not*, require the incessant exertion of an equal amount of Sustaining Energy to continue them in being. This is confirmed by our own consciousness. We find that as great an effort is required to resist force, —as when we hold a weight in the extended arm in opposition to gravity,—as to generate motion.

These centres of force need not be, strictly, infinite in their numbers. For though, on the one hand, space is in thought infinitely divisible; and there is no limit to the number of points of force which the Creator could collect within a given space, and no limit to the intensity of force which, if it were His will, He might suffer them to arrive, there is on the other hand no limit to the re-

Digitized by Google

moteness at which He might place them, not allowing them, by the same Will, ever to approach nearer.

But whichever theory be preferred, the conclusion as to the feasibility of an annihilation of the material universe is the same. On either theory, "the instantaneous cessation of this energy, or its reaching its close, is abstractedly quite as easily conceived of as is its continuance; and whether, in the next instant, it shall continue or shall cease, whether the material universe shall stand, or shall vanish, is an alternative of which, irrespective of other reasons, the one member may be taken as easily as the other: just as the moving of the hand, or the not moving it, in the next moment, [or the sustaining with it a weight, for a time, and then ceasing to exert the sustaining force] depends upon nothing but our volition. The annihilation of the solid spheres,—the planets and the suns that occupy the celestial spaces, would not be an act of irresistible force, crushing that which resists compression, or dissipating and reducing to an ether that which firmly coheres; but it would be the non-exertion, in the next instant, of a power which has been exerted in this instant: it would be, not a destruction, but a rest; not a crash and ruin, but a pause." We would add, however, to this theory, that the principle of polarity, especially as exemplified by crystallization, lead us to suppose that the forces of the material world are not ultimately referable in all instances to mere points, but reside, perhaps even more frequently, in lines, or in planes. Such a disposition of forces is just as easily conceivable as the other, and it is not ultimately resolvable into it.

Page 152.

The Religion of the Gentiles.

"The light of God," says Dr. Southey, "which at the beginning was imparted to man, hath never been extinguished. From the patriarchs it descended to the prophets, and from the prophets to the apostles: but there

Digitized by Google

were many who wandered and lost the light, and their offspring became inheritors of darkness." The ancient Greeks, in proceeding to plant a colony, were religiously careful to carry with them, from their former home, the fire which should be used in their new habitations; and had the genuine flame which came down from heaven been preserved with equal care, the incense of adoration might have arisen, in regions the most remote, equally pure and equally acceptable in all. Though it was forbidden knowledge which led to the immediate downfall of our first parents, yet it is probable that many things were familiar to them while in Paradise, of which in their corrupt state they retained only an imperfect conception, and could give only an inadequate account; while there may have been mysteries, known to them, which from their nature could not be divulged to those who had not been initiated in Paradise: yet all that Adam was capable of imparting might have been known, had men chosen to retain God in their knowledge, to all the Gentile world, even up to the present day. Yet perhaps, had patriarchal religion thus been spread over the earth, the fulness of time would have arrived before the lapse of forty centuries; and the seed of the Word, falling on ground so prepared, would have produced sixty or an hundred fold in every clime! For it is probable that the patriarchal religion was rich in vital and evangelical truths; —that the God, who "left not Himself without witness," even among those who had forgotten His first revelations, vouchsafed to reveal to those who called on His name, the predestined redemption of mankind;—that Christ, the "seed of the woman," was distinctly foreshown;— and that many, even before Abraham, "rejoiced to see his day, and saw it and were glad:" glad, because mankind even then enjoyed, through Him, promises of resurrection unto life, and of heavenly rest for the weary pilgrims of this world.

But the majority of the descendants of Noah went astray: and not retaining God in their knowledge, ne-

Digitized by Google

cessarily lost their knowledge of resurrection and of immortality. The religion of the polytheists was one of terror and darkness; and for the most part they sorrowed for the dead, "as they that have no hope." Amidst this darkness human philosophy was exerted in vain. Polytheism indeed was opposed: but what was gained by a recognition of the Unity was lost by a disregard of the moral character of the Deity: the God of the philosophers became a mere philosophical abstraction; and was seldom addressed in prayer. Among the common people on the other hand, if the gift of an abundant harvest occasioned any festive celebration, or any display of thankfulness, men failed to recognise in the giver a Universal Lord, the Supreme Cause of all: they saw but a divine controller of the seasons, a ruler of sunshine and rain. They gave the air to his dominion; but they knew not that the sea also was his, and he made it, and his hands prepared the dry land: and if they worshipped Jupiter in one temple, they had another for Neptune, and yet another for Ceres; and being ignorant that there was *one* absolute king, as has been said above, who tolerates, for reasons of his own, the rebellion of His servants, they had no just conception of the temporary sufferance of evil, and minor calamities filled them with dread, death with dismay and despair.

Page 211.

The present tendencies of the world not towards a universal reign of Christianity.

A variety of Scriptural proofs might have been adduced in proof of this point; but one will be fully sufficient. The book of revelation informs that in fact we are not to expect a universal reign of Christianity, as the result of causes now in operation. It contains an account of the chief events in the spiritual history of the world, commencing with the infancy of Christianity, or at some period yet future, and carried up to the general Judge-

Digitized by Google

ment and the dissolution of the earth by fire. And it presents a succession of awful pictures of human wickedness and Divine wrath. The seals, the trumpets, the vials are all charged with the righteous judgements of God, inflicted in punishment of the rebellions then existing. Nowhere can we discover a season wherein the wicked shall cease from troubling, and receiving a meet recompense of trouble, until the "thousand years" commence, during which Satan shall be bound, and the souls of martyrs shall live, and reign with Christ over the emancipated kingdoms. It would seem then that notwithstanding the influence of Christianity, the knowledge of the Lord shall *not* "cover the earth, as the waters that cover the depths of the sea," before the close of this dispensation: but that the general tendencies of the world are towards greater and greater sinfulness, until the conquests of the prince of darkness are terminated by a special interposition of the Almighty, and the usurper is cast down from his throne.

And we know not that sin will wholly cease, even during the millennium; while we are expressly told, (a fact which is often most wonderfully disregarded by expositors of prophecy) that multitudes, "the number of whom is as the sand of the sea," shall enlist themselves in the service of the Devil during the short post-millennial season of liberty which shall precede his everlasting condemnation.

Page 223.

The future condition of the heathen.

THE message of God in His Gospel is an offer of salvation dependent not merely on what Christ has done for men, but on their *faith* in what He hath done, and is willing to do. He who overcame the sharpness of death opened the kingdom of heaven to all *believers*. But we have now to ask, are there any exceptions to the rule, that a knowledge of the Cross is as necessary as the cross? Christianity itself furnishes one, in the salvation

Digitized by Google

of baptized infants without faith on their parts: and another perhaps in that of those children of believing parents who are "not unclean but holy." And we have another in the case of the children of the faithful servants of God who lived before the coming of Christ: who, though unbaptized, though not members of that kingdom of heaven which was not then established on earth, we still trust are inheritors of the kingdom which is to come. And, in the silence of Scripture, no conclusive reason can be assigned, why, if a child of believing Abraham dying in infancy can be saved, a more remote descendant of Abraham,—or of Adam, to whom the same promises were given,—should not be saved, by the Son of God whom it knew not, and through faith not its own; even though that infant's immediate parents were unbelievers. For the Lord who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, showeth mercy unto *thousands* in (or, for the sake of) them that love Him, and keep His commandments. But beyond this point we must proceed with increased caution; and with much diminished hope.

For the most part, the rewards and punishments of the world to come are promised or threatened to those who have embraced or have *rejected* the gospel of Christ, —the offers of pardon upon repentance, which, under every dispensation, have been made to man for Christ's sake. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not [the word preached to him] shall be condemned." Such is the general doctrine of Scripture. But it might be said, The condemnation is, that "light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil:" shall then the unavoidable ignorance of those on whom the light shineth not, occasion their condemnation? The answer must be, First, they shall neither be saved *by* their ignorance, nor condemned *for* their ignorance; but condemned for their wilful transgressions of those Divine laws of which they were *not* ignorant,—which were

Digitized by Google

written in their hearts. And secondly Scripture unequivocally declares that men may be condemned, *through* ignorance of the Gospel of Christ, and for transgressions of which they would have repented, had Gospel light reached them. The people of Sodom and Gomorrah "would have repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes," had some of the mighty works of Jesus been done in their cities; yet are they set forth as an ensample of the severity of Divine justice, and the certainty of punishment, because, having the light of nature, they walked in darkness.

Let it not be thought that because the "vengeance of eternal fire" which those cities are suffering is not the punishment of Gehenna, but a previous judgement, or because it shall hereafter be "more tolerable" for them than for others, that the people of Sodom and Gomorrah will find pardon at the Day of Judgement. The fiery rain from heaven was not purgatorial, but was a sign and proof of Divine wrath; which if it resteth on a man to the instant of his death, resteth on him eternally.

This doctrine, that men may be condemned, through want of a greater illumination than they possess, is amply confirmed by the analogy of nature. Ignorance, whether unavoidable or voluntary, does not shelter men from the suffering which follows, by way of natural consequence, upon the infringement of any of the laws of nature. Poison is not the less deadly, when imbibed unwittingly: and even he who strives to avoid danger, is often less safe than he who despises it. He who seeks the right path however earnestly, must still abide the consequences if he should in fact choose the wrong. And thus we are bound to fear that the poison of sin will destroy many, even among those who dread its power, and seek by vain sacrifices to propitiate them that are no gods.

Again, Scripture declares that of those that are called, not many are chosen; and we cannot believe that of those who are not called a larger proportion can be saved:

Digitized by Google

since this would make the preaching of the gospel a greater curse than blessing. We cannot but believe that a fearful judgement awaits the multitudes of the heathen; though they suffer not the twofold punishment of the rejectors of gospel light; nor the triple condemnation of those who, having been once enlightened, fall away; nor, lastly, have their portion with the hypocrites.

Page 245.

Man in the image of God, in that he is male and female.

"GOD created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them," and from these words alone we might reasonably suspect that man, in that he is male and female, is an image, resemblance, or type of his Maker. And a more comprehensive view of revealed truth confirms this suspicion. As the Deity is one, and yet there is a plurality of persons in the Godhead, so humanity is one, and yet is of a twofold nature, male and female. As a certain kind of derivation is included in the notion of sonship, and power, in some sense, proceedeth from the Father to the Son, so Adam was first formed, then Eve, and the woman was made out of man. And as Christ and the Father are one, so "they twain shall be one flesh." And as God created by the Word, without whom nothing was made, so man multiplied through Eve, who was called the mother of all living.

And further, Scripture discovers to us, that through the mysterious assumption of humanity by the Son of God, a third kind of relationship is established, having a real affinity to that of the Father and the Son, of the male and the female; and connecting all, if we may reverently so speak, in one series. "The head of the woman is the man, and the head of the man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God." As the Son partakes of the Father's throne, so will the redeemed partake of the throne of Christ; and so also the man is enjoined to

Digitized by Google

give honour unto his wife, and admit her to his bosom and counsels. As man is the image and glory of God, so is the woman the glory of the man, and so also is the Son the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person. As he that is joined to any woman is one body, so he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. And our Lord's prayer for believers was—"That they may be one, *even as* We are one, I in them, and Thou in Me:" and the union of Christ in his Church is repeatedly symbolised by the marriage union; and this latter, always sacred and mysterious, has been doubly sanctified, it appears, since the Incarnation of the Son of God.

Page 288.

The "spirits in prison." 1 Peter iii. 18.

It was sufficient for the main argument to show, that our Lord cannot reasonably be supposed to have preached to the imprisoned spirits, during the interval between his death and resurrection: but it may be worth while here to consider some of the numerous conjectural interpretations of this famous passage of St. Peter; and to propose another, which is perhaps more consistent with the language of the apostle; but which has not been generally adopted, nor considered as fully as it deserves. Not to dwell on *one* of the conjectures of Archbishop Leighton, (that St. Peter refers to the preaching of our Lord and his apostles, *after* his resurrection, to those in the bondage of sin;—and which is plainly untenable, from its utter want of connection with "the days of Noah,") it is commonly supposed that by the "spirits" are intended those of the inhabitants of the antediluvian world, shortly before its end; which were "in prison," as some think, under the bondage of sin when preached to by the Spirit of Christ in the person of Noah, (who is termed in Scripture a "preacher of righteousness,") or else, as others hold, though free when Christ preached

Digitized by Google

to them, were, after their destruction by the flood, imprisoned in Hades, as in a place of punishment.

To both of these opinions there are two main objections. First, there is certainly *no other* passage in the whole Bible, where the word "spirits" is used to signify men living on earth, or their souls as separated from their bodies. By "the spirit of a man" is generally intended either the breath of life,—as when Stephen prayed "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," or the mind or heart of a man,—as where it is said that human things are known, "by the spirit of man which is in him," or the heart or temper of a man,—as where one is said to be "grieved in spirit," or to be "hasty of spirit." By "the spirit" is intended either the Holy Spirit of God, or the operation of that Spirit, or the renewed heart of a man. But by "*a* spirit" is invariably meant an incorporeal creature, an angel, or ghost,—as when Job beheld "a spirit pass before his face," or as when Saul was visited with "an evil spirit from the Lord," or as when the disciples were terrified, thinking "that they had seen a spirit." And by "spirits," in the plural, and put absolutely, are always signified *angels good or bad.* Thus God is said to "make his angels spirits," and they are "all ministering spirits." And the devils are repeatedly called "unclean spirits." That these "dæmons," as they are, literally speaking, termed in the New Testament, are the Devil's evil *angels* seems sufficiently clear. For the dæmons a time of "torment" is reserved, which is surely the identical fire prepared for Satan and his ministers. And when "the spirits" were subject to the seventy disciples, Jesus "beheld Satan as lightning fallen from heaven." However the present point is not, that by spirits are always intended beings of precisely the same nature with the good angels of God, (for it *may* be that Satan's ministers are of a different species), but that *incorporeal creatures, and not men,* are always signified by the word "spirits." We

Digitized by Google

ought therefore, on this account to suppose St. Peter to refer, not to human, but to spiritual beings.

Secondly, we have no reason to think that man's disobedience in the days of Noah was so *peculiarly* heinous, as to demand any different preaching from that which has ever been requisite; since it is not through man's comparative *innocence* that the earth has been exempted from a second deluge, and the post-diluvian world has become, like the former, altogether "guilty before God:" and it is hard to suppose that the Spirit of Christ *did in fact* preach righteousness, by the mouth of Noah, in any manner distinct from that in which the same "Spirit of Christ" preached by the prophets afterwards. But St. Peter seems to allude to some disobedience peculiar to that period, and of which not men, but *spirits*, were guilty.

Now it is surely remarkable that in Genesis we find an obscure passage, which may, and frequently has been supposed to allude to a disobedience of this description. "When men began to multiply upon the face of the earth, and sons and daughters were born unto them, the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all that they chose . . . . And when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. This wickedness appears to have commenced not long before the declaration of the Divine decree, to destroy man from off the earth. Now the expression "sons of God" is in several places of Scripture used to signify *angels*. When the Almighty Creator laid the foundations of the earth, the "morning stars" (the most glorious of the celestial host) "sang together, and all the *sons of God*" (the whole chorus of the subordinate intelligences of heaven) "shouted for joy." And in a former part of the same book, (Job. i. 6.) when the "*sons of God* came to present themselves before

Digitized by Google

the Lord, Satan also came along with them;"—being of a nature, it appears, *akin to theirs*.

Nor need we doubt that angelic creatures could, and frequently did, both before and after the flood, assume a palpable and human shape. Jacob wrestled with an angel; Abraham gave angels, who are there called "men," a repast of cakes of meal, a calf, butter, and milk, "and stood by them under the tree, and they did eat." Lot washed the feet of angels (or men, for they are called by *both* names) and sought to rescue them from insult.

Through the transgression of the angels who were tempted by the beauty of the daughters of Eve to unite themselves to a species only a little lower than their own, the corruption of the human race, the *enormity* of their crimes before God, were fearfully augmented. A new sin contaminated mankind; a monstrous progeny had birth, powerful for evil beyond ordinary human beings, "mighty men which were of old," and a stain not arising from Adam's transgression infected the mixed offspring, each bearing about with him not only a polluted human nature, "naturally engendered," but an unclean spirit, supernaturally engendered.

It may be permitted to us to conjecture that it was *this* offence and stain, beyond all others, which provoked the Almighty to destroy the old world,—in order that he might utterly destroy those semi-angelic families, which else, by gradual intermixture would have polluted the whole race of man.

The mythologists, many of whose fables were certainly based on authentic traditions, appear to have heard, through the descendants of Noah, of this forbidden intercourse, these "mighty men." They seem to allude to it in the story of the *giants* or *demigods*, the sons of Cœlus and Terra, of heaven and earth, who rebelled against the Ruler of heaven, and sought to invade his realms, and were by him cast down, and buried beneath the earth. And just such presumptuous rebellion as

Digitized by Google

this we should naturally expect would manifest itself in the sons of the disobedient angels, though we read not in Genesis that they "dared defy the Omnipotent to arms." Conscious of superhuman strength, aware of their extraordinary parentage, corrupt in nature, blinded by pride, ambition might incite them to try the regions of the air, their fathers' original habitation, and to invade the "high places" which were polluted by their presence, and even to contend against Him, whose power they had cause to fear.

The original tradition, on which the mythologists founded their fable, was probably preserved in an uncorrupted form among the Jews; and of this tradition, as a thing generally known and believed in, St. Peter and St. Jude also make express mention. In the language of the latter, the "angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," (i. e. for the earth) are "cast down to Hades, and reserved in everlasting chains under darkness to the judgement of the great day:" and the former reminds his disciples that God "spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Hades, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement." We would conclude then that St. Peter's "spirits in prison" are the disobedient sons of God who, in the days of Noah, left their own habitation to associate with the daughters of men; and whom the Almighty Power, when He brought in the flood, cast down to darkness and chains. The period between the commencement of their transgression, and the destruction of the old world was to them a season of *trial*, in which the Saviour going among them by His Spirit, sought to recal them to God. Persisting (many of them at least, or all), in their rebellion, even as did the sons of men, they were at length given over to perdition, suffered to transgress no longer, but cast down, enchained, and kept for judgement.

It is evident that when Peter and Jude refer to the rebellion and punishment of the angels they are arguing

Digitized by Google

from the known to the unknown. They sought to convince men of the certainty of future judgments, by *reminding* them of the judgments which *they knew* God had inflicted in old times. For this purpose they mentioned the notorious destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the deluge, the reality of which event was commonly believed in (though there were scoffers willingly ignorant of it), and the punishment of the angels that sinned. St. Peter seems to speak of this as if it had been equally notorious with the deluge, and as if it had either accompanied, or preceded, that event. It must be presumed that St. Peter, when writing of the "spirits in prison," as well as when referring to the "angels that sinned," intended and expected to be *understood.* If we suppose him to refer to a *tradition* concerning disobedient angels, all is clear. His words must otherwise have been as obscure, it seems, in his days, as modern commentators have generally found them.

The interpretation above suggested must however appear objectionable to those who have hitherto supposed *Satan and his angels* to be identical with "the angels that sinned." If such were the fact, it is plain that, since the disobedience of Satan was long before the days of Noah, the "spirits in prison," and the "sons of God" mentioned in Genesis cannot be identified with those rebellious angels. But whoever will calmly consider the account given in the Apocalypse of the *binding of Satan* during the millennial period must perceive that he and his attendant legions cannot be identified with the fallen angels of Peter and Jude. For *they* are *already* bound, in chains, in prison, in Hades, in the bottomless pit, no longer permitted to transgress, but confined, and reserved for judgement. But Satan is now free. For a thousand years, which have not commenced as yet, he will be in prison, in chains, in Hades, in the bottomless pit, even as they are now; unable longer to "deceive the nations," to "go to and fro in

Digitized by Google

the earth," "as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour." At the close of the millennium he will be released, and again be permitted to deceive the nations. Nor need it appear strange, that while multitudes of evil angels, though condemned beyond reprieve, are still permitted to roam about unchained, to seduce and ruin mankind, *some* should be already imprisoned. For their offence was intolerable, and lest its consequences should be perpetuated, and the crime itself repeated, God at once swept away the human transgressors and their giant offspring, and cast the spirits into a prison, whence they could seduce no more.

After the foregoing observations were written, the author found in one of the admirable "Essays and Sermons by the Rev. H. Woodward," a similar interpretation of the expression "spirits in prison:" which, as he there learned, is understood by the author of "Eruvin" also to refer to the sons of God who transgressed with the daughters of men. But it is stated in the Essays, that Christ's preaching to the imprisoned spirits "*must* have been when his body lay in the grave, and his soul, in a state of separation, went into the invisible world." The majority of modern commentators certainly perceive no such necessity. And to what purpose could Christ preach to spirits *already condemned:* "cast down and *reserved for judgement?*" And, as has been argued above, the life-giving Spirit of God abhors death, and can in nowise ally itself with the power of the grave, nor dwell in the shades of darkness. It displayed its energy, on the contrary, in quickening our Lord, in *raising him from* the dead.

The opinion that our Lord's preaching to the imprisoned spirits took place in the interval between his death and resurrection is perhaps in a great measure to be ascribed to a neglect to observe the connection between Christ's death, quickening, and preaching, and the things spoken of by St. Peter in the subsequent

Digitized by Google

parts of the same sentence. *Why*, it may be asked, should St. Peter pass off from the consideration of the death and resurrection of Christ to that of his preaching to the spirits, unless that preaching took place, not before, but *between* his death and resurrection? There are four things, it may be replied, which St. Peter mentions in one connection,—The death and rising again of our Lord,—the preaching to the spirits,—the deluge, and saving of Noah by water,—and the baptism of Christians. The connection of the first and fourth of these is obvious, and that of the third and fourth not obscure. From the thought of our Lord's rising from the grave St. Peter passed to the figurative baptism of the flood, mentioning, by the way, our Lord's preaching to the spirits, in connection with what followed as well as with what preceded it; that preaching being *by the agency* of the Spirit that quickened him, and *shortly before the time* when the deluge slew, washed away, and buried sin, and raised and saved the righteous Noah and his family.

A further reason is given, in the Essay above referred to, for supposing that our Lord preached to the spirits after his crucifixion. A curious parallel is drawn between the passage of St. Peter, and 1 Tim. iii. 16; in which, it is said, "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, *seen of angels*, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory;" which are supposed severally to refer to our Lord's incarnation and ministry, death on the cross, *preaching to the spirits*, demonstrating, by resurrection, his divine power, proclaiming the universality of his gospel, and ascending into heaven. But this parallel fails if we understand in a literal sense (and why should we not?) the words "preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world." For though our Lord gave proof of his divine power, by his resurrection from the dead, it was given, prior to his resurrection, not to "the world," but merely unto "witnesses chosen before of God;" and though he proclaimed the catholicity of his kingdom, he *forbade* his disciples to

Digitized by Google

quit Jerusalem, and in fact they did not "preach to the Gentiles," until after his ascension.

Besides, the expression "seen of angels" is abundantly significant, without being thus explained. It is argued indeed in the Essay, that since the obedient angels had always beheld our Lord's face in glory, since their creation, therefore the rebellious spirits who had been banished into darkness, are probably intended by St. Paul. It is true that the angels of light had always beheld our Lord's face in glory, but they had not beheld before the grand mystery of godliness; nay, into its fathomless depths they still desire to look. They had doubtless heard of the wondrous plan of redemption long before. At least from the time of Adam's fall those ministering spirits must have comprehended somewhat of the intended salvation, "saw the promises afar off," and eagerly desired their fulfilment. When the Son of God went forth, in all the plenitude of His Father's power, to reduce the primæval chaos into order

> "Him all his train
> Followed in bright procession, to behold
> Creation and the wonders of his might."

And the magnificent display of His power and wisdom filled them with acclamations and songs. Now even to us, who can behold the glories of the creating and sustaining Word only by the eye of *faith*, the humiliation of the Son of God presents a spectacle of overwhelming wonder. What then must it have appeared to *them*, who had beheld him in his heavenly glories,—who had "seen him as he is?"* What heart can conceive the feelings with which they gazed down on Jesus, when he occupied a rank *lower* than their own, and trod the earth with toilsome steps, among mortals who met their Creator face to face, and knew Him not! And who shall describe the

---

* As *he is*, who said of himself I AM.

Digitized by Google

emotions that agitated as one soul the myriads of the heavenly host who witnessed the temptation in the wilderness, the agony in the garden, the pangs of crucifixion, the slumbers in the sealed tomb? Or who can adequately comprehend their feelings of triumph and veneration at that "bringing of the first-begotten [from the dead] into the world" at which the decree passed, "Let all the angels of God worship Him?"

Surely these spectacles may have been of no small importance: redoubling the activity of the ministering spirits in the service of those for whom their Lord had died. Nor is this all. We know that Christ by his death reconciled unto himself *things in heaven* as well as things on earth: and like the Israelites who *gazed on* the brazen serpent, so the angels may have derived new life, from being eye-witnesses of the cross of Christ.

Page 338.

The presumption of pronouncing upon man's destiny, on the supposition that he had continued sinless.

If it be an idle and presumptuous thing, to enquire what would have been the destiny of sinful and fallen man, but for the mediation of Christ, it is no less vain and presumptuous to enquire what would have been his lot, had he never fallen. As the mediation was decreed before the foundation of the world, so preparations were made in heaven, many mansions were made ready, for those whom Christ should rescue from death, even while man continued in his uprightness, and found perfect happiness in Paradise. And it seems not improbable that preparations were made upon the earth also; that the general constitution of our globe was from the first such as to render it a fitting place of probationary discipline for fallen man; and that beyond the borders of Eden decay and reproduction, sickness and mortality, may have prevailed from the first. It would seem unreasonable to suppose that while the heavenly mansions were

Digitized by Google

actually prepared, even "from the foundation of the world," the Divine Artificer should have formed the earth without respect, as it were, to the arrangements made elsewhere, to be the abode of a sinless race.

But this and similar considerations, which ought to have the effect of impressing us with a deep sense of the absolute and unchangeable character of the Divine decrees, and so checking our proneness to speculate on unreal, and therefore perhaps absurd, suppositions, have unfortunately tended on the contrary to encourage many to pronounce confidently what would have been the destiny of man, had he remained upright. Thus it has been asserted by Dr. Buckland and others, that "under no imaginable condition are we taught to contemplate an earthly Paradise as the enduring abode of the first created man, or of the countless myriads of his descendants." In fact we are never taught in Scripture to contemplate the earth, or mankind, under *any* conditions but those which revelation has made known. As a mere hypothesis we may put any case we will; but it would be wise to abstain altogether from the attempt to draw any conclusions as to the course which, as we think, God would have adopted in an event which is purely hypothetical. The high authority of Dr. Bull has been given to the same side. "Let it once be granted that man, if he had continued obedient, should have enjoyed an everlasting life, any man of reason that shall closely consider the matter will presently collect that this life could not in any congruity be perpetuated in the earthly Paradise; and therefore the man was, in the design of God, after a certain period of time to have been translated to a higher state, i. e. to celestial bliss." We cannot know that Paradise would have been unfit for man's permanent abode: and we have no right whatever,—it is necessary to repeat this—to assert that this or any other mode of dealing with the human race, under circumstances which were never to occur, did enter into "the design of God." It is sheer folly and presumption

Digitized by Google

at best, to attribute to the All-wise and Almighty God any design, except such as we believe He will in fact execute, or hath executed already.

And even as a mere hypothesis, this notion that the Deity intended to translate each individual of the myriads of the human race from earth to heaven, after a certain period of time, is encumbered with difficulties as great as any which it attempts to remove. Unless the garden planted eastward in Eden had no particular locality, and Paradise consisted merely in spiritual privileges which might be enjoyed equally on every part of the earth's surface, the greater portion of the countless myriads of Adam's sinless posterity must have been excluded from the Eden of their forefathers from want of room: or if it accommodated all, for what purpose was the rest of the earth made? Even supposing that, previous to the curse, the earth at large would have formed a far more pleasant and fitting abode for man, we cannot suppose that the Divine favour, accompanying the children of men, as it accompanied the Israelites, from country to country, would have made all places *alike* Edens of delight. There was *a spot* of peculiar sanctity and blessedness from which Adam was expelled: on the other supposition his punishment would have consisted simply in the withdrawal of the overshadowing cloud of Divine glory. But it would be useless to pursue such speculations further.

Page 344.

See the article appended to page 111.

Page 377.

"*The Holy City.*"

It has been maintained above, in pages 321 to 327, that we ought to expect that the restoration of Israel to God's favour will be post-millennial; and that the holy city

Digitized by Google

promised to them will not be transitory, but hath foundations which cannot be moved. But we should do well to bear in mind, that in very many passages of the Old Testament language is used in respect of the coming of Christ, which must have appeared at the time to refer to one Advent, though in fact two were intended. And thus, probably, as well as through their proneness to unspiritual interpretations, and their natural impatience under subjection to Rome, many of the Jews were led to expect the Messiah to appear as a king and a conqueror, who should rule the nations with a rod of iron, and be the glory of his people Israel. Their error should remind us, that where *one* restoration of the Jews seems to be promised, two may be intended: that Hebrews acknowledging Christ as their High-Priest may yet inhabit Judea, and build the walls of Jerusalem, and make it a holy city; although still looking, even as we look, for no transitory promises, still confessing themselves strangers and pilgrims on the earth, still expecting their grand and final restoration, still having their conversation (πολιτευόντες) in heaven, and waiting for that Jerusalem which is above, wherein Christians of all countries shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God.

Page 383.

The two thrones. Rev. iii. 21.

THERE is perhaps no one passage of Scripture which is capable of furnishing a more forcible argument in disproof of the doctrine called Unitarianism than that which has been just quoted in the text: and the argument appears to be fairly admissible at least in this Appendix, inasmuch as it nearly relates to the future state of all who overcome.

There are very numerous passages of Scripture, it may be admitted, which *appear* to show that the blessed Son of God, although possessed of great power and glory,

Digitized by Google

has nevertheless *no* power nor glory which shall not, either in this world or the next, be conferred on all his true disciples. "The glory which Thou hast given me," saith our Lord, "I have given them." Again, "I have called you friends; for *all things* which I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." And St. John writes, "We be called the sons of God: when Christ shall appear we shall be *like* Him, for we shall see him as He is." And all believers are termed "heirs of God; *joint-heirs with Christ*." They who are concerned to vindicate before men the majesty of the Son of God need not be perplexed by these passages, nor by any others which an opponent of the truth may bring forward with the same view,—but may safely allow (though perhaps in some cases allowing more than they need), that they do assert an equality, in the heavenly state, between Christ and the several members of his church. But let us now consider our text. "Unto him that overcometh will I give to sit with me in *my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down with the Father in His throne." These words are enough to show (in perfect agreement with, but without aid from, the Scriptural doctrine that Christ hath a twofold nature), that Christ hath TWO THRONES, one which he terms his, the other the Father's. To sit upon the same throne plainly implies to possess the same rank, the same glory, power, might, majesty, and dominion; to have two thrones, is to have a twofold rank, a twofold dominion. Hence we conclude, that all the followers and friends of Christ will be rendered equal with him, being raised to the same utterable height of glory which peculiarly appertains to the Son of Man, sitting with him on his throne; while Christ the Son of God, infinitely above them still, "high throned above all height," shall, through all eternity occupy the seat, and wield the power of God the Father Almighty. How is it possible to evade the conclusion, that as man will be equal with Christ, so Christ is equal with God?

Digitized by Google

To sit upon the same throne either implies equality, or it does not: and the impugners of the doctrine of Christ's divinity may choose either alternative, or, if they please, try both. If it imply equality, then Christ is equal with God. Equal, and co-equal, and one. He dethrones not His Father, but sits with Him; He is seated, not on a rival throne, but on the same; He exercises one and the same supremacy. It may be admitted too, as it is by the soundest divines of the Church of England, that the dignity is in a manner derivative, but it is not therefore inferior. The redeemed are truly *joint*-heirs and equal with Christ, even though it is *of his gift* that they sit with him on his throne. Perhaps then it will be held to imply inequality. The supposition appears absurd in itself; and what are its consequences? That the redeemed who sit on the throne of Christ will *not* be equal with him; on which supposition many of those passages on which the Unitarian mainly relies will, by perfect parity of reasoning, be nullified. For no reason can be assigned for the supposed inequality, but that the dignity is derivative, and therefore inferior. If so, then, where it is said "The glory which thou hast given me, *I have given them*," this also implies inequality. We may be certain that our text, containing the promise made, in the case of the last of the "seven churches," to him that overcometh, promises nothing less than the highest honour, glory, and bliss, which has ever been offered to mankind in Scripture. We cannot suppose that Christ, in promising to seat man on his throne, promised him a dignity inferior to his own, if elsewhere he had promised, or intended to confer on him, or knew that he would obtain, an equal dignity. The Unitarian then cannot degrade Christ below the Father, without degrading himself below Christ. But we may press this point much further. On the principles of the Unitarians, the Son, sitting on the Father's throne is not only not equal with Him, but *incalculably, nay infinitely inferior*. What then will become of that co-equal

Digitized by Google

dignity for which they contend, implied in joint heirship, or in the other promises?

There will be, it may be observed, a certain inequality between different believers in the world to come. For specific acts of obedience will have specific rewards; of some it is said, "*great* is their reward in heaven," and to some it will be given "to sit on Christ's right hand and on his left." But notwithstanding these minor differences, they will sit on the same throne: their privileges will be all the same in *essence*, but unequal in *degree*. They shall be honoured, by being caused to shine "as the stars for ever and ever;" but "one star differeth from another star in glory." But this minor inequality cannot subsist between the Two who are seated upon the upper throne. Humanity is finite, and man can excel man; but to Deity absolute perfection, absolute infinity are *essential*: and the Son must either equal the Father, by being also infinite in every attribute; or, not being infinite, must be infinitely inferior. *None but God can sit upon God's throne.*

But perhaps it will be contended, that the text admits of a different interpretation, by which the argument may be evaded. It is just possible that the words, taken by themselves, may signify, that there is but one throne; which Christ calls his, because he is seated upon it by the Father. And this interpretation may at first sight appear to be countenanced by the words—"Unto him that overcometh .... *even as* I also overcame:" which may seem to promise to those who are similarly victorious a similar reward. But if we therefore attribute to Christ that kind of precedency only which belongs to the captain of our salvation, to the chief and leader of the glorious army of martyrs and saints, and suppose him to be similarly rewarded with the rest by a God infinitely above him, we shall find it hard indeed to explain the words "*I will give* to him to sit with me on my throne. The words "Unto him that overcometh ... as I overcame" should lead us to a widely different interpretation.

Digitized by Google

Christ, when He had obtained that victory over sin and death which was possible to God alone, for ever sat down enthroned on the right hand of God; for man remains only a minor victory, and even that he cannot obtain by the strength of his own arm; and his reward, in being seated on the throne of the Son of man, will be far beyond his deserts. We ought not moreover to take the text by itself, for from other passages it is abundantly plain that there are two thrones. The heavenly city beheld by St John had no temple, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." And it needed not sun nor moon; "for the *glory of God* did lighten it, and *the Lamb* was the light thereof. And the nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it." And, "the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and His servants shall serve Him." What can be more plain and certain than that the redeemed shall *not* sit upon *this* throne. As subjects they serve the Lord God and the Lamb that sitteth thereon.

But there is another hypothesis which must be briefly noticed, because, extravagant as it is, it has been advanced in some popular writings, and even by ministers of the Anglican Church. Influenced by the passage in St. Paul, (1 Cor. xv. 24 to 28) which declares that at the end of the world Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and put down all rule, and all authority and power, and be subject to Him that put all things under him, they suppose that Christ now occupies the throne of God, but shall hereafter exchange it for the inferior throne of the Son of Man. If this be so, then Christ is now divine, and hereafter will not be so!

The truth seems to be, that at the time of the end God,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—will be "all in all," through the resignation by Jesus, the Son of Man, of the supreme authority and dominion now delegated to him. The Son of God will surely remain, as before, seated on his Father's throne, wielding the

Digitized by Google

same sceptre; but the Son of Man, having "laid down all rule," will then sit on that second and inferior throne, to which he will welcome the fellow-servants of his Father.

We have a very remarkable illustration of this mysterious transaction, if not an actual type of it, furnished by profane history. The destruction of Jerusalem by Titus is generally admitted to be typical of the second advent of Christ. It marked the close of a dispensation; and it inflicted a fearful judgement upon the enemies of God. Titus, who led the armies of Rome, was *the son* of the then reigning emperor Vespasian; and "the father had committed all judgement unto the son," by giving him absolute command of all the forces of the empire, in order to the reduction of the rebellious province of Judæa. Not long after this Vespasian associated his son with himself on the imperial throne: the general laid down his rule, that the emperor, or emperors, might be all in all.

THE END.

C. WHITTINGHAM, CHISWICK.

Digitized by Google