

U

"Immortality"

by

Moses Gries.

Preface.

The question of a future existence has been the object of much attention, and has been discussed by many learned investigators. Therefore, in writing this treatise it was not my intention to present any new facts concerning this well-known topic. But the attempt has been to collect for the reader the usual arguments and facts as given by recognized authorities, and, although the work has been undertaken in a purely fair-minded and unbiased manner, especial attention has been given to the consideration of Immortality from a Jewish standpoint. The question has been considered pro and con, and each argument has been given its due value. The effort has been, to present, in the English language, a clear and unbiased history of Immortality among the Jews, and a brief account of the best arguments. — I am much indebted for valuable information to the Rev. Wm^l ^{Esq} Adler, Dr Ludwig Philipsohn, Gideon Brecher, Wolfgang Menzel, John Stuart Mill and various other authorities.

With these few preparatory remarks, this work is presented for examination

by the Author.

Immortality.

I. Man is the highest ^{and} most developed being on earth; he ranks superior to all other animal existences. By his erect posture ^{and} erect walk, he is distinguished from the lower animals. His upright position ^{and} the peculiar location of the eyes in the head, enable him to look straight forward or upward; his field of vision is vastly more than the rest of the animal kingdom. The hands of man possess an exceedingly peculiar structure, pointing out to the intelligent eye, their adaptability for various kinds of manual labor. Free movement is granted to hands ^{and} limbs for greater convenience in mechanical work. But the fact most worthy of mention with regard to the hands, is their character as the organs of touch. Although all portions of the body are subject to changes in our environment, although the entire surface of our skin, can detect changes in the temperature, hardness ^{and} softness ^{and} the like; nevertheless the finger-tips serve as our

main instrument of communication with the outer world, through the sense of touch.

Of man's other senses, vision^{and} smell are found more highly developed in some animals than in man; but man has harmonious, uniform development; he does not rely upon one sense for his knowledge of the world which encompasses him,^{and} therefore does not experience development in any special sense, to the detriment of the remaining.

Human beings have the power of adapting themselves to the varying changes of season^{and} to various climates. It is true that some animals have migrated from one clime to another^{and} have, nevertheless flourished. But this is more particularly true of man.

Man alone of all animate creatures possesses the faculty of expressing himself in articulate speech. Here again, some animals have vocal organs closely resembling those of man,^{and} yet they do not evince the power to control to the same degree as man.

We have enumerated a number of physical re-

resemblances^{and} differences. Resemblances in their like construction, differences in their degree of use^{and} control. Throughout it is evident that man stands at the head of the animal domain; he is indeed the crowning work of God's creation; he is the king of all he surveys. In this, we recognize the fulfillment of that Bible passage (Gen. I. 28): "And God blessed them (Adam^{and} Eve),^{and} God said unto them, 'Be fruitful^{and} multiply,^{and} replenish the earth^{and} subdue it: ^{and} have dominion over the fish of the sea,^{and} over the fowl of the air,^{and} over every living thing that moveth upon the earth'."

Man has used his natural faculties to their best advantages. The entire realm of nature has been explored, animals of all kinds made subservient to his will, wind^{and} wave made subject to his call, until in truth he has established himself a very king on earth. - But the success which has attended man's efforts in usurping rule^{and} dominion, has not been solely a result of his physical powers. Truly man

possessed certain physical capabilities, which, without an adapting power, would have been physical weaknesses. Man, in strength, in agility, in means of defense, is deficient when compared with lower forms of animal life. But his lack in these, his want of a hard and bony armor of scales and the like, has been amply recompensed in his greater sensibility. Man is physically weaker; he is provided to a less extent with weapons of defense; but his greater exposures to danger and attacks, have at the same time warned him speedily of the impending disaster. His sensibility to outward stimulations has sounded the alarm: but what benefit in being awakened to danger unless we can resist it? Man could not cope with his natural foes, unless he possessed some power other than physical and brute force. This aid to man we find in his possession of mind, the human intelligence, which has qualified him to use for his benefit the various means of sustenance and defense, which nature has so liberally placed at

his disposal. Man possesses mind, reason. In this he resembles God, in whose image he was created. As it is said, in Gen. I 27, "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created them".

Upon this likeness of man to God, upon this resemblance of man to his Creator, are based the morals of religion. Our nature is two-fold, as is evidenced by the Bible (Gen. II 7), "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." - Our likeness to God is not physical but spiritual. "The soul is from God and will return to Him," says Ecclesiastes. He is perfection and our duty is to be like unto Him. Here lies the foundation for all religion: the recognition of God's perfection, and our duty to be like Him.

Self-consciousness is found in man, but is lacking in animals. What has once lived in man's experience does not die and pass away. It is ever

renewed by our power of memory. Thus 'man', in his possession of mind, differs from lower creatures, as is seen in that they possess the same organs of speech^{and} yet are not capable of articulated speech, ^{and} can not give expression to their thoughts^{and} feelings. —

Mind; consciousness belongs to man, instinct to animals. This can be clearly seen when we consider the habits of animals; e.g. the bee newly-born flies straight to the flower, to cull the sweet honey. It needs no experience to instruct it in its duties, nor does experience improve it in its work. The bee-hive is no more complete, ingenious, or more convenient in structure, than it was centuries ago. The spider weaves its web in the same ancient fashion of its ancestors. No improved appliances, no labor-saving machines, no power of steam or electricity have been called into use in these spheres. To man, a conscious, reasoning being, possessed of mind, do we owe their discovery^{and} use. Consciousness is to man, instinct to the

animals. - By means of his consciousness, man's personality is disclosed. No longer is he trammelled and shackled, but he has liberty, he is free. Free will is his. He is not governed by instinct; his senses do not guide him hither and thither, but the power of choice is his. But this free will is limited. When consciousness ceases, choice ceases. Nature's laws control us and our own powers in their limitations, limit us also.

Free will in choice implies intention, design in our action. And thus our acts assume a moral aspect. Things become wrong or not wrong, moral or immoral. Animals have no moral recognition and have no free will. But God has perfect free will, and thus forms the highest and most perfect type of morality. Thus we find man the conscious, like God, the All-conscious, man with limited free will, like God with perfect free will, man with a moral responsibility, like God, the type of Perfect Morality. In this consists man's true likeness to God, the fulfillment of God's intention, when he said (Gen. I 26): "Let us make man in our

image, like unto ourselves!

A marked characteristic in man is his process of Evolution. It has already been mentioned that the animal even in its first experiences is guided correctly by its instinct. With man, it is different. He is born as a helpless infant, and then advances by a very slow growth. Here again the animal is quicker in its development. It needs not the instruction of its parents! But we daily experience the fact that children solve what were mysteries to their parents! The child, as it grows up, is influenced by its surroundings, by the ^{mother} ~~matters~~ and the relatives! But with increasing years it enters upon a larger field of experience. We see, hear and act over again the events of ages far removed in time, the thoughts of people widely separated in space. The world benefits by past experience. The child stands on the shoulders of the parent. "Pygmaei gigantum humeris impositi, plusquam ipsi gigantes vident." "Pigmies standing on the shoulders of giants, see further than the giants themselves!"

II. Man's existence in its present form, i.e. the union of body^{and} soul, ceases in their separation. Hence Death may be properly defined as the removal or separation of one from the other. The body loses its organic life, but as matter remains indestructible. But there are times when the body is at rest, when it does not answer to physical impressions, e.g. in sleep. In this unconscious condition, we are constantly assured that although the body is at rest, the soul continues in all activity. In old age or in sickness, the body becomes weak^{and} declines in strength, but the powers of mind^{and} soul does not. The weakness of one does not imply the weakness of the other. Their relation is not so close that the existence of one means the existence of the other, the death of the body, the death of the soul. Death is but the loosening of a bond of union between body^{and} soul. The body, resolved into its elements, lives on, ^{and} the soul - the higher, superior, nobler entity in man, that entity in which we approach more closely to God, - is it destroyed? No! it lives on,

is immortal. — The soul is not immortal, in that it goes on existing in a changed form, or absorbed in a world-soul. We do not call body immortal although it is not destroyed but rather absorbed in the great world-body, the universal matter. The soul, to be immortal, must not be merged into a universal soul, it must not lose its identity but must retain its individuality.

Freed from mortal needs, from corporeal demands, liberated from the confines of its bodily existence, the soul ought naturally and necessarily to reach a higher existence, toward which, even in this life, it is ever tending. — Its future development is in some wise dependent on the free-willed conscious movement in this world. This constitutes and forms the ground for future reward and future punishment. The law and nature of this cannot be determined, and if they have ever been stated and defined, these teachings must not be considered as the teachings of Judaism, but rather as local and temporary doctrines, i. e. belonging to special times and special circumstances.

III. The arguments ^{and} grounds for belief in a future existence naturally divide themselves into different classes. The usual arguments may be briefly stated as follows:

1.) The universality of this belief, among all nations, in all climes ^{and} in all times, from antiquity to the present modern era. The East Indians have held their belief in Metempsychosis, the Egyptians in Palingenesis, the Greeks ^{and} Romans in the appearance of the departed souls before the judgment seat, ^{and} our American Indians in their Happy Hunting Grounds. The different religious denominations all teach the doctrine of a future life: the Catholics in a Paradise ^{and} Purgatory, ^{and} thus we might continue to enumerate them all. Even the Hindoos, who have long been held up to the world as the solitary exception, have also, it seems, held this same doctrine of immortality. I quote from Max Müller's "Chips from a German Workshop," "the immortality of the soul, as well as the personal immortality ^{and} personal response."

ibility after death, is clearly proclaimed in the *I Ching*. It is usually supposed that they believed in a doctrine of final absorption in an universal spirit. But we see here, by the above quotation, that there is some foundation for a contradiction of the usual statement. - Although, in the writings of Confucius, we find no direct mention of a future state, we also find no word meaning death. Death is also looked upon as a gathering to one's family, a return to one's people. The belief is also implied in the homage paid to their dead.

Whatever the argument of a Universal belief in a future existence is worth, can be more conveniently discussed in another chapter. Notwithstanding the numerous contradictions that this theory has encountered, despite the numerous instances that have been adduced of savage tribes that have no conception of immortality, the fact is now generally accepted that the great majority of nations, both of antiquity and more recent times, believe in a world

to come. The statement that the belief is Universal is received without much contradiction; but the value, that is attached to this fact, varies most wonderfully. The belief may be universal; that is granted. But the origin of this world-wide spread doctrine ^{and} the conclusions drawn therefrom, - these form the subject of much bitter contention.

2.) From the being of God ^{and} his Wisdoms.

Man is so organized as to be capable of the highest development. But he does not attain the full development of his powers on earth. Since an organization, so peculiarly endowed ought to have a definite aim in view, the process of development ought to lead to some final end. But it is apparent to the eyes of all beholders, that man's development must reach completion at some time, if not on earth, then in another world, after this life. If not, then man's being, his creation, his structure ^{and} organization, evidently prepared for such great development, would fail in the purpose for which it was created, ^{and} thus

cast a reproach upon the wisdom of God.

3.) From justice of God.

In this world, the wicked ^{and} unjust often thrive, while the just ^{and} righteous suffer most grievously. Accepting the innateness ^{and} consequent correctness of our moral judgements, it becomes a necessity, in any theory of a God as a Governor of the world ^{and} of men, that the just must be rewarded ^{and} the wicked duly punished. This righteous dispensation of justice, according to our conception, does not meet its fulfillment in this world. Therefore we need a future life ^{and} existence, in which the human souls may be fitly recompensed in strict accordance with their real merits. No veil can screen our actions from God's sight, He is the All-seeing, looking into the heart of man. Accordingly, whatever measure of prosperity ^{and} happiness may be granted to the unrighteous on earth, we have, in the acceptance of God's justice, an assurance that noble, righteous men

will wear the crown of glory in a more widely ruled kingdom. The evident inequalities in the distribution of the bliss^{and} joys of earth would be incompatible with a belief in the justice of God, unless we accepted a future state, promising a future reward^{and} a future punishment.

This argument seems to establish a probability, but once admitting the existence of a Deity,^{and} the consequent predication that he is Just, probability advances to positive certainty. Certainty not as to the truth of the matter, but certainty compelling us to accept the doctrine of Immortality.

In this connection, we might make mention of an objection that is often raised. Are not animals likewise possessed of souls? Do they or do they not attain immortality? Is it not a reproach upon God's wisdom^{and} justice that they do not enter a future life? Having read the previous chapter, the reader is somewhat prepared to face this question. It has been clearly shown that man is superior

to the remainder of the animal kingdom. The resemblances which exist are physical. Animals, though oftentimes possessed of sagacity^{and} shrewdness, can not be said to possess consciousness^{and} free-will. The element of free will is necessary to make animals morally responsible. None but free-willing agents can be held accountable for their deeds. Therefore, since animals are not free-willing agents, they are not responsible for their actions, and the life which is in store for them does not come as reward^{and} punishment for their deeds. The absence of free-will excludes all possibility of judgement. Consequently, unless we are willing to accept the above, ^{and} deny immortality to animals, we are forced to believe that animals, just as men, are possessed of minds, capable of intelligent choice. It is preferable to believe that man alone is possessed of this higher nature, making him a conscious, responsible^{and} free-willing agent, ^{and} as such he alone can enter

351
a future life. - This answers the objection with reference to the justice of the Creator, but there yet remains an objection with reference to the wisdom of God.

Animals as well as men are endowed with certain capabilities. They also are destined to accomplish and work out certain ends. Unless their aims be completed, the animal will have been created in vain. Does not this failure in the attainment of its end reflect upon God's wisdom? - In answer we are told that the animal has no cares; it evinces no regard for the future; it completes its existence at each moment; it possesses no consciousness. This may be a final answer and of sufficient cause to quiet all objections. But it is unsatisfactory to me. It does not reply to the fact that animals possess a certain vital principle, which we are unwilling to admit to be a result of material powers. This life-principle is concomitant with, but not causally dependent on matter. We are forced to grant that all the actions, feelings,

and thoughts of animals (if they have any) are all pre-destined. But this is hardly in accord with experience. And although we do not grant to animals the same degree of free-will, of thought and of action as we do to the human being, many able and unprejudiced thinkers hold that animals are possessed of more than instinct, and assert with much confidence that they feel, love, hate and reason, though in a less degree than man.

4.) From man's being.

Soul must be immortal because nothing can be lost; it does not merge into the world-soul, as matter does into the all-pervading atoms, but being a unit, it must remain a unit and thus retain its individuality. Decay is the law of nature. Plant and animal life seem to pass out of existence. Decay is in progress on all sides. What more natural then, than the expectation that we also shall mingle our remains with the rest? And this conclusion from analogy would be just, were it not

that man is endowed with a double nature, were he not a compound of mind^{ed} and matter. The material portion of our nature changes its form, crumbles into dust. Can we say the same of mind? In what way does mind differ from matter? In what manner does man differ from other forms of life, that he should escape the general law of decay, that he should continue to live on in the hereafter?

I now take the privilege of using a comparison made by Dr Channing:-

A tree grows to a certain height, bears leaves, flowers^{ed} and fruit. Its end is accomplished, its work is done. The leaves, the flowers, the fruit are not the evidences of its future undeveloped activities. (It) Its powers have received their full expression; its principle of life can effect no more. - But when a great intellect accomplishes a great task, or reveals to light some hidden truth, we never feel that this man's life work is ended. We behold

here but the openings for continued advance. The energy of life is not exhausted, but, from the hidden springs, new strength will issue forth and quicken to greater efforts. The tree reaches its perfection when it has born its fruit. Unless this be accomplished, it fails of its purpose. The fruit is its design; this is the tree-perfection. Not so the mind. The mind is great in proportion as it enters upon new fields of labor, in proportion to the exercise of its peculiar origination faculty. The mind collects the experiences, draws its conclusions, and thus explores new realms of thought. Each mind works in its own manner, it assimilates and finally produces its own. Originality is its perfection. The tree is controlled by a rule to give a definite product. The mind is free, uncontrolled: their natures are different and the destruction of the one does not indicate a like fate to the other.

The tree in its growth must be limited, other-

wise its natural increase would cause destruction to other existences. But the mind can grow and produce new fruit in abundance. The supply is not exhausted; other minds are not injured, they are benefitted. New avenues of activity are opened to man. Thus the increase of any special plant, a tree, is injurious, because made at the cost of some other species; but the increase in the growth of the mind is beneficial, because it gives new powers to other minds.

Granting the difference between the nature of mind and matter, between animate and inanimate existences, it is not possible to argue from the one to the other, that the decay of the one is the decay of the other, that the destruction of the material is the destruction of the immaterial. - A difference exists which is made plain when we consider what makes for man's self-consciousness. In what does the element of his personality consist? What marks him as the

distinct individual? Man's sources of happiness are memory and hope. Memory recalls the past, the pleasant associations of by-gone days, the dear companionships, the firm friends of our youth. Hope awaits the future realization of our present aims, the attainment of the highest development of our powers. The greater the improvement of the mind, the more it feels its own great mission in life. The possibilities of our nature are revealed, and the more we shrink from destruction, the more man realizes the capabilities of his powers, if they should reach their fullest development, the more unwilling does he become to believe that this existence can be the end of all, that the powers here in their infancy should attain to no higher state.

The material existences are destroyed by being resolved into their elements. They change their form, and may be used again, remolded into new forms. But should the mind suffer destruction, it

would be no change of form, but an absolute annihilation, unlike any other phenomena in nature, and not in accordance with the general laws of decay.

Mind is a unit in existence; it is an element, we cannot divide it into parts. Its destruction would mean annihilation, because each man has his own peculiar possessions, which cannot be transferred. Each man's feeling, his memory, his affections, his self-control, these are individual possessions: and with the loss of mind would all be lost, irrevocably lost. $\therefore$ In no soul can mind be supposed to correspond to the general law of decay in the Universe. Personality is man's peculiar property; this is his immortal element.

The higher longings of man are not satisfied on earth; in all our investigations, thoughts, actions and desires, we do not reach completion in this life. Therefore we all experience an intense longing for a continuance of existence, for that completed life,

which shall make the arc of this world, the circle of the future. The future life shall be our future sphere of activity. Powers, here undeveloped, shall then reach their highest perfection. Not as a matter of course, but as a direct consequence of all our free-will actions. In this life, all advance, all progress was secured by earnest effort. Thus the future will afford the opportunity for highest development to the best efforts. No sloth, no idleness can be permitted, but vigor and activity will gain the prize in the battle of life.

We have already mentioned several facts in argument against the identity of the position of the human species and of the animal orders with the regard to a hope for immortal life.

It is an argument often used in behalf of the doctrine of a future life, that in man exists a peculiar affection, binding up his life in the lives of his fellow-beings. Love is that bond of union. Love is the power, that so firmly unites man to man, man

to woman^{and} woman to child, that the destiny, which calls the loved one to his last journey, well nigh drags the lover to his final end. Is this love for naught? Is that love mere wasted affection? Is it vain that heart goes out to heart, that all sacrifices are made, sacrifices which exclude any possibility of selfishness? It is not an affection as it exists in animals, which concerns itself solely with the propagation of species. Such love cannot make sacrifices, ^{and} human love brings its daily offerings. In pain, in suffering, in deepest despair, we consign the loved one to his last resting-place. Does the light of love, which, beaming in the soul, has made men better^{and} nobler, meet extinction in the death of this mortal body? What was the object of our love? It surely was not this fragile frame of clay, which now lies rotting in the dust. It was the man, the person, the individual, who inhabited the body. It cannot suffer annihilation; our nature rebels against it. Why should we experience these attachments, why are such feelings placed within man, if the stop-

page of the heart-beat is to sunder the ties of love? No! Love is not an animal affection. It has a divine nature, it links soul to soul, by an invisible bond of union, as firmly as the most distant star is linked to this earth. It is the gravitation force which pervades the Universe, uniting the world's souls with a lasting bond of union^{and} maintaining among them a perfect equilibrium.

From what we have said in this chapter, we can readily see how arguments for future life originate. There are within man, feelings which must find their answer, strivings which must attain their noble aims, longings which do not find on earth that response which their nature demands. The world is full of inconsistencies^{and} inequalities. The unprincipled wicked rule with a high hand, gather in the goods of earthly existence, ^{and} laugh at the down-trodden^{and} despised condition of lowly virtue. Somehow, there is implanted in the human soul the idea of retribution. It seems ingrained in man

that he should possess an inward conviction, that reward and punishment will be meted out, in payment for virtue and vice. But alas, for the virtuous, the rewards are too often confined too strictly to hopes for the future than to actual realizations in this life. This seeming inequality in the goods and ills in life has filled the ranks of agnosticism and atheism, while it has, at the same time, assured others of a future existence.

These two results happen as a consequence of the different points of view. The atheist would urge that God's justice, if it means anything for man, means that virtue is to be rewarded. All distribution of joy and suffering must be controlled by the law of justice. But they argue, since this justice does not evince itself, since the righteous do encounter pain and suffering in this life, without any visible reward, $\therefore$ we argue, there is no such thing as God's justice, or, if there be, it

is of no use because of its inefficiency.

The argument seems strong. The upright, the righteous, the honorable, the noble, do not always gather the largest crop of earthly possessions, worldly honor ^{and} worldly esteem. The most worthy do not always stand foremost in their communities. And yet does not each human being feel that the noble should be rewarded, that the best should rule. That the result is different; do not cast a reproach upon God's justice for not causing the righteous to triumph, but lay the blame where it belongs, at the door of the perverse, the wicked ^{and} unprincipled, who have gained the mastery in this world. It might as well be urged that God is unjust, because there is vice, misery, or wretchedness at all in this world. Let all the monstrosities or abnormities of men stand as a reproach in that they exist at all.

Rather let the inequalities of life lead us to the other position. If the soul ^{and} reason call

aloud for Justice, and it does not come on earth, let us hope that there is a future existence, in which the wrongs of this life may be righted. Let us believe in a final triumph of virtue, in a just retribution to come, if not on earth, then in the life beyond. There is no alternative. The voice of nature cries for justice, the human heart yearns for it.

Whether the appeal remains unanswered, cannot be determined by any means at our command. But it is certainly preferable to hope that the reply will come at some time or other, rather than to deny the Justice of God and even His very existence.

Origin of Soul

There are three views which we may treat in this connection.

1) The Pre-existence of the Soul.

This teaching found its main exponents in Pythagoras, Plato and the Jewish Kabbalists. According to this teaching, the soul was originally a portion of the divine nature, and after death returns to it again.

Plato argues that certain facts in our experience lead to this opinion; e.g. a child learns easily, because it remembers the knowledge of its past existence. Genius, or special talent in one direction, betraying itself in early childhood, shows a previous acquaintance and therefore previous existence. The likes and dislikes which we evince for certain persons at first sight, proves a former meeting. These facts are explainable on different and more reasonable grounds, and it is needless to occupy space with a long discussion on this subject.

This teaching made its first appearance in

Judaism, when Philo, a Platonist, taught that "the space between the earth and the moon was filled with air, and this was the habitation of the soul, before it entered the body." The Rabbis taught that all souls were created on the first day of creation (Ber. Rab. 8). In the Talmud (Midd. 30a) it says, that a child, at birth, is struck on the lip by an angel, and thus forgets its past knowledge. The Kabbalist carried the teaching to the extreme, that each male soul had its corresponding female soul, even before they came on earth.

2) Propagation of the Soul.

According to this opinion, children derive their souls from their parents. But since this view is open to the serious objection, that if souls are capable of generation and propagation, they must possess extension and therefore must be material. This would certainly be out of harmony to the definition of soul as an immaterial substance, exempt from the laws of matter.

3.) Creation of the Soul.

This view seems to us the most reasonable position to take. Whenever a body is born, a soul is created. God creates them and makes them either pure and holy, or impure and sinful. The latter supposition would make God the author of sin, and cannot therefore be accepted.

Let us believe that "the soul is given to man, pure and free from sin." This position is in direct contradiction with the teaching "original sin", for which man could not be held accountable before a just Ruler.

Philo, although accepting the previously mentioned proposition, that the souls were created before the body, held (De Aleg. 708) that the soul is pure and good, before it is joined to the body. The Midrash regarded the soul as "a child of the heavenly paradise."

Those who believed that the souls were pre-existent to this life, express curious reasons why the

souls were sent upon earth. But the general teaching may be stated as follows: - the souls either sinned and were sent into the bodies as a punishment, or they were destined for bodies (yet to be born), from the very beginning of things.

and the Pentateuch concerning the

Christianity has long maintained that it originated and gave full expression to the doctrine of Immortality. This claim has been based on the supposed absence from the Old Testament records of any reference to a future life. In this chapter we intend to speak of the evidences of a belief in a future existence, found in the Pentateuch. As regards the other books of Scripture, we find passages, which, properly translated and interpreted, leave no room for doubt. What we are especially concerned with at present, is the absence of any direct mention of a future life, by the author of the Pentateuch.

Are we to believe that Moses, supposing him to be the author, was ignorant of the Immortality doctrine, or do we wish to believe that, knowing the doctrine, he himself could not accept it and for that reason wilfully and intentionally suppressed it?

It might be well to state in the beginning that the Thorah is not a code of religious beliefs and doctrines. It is a historical work, narrating the history of a

people. True, it is a teacher of religion, but not all the beliefs are expressly stated, nor yet are arguments advanced in favor of special doctrines. Thus we find that the existence of a Creator was assumed. And likewise we find that the distinction between mindnd body, the recognition of a dual nature is implied in Gen. I 26nd 27nd Gen. II 7. Man is created in the image of God, into his nostrils is breathed the breath of life, but his body is formed from the dust. What do these passages mean? Are they intended to express a physical resemblance of man to God? Surely not! the body is formed from the dust, the higher spiritual nature is imaged after God himself.

Mosesnd Israel came from Egyptnd ought to have been acquainted with this doctrine. Even on the supposition that Immortality was a part of the esoteric teaching of the Egyptian priests, we have every reason to believe that Moses was acquainted with all. The question which we are compelled

to answer is this: Why did Moses, knowing this doctrine, suppress it? What could have been a motive for such action? -

1) The aim of Moses was to better the welfare of Israel, to further the personal well-being of his people. His intention was to establish a Hebrew commonwealth. His labor was to legislate for their physical well-being, to concern himself not so much with the individual's spiritual welfare, as with the establishment of a national organization. The commonwealth must be preserved, the government of the nation to be perfected. Such was his main task. Life and Law were to be identified in his work, and the Laws must concern themselves with regulations for right living. This is a physical and earthly matter, not an aim which was to reach its completion in a future life.

2) The Pentateuch, although teaching religion, was essentially a historical work and law book.

But is not the welfare of the nation based upon that of the individual?

It cannot be said that it is doctrinal. All the revelations given in the book are given as a narrative, with the single exception of the Ten Commandments. Thus it seems quite natural that no direct mention of Immortality is found. It has no proper place in an historical law book.

3) Critics have been at great pains, at all convenient opportunities, to show the lack of originality in Moses' writings ^{and} laws. With the intention to detract from his greatness, they assert that he copied this ^{and} copied that, all from the Egyptians. But here, when we come to the question of Immortality, our critics would fain lead us to believe that Moses was not so very Egyptian after all. - Aside from the motives ^{and} prejudices, with which these writers approach a subject of this kind, we readily confess that Moses borrowed much from the Egyptians. But he was not a blind imitator. Discriminations were made, excellent judgment was displayed in retaining here a

little^{and} eliminating something else. In this very case before us, Moses presents to us an example of his use of judgment.

While in Egypt, our lawgiver probably had ample opportunity to observe the inner workings of the Egyptian body of priests. He beheld the vast pomp^{and} ceremonial attendant upon the burial of the dead. He recognized the power of the priest hord over the people. His eyes were not blinded; all lay open^{and} revealed to his sight. The Egyptian priests terrified^{and} held in subjection the ignorant^{and} superstitious people, by a vivid portrayal of the torments after death. The lower classes were maintained in a miserable state of degradation, through the influence of this same priesthood. There was no future to the lower orders to which to look forward. What need for higher aspirations in their life, since all was fore-ordained^{and} pre-destined. - Moses recognized the evil influence, he beheld its gross iniquities, dai-

ly iniquities. What is the result? Instead of imitating, he learned a lesson from Egypt, but finds for his knowledge a different application. - In the new Jewish commonwealth, which he established, he created no new order of priests, endowed with all the power^{and} privileges granted to the Egyptian priesthood. He is no imitator here. An order of priests is established, but instead of being the ruling influence in the state, instead of gaining possession of all property^{and} riches, they are granted support alone from the hands of the people. The kings have been dethroned, ^{and} have become dependents for mere support!

Do the priests still exercise their wondrous ^{and} vicious influence over the minds of the people? Do they yet terrify the ignorant by their pictures of future torments? Have they, in the Hebrew commonwealth, the control of the burial of the dead? Quite the contrary! The priests are prohibited, by special legislation, from

coming into contact with any dead bodies, except in certain privileged cases. The reason seems quite evident. Moses wished to remove this power over the dead ^{and} over the living, from the hands of the priests.

Moses finds his duty in elevating Israel from its degraded state, in instilling nobler aspirations into their hearts. Israel is not divided into castes; a man is not born with so many duties imposed upon him, with his life-work all pre-destined, but is free, unrestrained to follow out the inner ^{and} nobler promptings of his nature. He is no longer deprived of free-will; no longer must he be a tool in the hands of crafty workmen; he is a man, superior to animate ^{and} inanimate existences, in that he possesses free-will, reason, intellect.

The priesthood degraded the people, their teaching of future life was their weapon of attack. Moses wished to elevate the people, therefore

he laid aside the weapon, which had been a threatening influence; he made no mention of a future life. He had good cause to be silent.

No direct mention of Immortality is made in the Prophets, and Phillipson explains this fact as follows: - The Prophets aimed to ground the Laws of Moses more firmly in the hearts of Israel. All heathen nations were in opposition to Israel; their habits, customs^{and} beliefs differed. And thus the Hebrew people were constantly falling away from the true faith, the belief in one God, ever^{and} anon idolatrous worship^{and} heathen customs were introduced. Consequently the Prophets, in their aim to hold Israel in the true^{and} straight path, omitted all mention of Immortality. Heathens^{and} Jews accepted this doctrine, but the Prophets, wishing to maintain Israel as a distinct^{and} separate people, did not make special mention of this doctrine, which both held in common.

In Hagiography, the writers aim to express the

religious feelings, emotions, thoughts ^{and} doctrines of the individuals. And now for the first time, a clear statement is made of a hope for a future life, e.g. Psalm XVI 10: "Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the grave, nor wilt thou suffer thy pious ones to see corruption." Other verses, to which we will refer later on, confirm the fact that in Hagiography the hope for a future existence is plainly stated.

Bible references to Immortality

Several times already, we have had occasion to refer to Gen I 26, 27, 28^{and} Gen. II 7, which prove that the writer of Genesis recognized the two-fold composition of man; viz. man is a compound of body^{and} soul^{and} created in the divine image. The latter does not mean physical resemblance.

Gen. V 22, 23, 24 narrate very briefly an account of the death of Enoch, who walked with God^{and} then was no more, for God took him. This peculiar account of Enoch's life, cannot indicate an ordinary death, but rather that Enoch entered into some closer relation with God. What can it mean but that the righteous man, Enoch, ^{and} the pious Abel, who suffered an early death, did not receive their reward in this life, but in the life hereafter? God's justice is often mentioned in the Pentateuch, ^{and} reward for the righteous is often promised. What then could be the understanding

of these verses, unless those, who missed their earthly rewards, gained a future prize?

Gen. XV 15. Abraham is promised to "come to his fathers in peace" and to be buried at a good old age. - Abraham dies, but is buried far from his native place. At his death, Scripture says that "he was gathered unto his people." In both cases, the actual account of the burial is contained in other verses, showing that these verses here have no reference to the material existence and material body. Abraham was not, in a material sense, gathered to his fathers, for he was buried in the cave of Machpelah, while his fathers remain lay buried in Mesopotamia.

Similarly we read that Jacob is to be gathered to his people (Gen. XLIX 29), and some time after he is buried in the resting place of his fathers. Aaron (Num. XX 24) is promised that he will be "gathered to his people," and is buried on Mt. Hor. Moses (Num. XXXVII 13) is promised that, like his brother

Aaron, he will be "gathered to his people," and yet he does not enter the promised land but dies on Mt. Nebo. The promises made by God, would have remained unfulfilled, if we believe that they indicate a physical reunion in the grave. Aaron and Moses are not interred in the land of their fathers, ∴ therefore these verses can not refer to their actual burying and physical gathering together, but must refer to a spiritual union after death.

Leviticus XX 2, 3, 6, speak the prohibitions and the punishments for those, who make an offering to Moloch, or who seek familiar spirits and wizards. The offenders are to be "stoned with stones," and in addition "God will cut them off from among the people." Can this second part refer to a physical separation from the people? Death by stoning has already been determined upon, and therefore "cutting off" means some separation after death.

In Num. XXIII 10, Balaam says: "Let me die

the death of the righteous and let my last end be like his". - This peculiar remark is taken as a reference to a future life. It cannot be the expression of a hope to die as a righteous man dies. There exists no essential distinction between the deaths of the wicked and the righteous, one may die as quietly and peacefully as the other, therefore its meaning is found in that "the death of the righteous" refers to a future state.

Lev. XIX 31 contains a prohibition regarding connection with wizards, familiar spirits and witches.

I Sam. XXVIII 7 narrates the story of Saul and the Witch of Endor, in which Saul asks to interview the deceased Samuel and his request is granted.

Isaiah VIII 19 also speaks of familiar spirits.

These various references, although they do not show the doctrine of Immortality, at least indicate quite clearly that the people had a belief in a future and continued existence of the soul.

David (2 Sam. XII 23) fasted^d and prayed while his child was sick. When the child died, he ceased praying^d and fasting, rose up, ^date^d and drank. "Can I bring him again? I shall go to him, but he will not return to me," he responded, when reproached by his friends. - What is the meaning here? It cannot mean that David intended to be buried in the same place with his son. This would in no wise allay his grief. And yet David eats^d and drinks. His child is dead, they are separated, but consolation is found in the fact that "David will go to his child" to be united with him in the life immortal.

A number of the Psalms contain verses, which have been made to refer to a future life. But as usual in such cases, so many interpretations are given that it is really impossible to decide which interpretation is correct. The following verses state more clearly a hope

for a future existence: -

Ps. XVI 9-11. - An attempt has been made by modern Christian interpreters to make these verses express a plea for protection from danger. This explanation can be partly accepted and mostly rejected. The last part of vs. 9 "my flesh also shall rest in hope" can mean physical protection. But the 10th vs. says: "thou wilt not leave my soul in the grave". The Hebrew word נַפְשִׁי is used and must here be explained as soul. An additional argument that this verse means a hope for future life is found in the explanation given by early Christian commentators. These always explained this verse to indicate the Resurrection of Christ. This meaning continued till the time of King James, so that we find קַדְשׁוֹ translated "Holy One".

Ps. XVII 15, "I will behold thy face in righteousness when I awake; I shall be satisfied with thy likeness". The awakening means an awakening from death.

Ps. XLIX 15. "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me". The wicked, who escape punishment on earth, will be recompensed in the future, but the righteous, God will take unto himself.

Ps. LXXII treats of the prosperity of the wicked and the adversity of the just, and offers consolation in that "My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever".

Job XIV 14 is often quoted and used in speaking on Immortality. It is probably the most familiar of all quotations on this subject. אם ימות גבר מתיחיה. "If a man die shall he live"? All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Here we behold the suffering Job, recognizing in the midst of dire affliction, the apparent injustice of God. What more striking example of the fate and fortune which often attend the righteous upon earth! Job sees the fault and seeks for the remedy in the hope for a future life, when

man shall live again. Man may suffer in life, but reward must come to the righteous. Therefore Job hopes for existence in a world to come; therefore is he urged to cry out (Job. XIX 25) יָדַעְתִּי כִּי נֹאֲלִי הִי "I know that my redeemer liveth^{and} that he will remain after the dust has disappeared. My body will perish, but I, freed from my body, will see God. I myself shall see him, even after my flesh shall have been consumed.

Ecclesiastes III 17 furnishes us not so much with a verse teaching a belief in Immortality, directly, but one teaching the doctrine of future reward^{and} punishment. The inference lies near. From future reward^{and} punishment to Immortality is not a long journey. The two beliefs have been intimately associated at all times, amongst all nations. Wherever the one has existed, the other has been found. But we need not rely upon this sentence to convince us that the "Preacher" knew^{and} believed in Immortality. No other

interpretation can be made, i.e. justly^{and} impartially made, to that familiar sentence, which occurs in our burial rituals.

Eccl. xii 7 affords a clearly drawn distinction between the body^{and} the soul. The dust shall return to the dust as it was, but the spirit returns unto God, who gave it. The two entities are recognized as distinct existences, joined in life^{and} separated in death.

The body does not perish but is merged^{and} lost in the earth. Does the same fate await the soul? Is it also merged into^{and} lost in the world-soul, in God? Does it lose its identity? Commentators say that the author of Koheleth intended to teach a contrary doctrine. כשחיה "as it was" is used in speaking of the return of the body to the dust whence it came, but the same expression is not found nor yet implied in speaking of the future of the soul. Hence it has been concluded that "the return to God, who gave it" does not mean an absorp-

tion into the Universal spirit, but merely the final summons before the judgment seat of the Most High.

Numerous passages occur, which have been made, by orthodox expounders, the basis for a belief in a bodily resurrection. Isaiah and Ezekiel have both contributed to this class of verses. Thus we find Isaiah xxvi 14-19. These verses do not refer, as has been supposed, to a resurrection of dead bodies. Real corpses are not at all spoken of, but Isaiah is speaking of the State and its fallen condition. The State is the corpse which shall resurrect; the nation has lost its power, it will recover, gain in strength and regain its former prosperous condition.

vs. 19. "Thy dead men shall live, (with) my dead body they shall rise", is figuratively used to indicate the hoped-for renewal of Israel's strength and power, not an actual physical resurrection.

The well-known 37th Chapter of Ezekiel, in which

the prophet is placed in a valley full of bones, and then receives the order to speak to the bones, commanding them to rise, to take on flesh and sinews, is but an enforcement of the above statement. In verses 11-14, the bones are openly declared to mean the house of Israel, which has lost all hope. A new spirit of life must be instilled into these bones; the house of Israel must not give way to despair, but must take on new courage. — The reference is not to dead bodies, neither to those already deceased nor to those about to die. It cannot mean, as some have rather ingeniously suggested, that the dried bones in the valley of death refer to the departed ancestors of the House of Israel. These are to resurrect, to be called back to life, to infuse the strength of new-born courage into the hearts of despairing Israel. Were this the meaning, the verse would not read: "Dried are our bones, and lost is our hope, and we are lost." Ezekiel wishes to strengthen his people

with the hope of a return to Palestine. He predicts the return from captivity^{and} restoration of the Jewish state.

This best interpretation seems to be that these verses have, a historical meaning. No real resurrection is intended; the allusions are purely historical. We have before us a figurative expression of Israel's present forlorn condition, the prediction of its restoration to influence^{and} rule. But now arises an argument, to which, in reality, I cannot find a sufficient answer. Is not the frequent use of this figure of resurrection an indication that the belief was common in those days? Would the Prophets have made use of an illustration which was foreign^{and} unknown to the people? Would an illustration, that carried with it no probability, give weight to the hopes, which the Prophets meant to awaken? — Phillipson says that if this belief were common, the effect would have been diminished^{and} therefore the contrary must be supposed. Some basis is found for this opinion, in the

3rd verse of this chapter: "And God said unto me, 'Son of man, can these bones live?'; and I answered, 'O Lord, God! thou alone knowest.'" It is exceedingly doubtful whether Ezekiel would have made such a statement, if the belief in resurrection had been common.

But the other part of this answer, that if the belief were general, the illustration would lose its force, seems to me to be out of harmony with our experience. Pulpit-preachers and speakers in general have made effective use of homely illustrations, well known to everybody. This very familiarity, the truth of the illustrations has added strength to the argument, and implied, by analogy, the truth of the object thus illustrated. Thus here, if the people in general accepted the doctrine of resurrection, they would the more readily believe that the House of Israel would come back to its former power, since it was like the body, which they believed would return to life again.

Thus a similar passage occurs in Daniel XII. This has also been taken as a direct reference to bodily resurrection. There is not much doubt but that here the real meaning is historical, and yet, since use is made of this same comparison to the resurrection of the dead, it is questionable, to my mind at least, whether it does imply that the belief was generally accepted.

The historical allusion is to the Syrian oppression, which is now to be resisted and overcome by the Maccabean heroes. The most important verse in this passage is XII 2: "And the multitude of them, that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to enduring shame and contempt."

Post-biblical.

From the closing words of the preceding chapter, it appears doubtful whether or no the Hebrew people, at the time of the Prophets, believed in a bodily resurrection. But in the ages following, the belief developed itself and no doubt of its existence remains. The influence of foreign thought becomes evident, and therefore it may be urged that this doctrine first found clear expression in Hebrew writings, after the Babylonian captivity. We know, as mentioned above, that Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel referred to resurrection and used this idea as a picture of the renewed birth of the nation. At this time, Israel has sufficient opportunity and sufficient cause to meditate upon God's commands and man's required obedience. Necessarily there followed ideas of reward and punishment to be meted out now, or if not now, when? Messianic expectations were rife, and along with this hope for a Messiah, came the longing for the universal awakening of the dead, a

rejuvenation of earth, the long-sought millenium. It was indeed exceedingly natural that the minds of the people confined their hopes for happiness, to an existence on Mother Earth. It was more easy to repopulate the earth, ^{and} to make our mundane home the scene of heavenly pleasures, than it was to imagine an existence in which the mind was freed from the body, ^{and} elevated above the need or desire for sensual pleasures. The future was not as yet mind freed from the wants of the body, but rather mind freed from the ills of the body, in a life on a beautified earth.

The various opinions entertained with regard to this subject, formed one of the main points of difference, distinguishing the various sects.

The Pharisees insisted upon a literal interpretation of Scripture, while the Sadducees ^{and} Essenes did not.

The Pharisees believed in the Immortality of the soul, also in a future reward ^{and} punishment.

The Sadducees believed in Immortality, but perhaps ² *see Jos. Antiq. lib. 18, 1, 3.*

denied resurrection. Josephus is the authority on this question^{and} he is not explicit. G. Brecher surmises that this sect must have been misrepresented by their opponents,^{and} that in reality they did not deny resurrection; "because," says this author, "they were Jews^{and} could not cut themselves off from their religion."

The Essenes believed that "the body perishes, but the soul is immortal." The body is the prison of the soul, which, when released, if wicked, suffers hell-torments, but if righteous lives in a beautiful, pleasant country, fanned by the gentle zephyrs."

In the Apocryphal writings, we find, in a number of places, direct mention of a belief in Immortality. A passage in Ben Sirach XVII 30 says, "Not everything can be in man, because man is not immortal." - This passage, so plain^{and} outspoken, shows that Immortality was, at that time, not an essential doctrine in Judaism. This fact, if it were so, would remove G. Brecher's objection.

against the opinion above expressed, that the Sadducees did not accept resurrection. This quotation would seem to exclude even Immortality, and resurrection was necessarily less esteemed.

Nevertheless, this denial of Resurrection ^{and} Immortality did not find a place in all the Apocryphal works; e. g. the Book of Wisdom sets forth the two-fold nature of man. The body is regarded as a hindrance to the soul, ^{and} only after death can the soul attain its fullest completion. Thus we read, III 2-5, "Man appears in the eyes of those who possess knowledge to die, ^{and} death is regarded as a misfortune, ^{and} their departure a destruction; but no, they are at rest in peace."

This Apocryphal work thus presents the higher idea of a future existence, viz. that the soul will continue as an individual existence.

The book of Tobith expresses a similar hope III 6, "Do unto me according to thy will, com-

mand that my spirit be taken up; that I die and become earth, for it is better for me to die."

But the 2nd book of the Maccabees is most replete with direct references to this question. Among the verses, we find VI 26, VII 9, 11, 14, 23, 29.

In VII 9, we have the familiar story of the seven brothers, whom Antiochus Epiphanes wished to convert from Judaism. The brothers could not be persuaded nor frightened into a desertion of their ancestral faith. This verse occurs, "Thou like a fury takest us out of this present life, but the King of the World shall raise us up, who have died, unto everlasting life."

- Later, in XII 43-45, we read the account of Juda Maccabeus bringing an offering to Jerusalem, in behalf of his fallen comrades. This sacrifice is a sin-offering for the slain and would certainly be meaningless and useless, unless he believed in their resurrection. Later on Onias is represented as appearing to Juda in a dream,

in his capacity as a priest, even as in life.

Having Josephus, the renowned historian in a speech addressed to his soldiers to restrain them from committing suicide, outlined the relation of the soul to God. "Our bodies, 'tis true, are mortal and constructed from perishable materials, but a portion of the Divine nature, an immortal soul, resides in the body" (Wars of Jews Bk. vi. ch. 8). In this connection, the punishment which awaits suicides, as the reward of the righteous is stated. - Thus, the belief of this period can be concisely stated as follows:-

- 1.) The souls live after death, the just in happiness and the unjust in torment and punishment.
- 2.) The souls of the just inhabit their former bodies and lead a happy life.

Philo, the philosopher of this age, makes the life of the righteous in this world, their immediate reward, and thus also the unrighteous receive their due punishment on this earth. The fol-

following quotation expresses this idea: "The wicked, even if they reach old age, are dead because they do not live justly, but the just attain immortality, and live eternally, even though the body perish."

Man, by self-purification by righteous living, by earnest meditation can approach nearer in his relation to the Almighty. Thus God rewards man even on earth, while the wicked continually suffer the pangs of separation from God's bounty and love, suffer in their non-communion with God. Man's relation to his Maker is his reward and punishment.

It has already been stated in a preceding chapter, that Philo, like Plato, taught the doctrine of a pre-existence of the soul, and also a soul-migration. He imagined that the souls existed between the moon and the earth, and that, experiencing a longing to enter the body, or, perhaps, merely desiring a change, they were sent into human bodies, to inhabit them, and

til death, and then to return again to their former state. That Philo believed in a pre-existence of the soul affords sufficient evidence that he believed in Immortality. Many have concluded, from statements found in his writings, that he denied a future life. The theory, which he taught, that man was rewarded and punished here on earth, would seem to be a contradiction of any future reward and punishment. But when we see that he was Platonist enough to accept the pre-existence of the soul, we can readily believe that he followed the natural inference and accepted a future existence. Especially is this true, when we consider that Plato used this pre-existence of the soul as an argument for its continued life after death.

The Rabbinical Age.

In the time covered by the Talmudic literature, we find that the belief in Immortality has developed itself more and more. It has received increased attention. Israel was oppressed. Misfortune overwhelmed them. Their earthly lot was exceedingly bitter. Necessarily therefore the Rabbins laid more stress upon this teaching, and enforced with much earnestness the doctrine of future recompense, of a continued existence of the soul and of the resurrection of the body. By some, the soul was supposed to have had a former existence, to have been created at the very beginning; e.g. "God took counsel with the souls of the righteous, whether he should create the world". (Ber. Rabba Sect. 8.) Man's resemblance to God was in his possession of a soul. Thus, in Berach. 10a, - "As God fills the entire Universe, the soul fills the entire human body. As God sees everything without being seen, thus the soul sees. As God nourishes"

us, thus the soul nourishes the body. As God is pure, so must the soul be pure. As God reigns in secret, thus the soul also reigns."

We find, scattered throughout the Rabbinical literature, opinions concerning the nature of the soul, the hope for Immortality, the relation of man's life to his future welfare, &c., &c.

Thus, in the Ethics of the Fathers IV, occurs a passage teaching, that man's conduct in this life must be so regulated as to merit future welfare. "This world is an ante-chamber. Prepare thyself in this ante-chamber, in order that thou mayest enter the palace beyond."

Resurrection is taught (San. 90b). The world to come is a world of justice. The power and the honor of God demand that the evil-doers be punished. Otherwise the wicked, who despise virtue, who scorn righteous action, would seem to triumph over God, in that they die prosperous, and the end of life seems the end of all. Therefore a future

world for the rendering of justice is necessary. (Aboth IV 23). — "This life is a pilgrimage ^{and} this world is comparable to an inn, which is a stopping-place while we are on a journey, but the world beyond is the real home." (Moed Katan 9b).

Various opinions were entertained as to the nature of the future life. We know that amongst other nations the desired ^{and} unattained pleasures of earth, were granted in Paradise. Thus Berach 67a says: "In the future world there shall be no eating nor drinking nor any sensual pleasures, but the pious shall sit, adorned with crowns ^{and} delighting themselves with the presence of God." While another authority maintained that the hereafter was a continuation of this life (Moed Katan 29a). "The pious have no rest beyond, they pass from one effort to another"; i. e. the hereafter is not a place of idleness, but the soul goes on in its development, to reach its fullest completion.

Yebam. 63b again, teaches the pre-existence of

the souls, all being assembled at one place, the Guf having been created on the first day of creation.

Jehuda HaNassi taught that the soul was given to man at birth. But this was corrected by the Rabbins, who said that the soul is given to man at the beginning of his inception. (San. 9b). Plato's idea that the soul had previous knowledge because of former experience, is also referred to, but the child loses this knowledge at birth.

The possibility of repentance is much enlarged upon. After the deeds of the wicked have been duly weighed in the scale of justice and he is punished (it cannot be for everlasting but only for several generations), if he truly repent, he will be freed from suffering. - Repentance is easy, according to Midrash Koheleth, which separates the regions of good and evil by two fingers' breadth, so that the transition from evil to good, from Gehenna to Paradise, is easy for the repentant sinner. Thus, the Midrash to Ps. 26 says: "If a man has ten sins

and ten righteous acts, they do not balance each other, but first he is punished ^{and} then he is rewarded." (Ecc. 106) "The babe has a portion in the future world."

The Jews did not teach eternal punishment, as is evident in the above quotations, nor did they hope an exclusive occupation of the future heaven. "The righteous of all nations ^{and} religions can attain immortality." "Righteous heathens may enjoy a future life." If a heathen observe the laws, concerning which Scripture says, "the laws which man must obey, that he may live." This is in strange contrast to the Christian dogma, that none shall be saved except those who accept Christ. The spirit of tolerance ^{and} true tolerance has here found a higher expression than in much-vaunted Christianity. Righteousness ^{and} right living are the requirements for admission to Paradise, not a belief in any special dogma, creed, or religion. Deed ^{and} not creed is the true talisman for future bliss.

Post talmudical Age:

After the close of the Talmud period, two schools of learned men existed, both seeking a basis for their teaching in the Talmud, but differing very widely from each other. These two schools were the Kabbalists and the Philosophers.

The philosophers followed Aristotle with regard to the nature of the soul. Soul is a substance separate from the body, and yet it is the life-principle. The matter (חומר), making up the body, has the potentiality of life; when united with the form (צורה), it comes into actuality.

Man and animal are alike in some respects. Both possess sensation (נפש חיונית) and the need for nourishment (נפש הדמויות), but the power of understanding (נפש השכלות) is distinctly human. This last does not exist in man at birth, but comes to him from without. It is an emanation from God, which is breathed into man and is immortal.

Isayah Hagadol.

The misfortunes and joys of life are mingled.

Life does not reach its highest expression in this world but needs the hereafter. God, in his wisdom, has set the goal of the soul's existence beyond the reach of attainment on earth. The soul has knowledge of its future state, otherwise it would attain happiness in earth's highest bliss, and then rest satisfied. Reason demands a future reward, because vice prospers in this world, and may not be punished at all. Men triumph over their evil natures and avoid the doing of vice, and perhaps suffer in consequence. Therefore justice demands that there be a future world.

It might be well to state that the apparent prosperity of the wicked is not real prosperity and real happiness. The wicked, whenever they experience the pangs of remorse, suffer the punishment of their wickedness. This is the deepest and most lasting pain. Each man becomes thus his own judge and executioner. The greatest happiness is not the possession of worldly goods, the esteem

of our fellow-beings, but rather the self-consciousness and recognition of right action.

Judah Halevi.

Soul is distinct from the body. It is not material, nor is it an accident of the body. It is a form of a body and is indivisible. It is a self-dependent, angel-like, god-like being. It differs from the material body, in that the bodily powers are weakened by too strong impressions, while the mind remains unaffected. Thus, a brilliant light injures the eye, a too loud sound affects the ear. The bodily organs lose in power while the mind is strengthened. Thus, in age the physical power decreases, whilst the soul continually gains in fulness of power. The body is thus in reality a hindrance to the soul in the correct apprehension of ideas; therefore the soul will see with utmost clearness and correctness, when freed from the body.

Isaac Arama openly avowed the Alex-

andrian doctrine. According to him, the soul is a power, which can be developed by moral^{and} intellectual advance. Thus evolution continues until it reaches its highest perfection in God.

Albo teaches substantially the same. But both retain the religious element^{and} give it to its proper sphere of influence, while Alexander does not. Albo defines the soul, as "a spiritual^{and} self-existent being, capable of comprehending God's will." "Increase of the recognition of God with tendency to worship him is an approach to the threshold of the future world." Reward^{and} punishment is received, part in this world, part in the next. The righteous resurrect^{and} then die again, to live on eternally. Many have doubted concerning Albo's teaching on Immortality, but since the Talmudic tradition was considered, even by the philosophers, as divine, they could not deny resurrection, reward^{and} punishment, ^{and} Immortality. Albo includes future reward and punishment in his art-

icles of faith, therefore we can ascribe to him a belief in Immortality.

Moses Maimonides followed the Alexandrian teaching on this subject. He did not state that he accepted this teaching, but what he says concerning the soul, resembles the doctrine as taught by Alexander. The soul is not composed of elements, and therefore cannot be divided. It is not dependent on a body nor on life, but on God alone. Matter and form are inseparable, except to the understanding, which is peculiarly human: this marks man's likeness to God. Maimonides makes a four-fold classification (Moreh II 54) in which he makes plain what man has in common with the animal and in what he is superior. The one distinctively human characteristic is man's knowledge of God. This is the highest human perfection possible. But to know God is not sufficient. It is our duty to learn His qualities and to imitate them, and so to reach the utmost perfection, the

perfection of God.

The soul is a unity^{and} is surrounded by the five senses. These corporeal senses aid the soul in receiving impressions^{and} in gaining intelligent comprehension. The ideas which we form continue to exist, even after the objects, whence they were derived, have perished. This power in man distinguishes him from all other existent beings. This quality in him makes his Immortality.

The Jewish philosophers, believing that the future existence of the soul depended on obedience to God's laws, agreed in saying that the soul was preserved, retaining its recollection of earthly doings^{and} maintaining throughout, its individuality^{and} personality. On the other hand, the Kabbalists believed in a future life that smacked much of earth. The common presentation was that, in the future world, all man's wants would be supplied, his happiness perfected,^{and} all earthly aims, passions^{and} longings merely find a more

complete realization. The future was a better state of the present. But Maimonides says this teaching is not to be accepted literally. It was necessary to lead on the uneducated multitude, by such concrete pictures. "Just as we induce a child to study by the promise of some dainty, as we encourage the higher student by a hope for honors, thus here promises are made, which become motives for goodness and right living; - Although virtue is, and ought to be, its own reward, nevertheless such a promise is allowable, because not all people can comprehend and act in accordance with the higher conception.

Menasse ben Israel supported all the traditions and Kabbalistic teachings, and also gathered the philosophical opinions on this subject, in his work נשמת חיים and in De resurrectione mortuorum.

The arguments, which he offers, are the following. -
1. - The power of the soul is not weakened in old age nor in

severe illness, although the body loses its strength.

2.- The soul comprehends the nature ^{and} the movements of heavenly bodies ^{and} is therefore superior to them.

3.- Man has free will. He has remorse, withstands temptation, offers life in behalf of higher duty.

4.- No earthly happiness stills the longing after Immortality. Only man seeks to perpetuate his name in the world.

5.- Justice of God demands reward in future, since due reward ^{and} punishment are not granted in this world.

6.- Universality of belief in this doctrine is an indication of its innate nature; therefore it is like an axiom.

Moses Mendelssohn, in his *Phädon*, takes Plato's *Phaedo* as a basis. He adds to Plato's argument the ontological proof from the unity of the soul, which cannot perish. - "Soul is immortal, because it cannot pass from being into non-existence, since the destruction of the existent is impossible." "The soul being simple, after death

is not resolved into parts, but continues to perceive, to think ^{and} to will."

The soul is not in dependence upon the body, as is shown by our possession of intellect; nor does it exist in each separate organ, for then they would remain separate, ^{and} no ideas, as we possess them, could be formed.

Mendelssohn uses the familiar argument from God's Justice ^{and} Omniscience. This world cannot be the fullest completion of man's powers ^{and} hopes, because justice ^{and} morality would then have no basis, therefore we must not deny Immortality.

The soul fulfills the purpose of creation. This fulfillment is impossible on earth; therefore must be attained in a future state. Morality ^{and} duty are in contradiction, if there be no hereafter.

Vice must be punished, ^{and} righteousness, which suffers in the performance of duty, must be recompensed. Further, the attributes of God, His Goodness, His Justice, His Wisdom, demand a continued existence.

Grounds for a belief in Immortality.

William Alger, in his book, *The Destiny of the Soul*, says that a belief in a future state originated by means of feeling, imagination, faith and reflection. In this chapter, I retain and follow out the classification and the arguments, as presented by this well-known authority. A few additions, gleaned from other sources, have been added: -

- 1.- Man loved life, not because it was pleasant, but because he had the self-consciousness of a mastery over nature, and then could not endure the thought of destruction.
- 2.- Not wishing to encounter dissolution, man looked about him, to behold in nature, parallel phenomena of death and subsequent rejuvenation. Such phenomena were at hand in great abundance. The chill of winter binds the earth in its grasp of death. Vegetation and plant life apparently succumb to the relentless destroyer. But the icy mantle is soon laid aside, the seeds show signs of life and presently the earth is covered with glorious green. All nature,

apparently already dead, resurrects to a new life of freshness ^{and} warmth.

Thus also animate existence furnishes with illustrations of a change from a lower to a higher state of existence, which seems at first to be death ^{and} a resurrection into life. - The silk-worm apparently dies, in that it passes out from its present state of existence. But there is no death, but a change; a change from the crawling silk-worm into an acknowledged state, the flying moth. - In a similar manner, the disagreeable caterpillar is converted into a gay ^{and} brilliant butter-fly.

3. - The belief is accepted on the authority of religious teachers. Wherever in the world's history, with the single exception, perhaps, of Judaism, an organized priesthood has existed, this belief has been insisted upon ^{and} promulgated, ^{and} used as a power over the ignorant ^{and} confiding multitude.

4. - Reason has given argument for the support of this doctrine. These arguments are divided into five classes: -

I. Physiological.

1. - The human physiological organization was materialized ^{and} developed by means of a superior internal force, which we call the soul.

2. - The distinction between the soul ^{and} the body is inevitable. "Man dwells in flesh, but is not flesh". We use our material body, but are distinct from it. Thus we find a man willing to raise his limb, but unable to lift, because the muscles are paralyzed. The soul evidently remains unaffected by this paralysis, but the muscles cannot obey the soul's command.

3. - Death brings to us the consideration, "has everything perished when the body is laid to rest. Is this lifeless clay the end of all?" "A moment ago that hand was uplifted to clasp yours, intelligent accents were vocal on those lips, the light of love beamed in that eye. - One shuddering sigh - ^{and} how cold, vacant, forceless, dead, lies the heap of clay!" - What more natural than to believe that an animating principle has been liberated, that an energizing force has fled?

82.

That which has gone may still exist, at least
no proofs to the contrary are known.

II. Analogical.

1. - From happenings in nature, as e.g. the caterpillar into the butterfly.

2. - Death is only change, not destruction. Matter is indestructible; why should this higher form of existence be an exception and suffer annihilation?

3. - An ascending series exists in nature, from brutal to mental, from physical to spiritual, and thus - from earthly life, to a better and higher state of being.

4. - Our birth does not suggest this life. The child, in its embryonic state, dependent for support upon its blood-supply from the mother, does not foretell a life like this, but rather suggests a death, since the means of support, the connection with the mother, is broken.

How similar is the position and the various circumstances in these two cases. Everything to the seeing eye suggests death. The child living in the mother's womb, and man living in the body.

Separation would seem to indicate death. And, indeed, did we not behold the contrary, we could readily imagine our sceptics, looking upon this child existence, predicting its final death when it passes out from its present life. We can hear them arguing with the same certainty, that there is no possibility, much less a probability, of any future state; and yet the child lives! - The unborn child, in the womb of its mother, no doubt clings to its present abode with great tenacity, it leaves its congenial surroundings with much reluctance. Here its food is supplied without effort, everything is arranged in harmony with its wants. Separation from this home of its infancy would be death indeed. And yet, the child is born out into a second life, removed from its narrow sphere, freed from its former incumbrances and enveloping membranes. In the same manner, our life on earth has many joys, we dread the parting, but here again we cast away

present incumbrances, and the body which contains our soul, and yet we pass to a higher life. Why may we not say with Joseph Cook - "It is no more wonderful to live again than to have lived at all; to continue to live is less wonderful than to begin to live, and even the most determined sceptic knows that we have begun."

5. - The soul existed perhaps, before, as Plato, Pythagoras, Philo, Wordsworth and other intelligent minds have thought, urged on by strange fancies and "shadowy recollections" of some past experiences.

6. - On the supposition that a Deity did not exist, the same combination of forces, which made this life possible, renders a future existence also possible.

III. Psychological.

1. - If soul be immaterial, it is incapable of dissolution, and is therefore immortal.

2. - If a soul be material, but be a unit, it is equally immortal, since an element cannot meet destruction.

3. - Psychologists have often noted the fact, that we cannot negate self, that we cannot conceive ourselves

as non-existent. True, this incapacity on our part does not stand as an argument for a corresponding inability in nature. This would be the old error, that that must actually be true of which we cannot prove the contrary. This argument from the side of inconceivability is utterly valueless, as a proof whether a future state does or does not exist. This much is established, that in no wise can the destruction of our conscious forces be established. Our present life is a correlation of our personal force^{and} the physical body. The cessation of the correlation does not necessarily imply the cessation of the personal force.

It cannot be established by arguments which can convince^{and} remain binding. Probability, a preferableness in doctrine, can be attained, but positive certainty, never, unless our present means of knowledge are vastly enlarged. Each person experiences for himself the immortal part of life, ^{and} then he can cling more firmly to the belief.

It is preferable, therefore, to use the above argument, from the incapacity in our nature to consider ourselves as now-existent, in the way in which Rev. Browne of Boston has used it. Let the persons, who would teach annihilation, destruction, and therefore would deny Immortality, let them put this doctrine into their lives and regulate their feelings and family relations with this fact in view. The consequent coldness, bleakness and barrenness of life will be apparent. The loss of all beauty in the world, the lack of all nobility in our aims, the chill of our ardor and zeal, will at least, if it does not make for Immortality, create in us a longing for a future state.

4. - The fact of dreams betrays to us this same distinction between body and soul. While the body is asleep and in a condition resembling death, i. e. as regards the impressions from the outer world, the soul continues active. Thus the separation, which to some seems to

predict annihilation after death, is practically often effected in life. The soul is freed from the body and soars aloft into a spirit land. This separation is quite frequent in dreams, in certain diseases and in concentration of the mind. This last fact is worthy of consideration, since we have the power, even in our waking condition, to lose ourselves in the mind, to concentrate all the brain faculties, so that we actually become unconscious of physical pain and physical suffering.

IV. Theological.

1.- If the existence of a Deity is granted, and His attributes, as usually ascribed, are accepted, Immortality must be accepted. For, whatever purpose we were created, for that same end must we continue in being, or we are compelled to ascribe to God, fickleness in his aims, instead of eternity in his purpose.

2.- If a single conscious being suffers destruction,

God's creation would be in vain, ^{and} this cannot be.

3. - Infinite wisdom conforms powers to their ends. Thus our faculties would not be so great, so capable of higher ^{and} nobler ends, were our fate so humble. Such great longings ^{and} desires would not have animate spirits destined to annihilation.

4. - The benevolence of our Creator would not permit a multitude of human souls, which have been initiated into the happiness of the world, into the bliss of life, to be doomed to the darkness ^{and} night of an unhappy destruction.

5. - The justice of God demands a future state to compensate for the inequalities in this life.

V. Moral.

1. - The incompleteness of our powers during life.
2. - Premature mortality, i.e. men die before their purpose in life is worked out.
3. - Man possesses a consciousness, ^{and} by its possession secures for himself heavenly bliss, even:

in the face of disaster. He is confident of a future reward, ^{and}, by the approval of his inward monitor is sustained throughout in his strict adherence to duty.

4.- The world is constructed ^{and} governed on a wise ^{and} just principle. Everything is intended for the best. The result of apparent evil must be good; therefore, were there no future state, Death, which is the destruction of our powers, would become a good, instead of an evident evil.

5.- Endless progress is possible to the soul, without any renewal of its powers. We do not see its limit. Each advance prepares for another onward step. Thus bodily death is the defect in the mechanism, but does not exist in the animating spirit.

6.- Life here is an evolution of our powers, preparatory to our future state.

7.- "The more one lives for Immortality, the more he assimilates the immortal things into his spiritual substance."

8. - The belief in a future existence is Universal and this has long been held and as long opposed, as an argument that this belief is innate in man. Since it is innate in man, it must be an offspring from the Divine intelligence, and necessarily true.

9. This doctrine has been accepted and urged by authority. This authority is of two kinds, human and divine. The human approval has been found in the acceptance of this doctrine, even from the earliest ages, not only by the ignorant and unthinking multitude, but also by the most eminent thinkers the world has seen. Preachers, teachers, philosophers and scientists, of all ages and countries, have expressed their conviction in the hereafter. Exceptions have existed and do exist, but the large majority of the great minds of the world have lived in expectation of a life to come.

Divine authority is gained from God by means

of Revelation. To those who accept revelation, this authority affords positive proof and no additional arguments are necessary.

10.- A belief in a continuence of a soul-life and in a future dispensation of justice are a necessity in governing the world. Ethical right and wrong would lose all right to exist and would be transformed into worldly prudence and imprudence. The influence of this belief is such, that no nation has survived the loss of its religion. Man's social relation is preserved by this feeling of being held accountable to an unseen power. There is a necessity for a final right and wrong, independent of man's changing will. This doctrine is of advantage to men. It is a necessity to render this life a world of justice. Hence it follows if there be no future life, that which does not exist would be of indefinite value to man, and is "essential to his well-being" here on earth. Let us say with Lotze, "That

will last forever, which on account of its excellence ^{and} spirit, must be an abiding part of the order of the Universe." Or, as Emerson has said, "What is excellent, as God lives, is permanent. Hearts are dust, hearts' loves remain, hearts' love shall need thee again."

There are still other arguments which are used, ^{and} which I will now recount in as orderly a manner as possible:-

In each individual there exists a longing for Immortality. This is supposed to be a natural instinct, existing in all men from their very birth. It does derive its origin from argument or reasoning ^{and} yet it is universal. Being an instinct, like all other instincts, it ought to have a corresponding answer provided for it. Provision is made by nature for all natural desires, therefore we can ask with justice, why should this universal desire on the part of man not be gratified ^{and} meet its provision?

'Wings are eager for flight^{and} are made for flight, eyes long for fuller vision^{and} are made for fuller vision, thus God would have made our human souls in vain, unless their longing for fuller life should have their higher sphere of action.'

The body^{and} the soul, although united^{and} independent in life, yet are not exact correlatives. Their strength^{and} weakness do not always correspond. The body grows weaker^{and} weaker with advancing years, while the soul expands the more^{and} more. It is released from bodily cares and as often happens, physically inferior persons are superior mentally. The decrease in the bodily strength is often accompanied by an increased perceptive power. These oft-experienced facts must put an everlasting quietus upon those supposed rationalists, who make the soul a mere result of the body.

When death comes, it need not bring destruction to body^{and} soul. Their union is not so close!

Even in the material world, the forms^{and} the structures are destroyed, while the matter itself remains. That disappears, which was the resultant of the arrangements of the particles; e.g. a statue as a statue and a work of art exists only as long as it retains its present form. When the form changes, the statue as such perishes, but as matter, remains indestructible. Thus the painting, the result of the canvas, the oil^{and} the painter's art, ceases to exist, when its present arrangement of landscape or life figures is changed. When torn in pieces, it is no longer the masterpiece of a master hand. It loses its character as a painting^{and} becomes mere canvas^{and} oil. The change of form^{and} structure has destroyed the work of art, but the matter remains^{and} is indestructible. "What existed as a collocation of parts has perished, but that which had existence independently of the act of nature^{and} of man, is not deprived of it by

the violent force, which has undone the work in ^{and} upon its substance." Therefore, since the soul has an independent ^{and} separate existence, the mere destruction of the body ^{and} the removal from the soul, does not destroy the latter. Its existence is not dependent upon its inhabiting some body. The human soul is a higher power, superior to the more sensory powers. These are limited to the perception of the material phenomena, but the human intelligence, by its superior faculties, apprehends higher ^{and} immaterial ^{and} spiritual phenomena ^{and} truths. It ought, therefore, to be spiritual itself.

The physicists ^{and} scientists are very ready to place but little faith in a life hereafter. And yet they teach that matter is indestructible, that nothing is lost, that force is eternal. The soul exercises itself continually as a moral ^{and} intellectual force, ^{and} must therefore continue to exist. Its existence cannot be doubted any

more than light and heat and their various manifestations. We believe in an undulatory theory of light. Not because as physicists, we can grapple with it in a material sense. We come in contact with the phenomena of light. These we can best explain upon a supposition of this theory. Likewise here the phenomena of life, that soul and body are not inseparable, that the strength or weakness of the one does not indicate the strength or weakness of the other, that the mental and psychical rules over the bodily and physical, gives to us a basis for a similar belief in a soul-force, which, once existing, like all other forces, must continue to exist in all eternity.

The intellectual and moral powers grow up, bear leaves and blossom, but no fruit appears. But nature does not labor in vain, and since earth afforded the soil in which the tree was planted, and the tree grew up and bore no fruit, it is to

be hoped that the life hereafter will furnish the clime in which, after transplantation, the tree of our higher faculties may grow to its fullest height and bear the most wondrous fruit.

Arguments against Immortality.

Mr. John S. Mill, in an essay on Immortality, a quite clear exposition of the usual arguments against Immortality. This chapter contains three arguments and whatever else of value that has been found in my investigations.

Mr. Mill says, "Science can bring no evidence against Immortality of the soul, but that negative evidence, which consists in the absence of evidence in its favor." And even this negative evidence is not of the same strength that negative testimony often is; e.g. in the case of witchcraft, this negative evidence, - i.e. the existence of no proof capable of standing a fair test, amounts in value to the strongest evidence. Witchcraft manifests its power on earth² therefore the absence of evidence in its favor, amounts to its disproof. But with regard to Immortality, the case is different. We know, as we know in the case of witchcraft, that the soul does not

continue to exist on earth, nor does it manifest itself by interferences in worldly and human affairs. "But that it does not exist elsewhere, there is absolutely no proof." A statement like the last, coming from so renowned and so just a thinker as Mr. Mills, ought to condemn to everlasting silence those fanatical apostles of unbelief, who scoff at and ridicule the idea of a future existence.

In trying to prove a world to come, we ought to be continually mindful of the fact, that the doubters are such with whom a number of the arguments would carry no weight. Materialists and sceptics generally will not accept the statement that the soul is a substance per se, but would rather regard it "as a bundle of attributes, feeling, thinking, reasoning, willing and the like; and these attributes they regard as a consequence of the bodily organization, which therefore they argue it is as

unreasonable to suppose surviving, when that organization is dispersed, as to suppose the colored odor of a rose remaining, when the rose itself has perished." In answer to this we would be compelled to prove that the attributes in question are not the attributes of the body but of a separate substance. Here the evidence is not conclusive either way.

But we do know that "all thought^{and} all feeling has some action of the bodily organism for its immediate antecedent or accompaniment." Certainly we have nothing but negative evidence that mental consciousness ceases when the functions of the brain are at an end; while we have this positive evidence that diseases of the brain,^{and} decay^{and} weakness of the brain enfeeble mental functions. Thus we may affirm "that in our present state of existence, cerebral action is, if not the cause, at least a condition sine qua non of mental operi."

ations". Thus the soul, by death, instead of being released from shackles and an earthly prison, is simply remanded into a state of unconsciousness, unless some other condition intervene, of which we at least have no experience.

Materialistic thinkers would do well to remember that the argument of inconceivability, or of the sheer impossibility of a future existence is of no value whatever. Anything is possible! Nothing is conceivable! Because states of consciousness have always been in our experience accompanied by cerebral action, is no reason for denying the possibility of mental activity without the movements of brain particles. Inconceivability is no argument. But in any special case, whether something did or did not occur, is purely a question of evidence, and must be treated accordingly.

Examples of fainting and unconsciousness are common, and all bring us the evidence.

that in this partial suspension of our physical powers, we have a corresponding suspension of our mental activities. From this, it has been argued that when death brings the total cessation of physical labors, all mental activities also cease. Death of the body is death to the soul. This argument has already in previous chapters received sufficient attention. The distinction between body and soul has been set forth. Their true relation of dependence and their points of difference have been pointed out. Mind has been shown superior to matter.

Therefore these scientific thinkers, who glory in being able to handle things, who make everything matter, capable of being examined, should please remember that matter, in its varied forms, has no actual existence. Our feelings and thoughts are more real, they are, in truth, the only existences of whose being we are certain.

Material forms are merely the result of our sensations. Therefore it is not wise to argue from the perishability of material structures by analogy, to mind which is in every way superior and unlike. To the old question, why should not spirit perish like matter? we might ask in reply, why should it?

Answer to the "instinct" argument. -

The longing for Immortality is said to be a natural instinct. And, as is argued, no instinct can exist, which has not its correlative somewhere; thus hunger is satisfied by food, and thirst by water. Granting this rule, we find that the desire for life finds life existing; but there is no necessity to conclude an eternal life, no more than hunger forces us to believe in an endless supply of food for all ages to come. All this style of argument must be classed and treated as argument from design. The fin of the fish is created for the water in which the

fish swims. Hunger is satisfied by the food, created for that purpose. Thus since design must govern all of God's works, man's desires and instincts ought to meet sufficient answer. His longing for continued life must be gratified. But why should response be given here, in this case. Man desires to be happy. This is one of his chief aims and yet we behold the daily spectacle of wretchedness and extreme unhappiness. Have we more reason to hope for Immortality than for happiness?

W. Menzel in his "Unsterblichkeits Lehre", says "Man beheld in nature that the chill of nature was followed by the pleasing warmth of spring, that the black darkness of night was dispelled by the reappearing sun, that seeming disaster was but temporary. Even sleep was followed by waking, therefore they hoped that death might also be followed by resurrection and Immortality."

This longing, thus aroused and so universal, found

106.
most varying development amongst various nations. The future was described according to the particular fancies of each people. The belief was strengthened by tradition, until what was a mere fancy became now an heirloom and an apparent certainty.

The human longing for a hereafter does not extend its influence further than this: it cannot be accepted as showing that there is an immortal life corresponding to our longing. Its effect was merely to make this belief common amongst all nations.

Answer to the "Universality" argument.

The universal belief in Immortality is really no argument. For every nation which has believed in this, has at the same time believed in ghosts, and thus we would be compelled to have faith in ghosts, or rather in the appearance to men of disembodied spirits. In investigating the origin of these beliefs, it will be extremely

difficult to determine which came first. It does, indeed, appear quite natural to believe that the supposed re-appearance of the dead to the living, caused a belief in the continued existence of the soul. But we reject the ghost theory ^{and} thus reject what may have been the origin of the immortality doctrine. When thus the chief support falls, the doctrine, from this point of view, has little to rest upon. It is more reasonable therefore to say, that Universality proves nothing except a universal longing perhaps. This longing has just been shown to be of little value as an argument. But granting that the belief is Universal, it might be argued that the belief is innate in man ^{and} is, consequently, necessarily true. But this wide-spread belief is readily explained by reasoning from phenomena in nature ^{and} by a natural shrinking from death. Physically, we are so constituted,

that we shrink from all harm, from danger and especially from death. This is a nerve-activity, and does not prove that our bodies will be immortal. It is natural that the soul also should shrink from death. Therefore, perhaps, we find that a bodily resurrection was hoped for, in connection with the continuance of the soul-life.

Although it is quite generally admitted that the belief in Immortality is very widespread, not all scholars will grant its universality. A difference of opinion exists! The Hindoos, the Brahmins and the Buddhists have usually been cited as being without the conception of a future life. In a previous chapter, I have quoted from Max Müller to show that this general opinion was not universally accepted. Thus also Egypt, which has long been considered as the source of this doctrine, is said, by some Egyptologists, to have believed in a life immort.

al for the good alone. The wicked were granted a temporary future existence and were then destroyed by Osiris. This statement has the support of Edouard Naville, Vicomte de Rougé, Littenberger, Lenormant, Poole, of the British Museum, and Prof. Rawlinson. No doubt, many eminent scholars can be found, who support an opposite teaching. But this conflict of authorities shakes our trust in this supposed Universality. Especially as the doctrines of the future life differed so widely, both from each other and from our present belief.

Thus far, all the arguments have been on the supposition of the now existence of a Deity. It remains for us to consider what arguments might be urged, having granted the existence of a God. Such arguments usually have reference to the various attributes ascribed to God. Let us accept, without argument, the qualities and powers usually attributed to the Deity. Our

major premises granted, we can now proceed to the statement of our minor premises.

Man being the crowning work of creation, the best ^{and} noblest production in nature, God's goodness would shield from annihilation this richest labor of his hands. Man attains but a partial state of development on earth; and must therefore reach a more complete fulfillment of his powers.

The instinctive desire for an eternal life cannot remain unanswered. Mankind must not be disappointed, unless we acknowledge that a future state be not beneficial for man. That it is beneficial, we consider sufficiently proven, when we recognize that man has certain definite aims, which are not accomplished on earth.

The argument from justice, which demands a reward of the righteous ^{and} a punishment for the wicked, is not a reason for immortal life. It is not necessary that life hereafter be im-

mortal, it may be temporary. This is all that could be justly concluded from the unequal distribution of the unhappiness of life. Nature could teach a similar change, which actually results in temporary survivals, as the butterfly from the worm. This illustration shows a temporary continuance of life in a changed form, rather than a perpetuation of life in a future world. We are here speaking of the arguments from the attributes of God, ^{and} I cannot more fittingly close this chapter, than with the thought of Mendelssohn, as found in his *Phädon*: -

'He who fulfils his duty here on earth with constancy, despite all difficulties, ^{and} who bears all adversities with resignation to God's will, must enjoy the reward of his virtue in the life hereafter. And the man of vice cannot pass away, without being brought to the knowledge, in some mode or other, that evil-do-

ing is not the path to happiness. In one word, it would be contrary to all the attributes of God, His Wisdom, His Goodness, His Justice, if He had created rational beings, that strive for perfection, in a merely temporary, evanescent existence.

Arguments against Immortality (Cont'd)

If men had the belief originally, then, as ages rolled by, the question became involved in doubt and dissenters arose. If man came in to existence as an advancement in the living order of beings, he must have been rude and uncultured in the beginning. There was not apparent to his mind, at first thought, the idea of a future existence. But intellectual progress preceded the dawn of this blessed hope.

Some bright mind first grasped the thought, cherished it and spread the new doctrine. The belief spread and spread, but ever there remained some few sceptical minds, refusing to believe, denying the reality of a life to come. - The arguments against Immortality are in 5 classes: -

1. - Man apparently succumbs to death. When a man dies, we receive no further evidence that his mind lives. Disease of the brain, interrupts thought, death may put an end to it. But this is a mere 'begging of the question';

for the question to be decided is whether in reality the mind does continue to exist.

Appearances cannot be relied upon; they often deceive us. The sun seems to move around the earth; but science^{and} observation have established the contrary. The first darkness, that came into the world must have seemed to be the destruction of the created Universe. But in truth the world was there as in time previous, but man could not see it. This same idea is expressed in the Midrash. When Adam beheld the first sunset, he thought that the world was at an end, but the sunrise on the following morning reassured him. Thus also the Midrash says that Adam was created in September (according to our calendar),^{and} that the days continually decreased in length. Then he believed that the end of the world was gradually approaching, but as the sun moved round^{and} the days began

steadily to increase in length, he recognized that this seeming destruction was but a law in the world.

Thus, in the case at hand, we can behold the material body decomposing, but whether the spirit has died with its earthly garb, we cannot establish. Neither microscope, nor telescope, nor acid, nor other human means of investigation can detect its presence. It is a spirit and from its very nature, is not susceptible of investigation in a material form.

2.- Many most eminent and learned thinkers have considered that the soul was not a distinct and separate entity, but rather that it is bound up with the physical body, and dependent upon it. — Without entering upon any learned disquisition as to the nature of the soul, recognizing the fact of consciousness, we would ~~accept~~ accept the teaching

that the soul is superior to matter, governs and controls its action. As such, the material death does not imply a spiritual destruction.

3.- The argument from our ignorance of the how, when and where, and manner and nature of the future life. All this is ridiculous. Inconceivability on our part is never an argument. It is absurd that man should limit the universe to the horizon of his mind. Because we do not know, is no argument that it is not. Illustrations can be multiplied, to show how absurd such an argument really is, but I deem it unnecessary.

4.- The materialistic argument that the soul is a portion of the body, just as tone is a portion of a musical instrument. But the fact of memory disproves this comparison. A sound is caused by a nerve-vibration, which finally ceases; it is not preserved, nor is it treasured up in memory. Thoughts and volitions

are not vibrations of brain-nerves, of a nature similar to sound-vibrations, or else they would also cease. They do not lose existence, but are preserved for all time by the power of memory.

The afferent ^{and} efferent nerves bring ^{and} take away again the outward manifestations of brain-activity; but the physical process of conducting a received impression to the brain, does not complete the process. One essential element lacks, i.e. the mind, the agent above ^{and} beyond the sensations, the intelligence, receiving the impressions ^{and} interpreting them. Materialists, who would attempt to explain the operation by actions of brain molecules, would do well to explain the fact of memory. How does man retain in mind so many distinct ^{and} entirely different impressions; how does he call them up at will? How does he pick out from a vast multitude a certain definite one? What urges the selection? Is it the action of some outward force, or is it the willing force of a conscious personality, which survives the shock of death ^{and} lives on in life eternal.

Origin of the belief in Immortality

Immortality probably received its first teaching^{and} possessed its first adherents in ancient Babylon. Babylon was, as far as we can determine, much nearer "the cradle of the human race" than Egypt. It is well known that Babylon, in olden times, was the most advanced in art, culture^{and} civilization. We have no records of their belief in a hereafter, except what is found in Diodorus, "The dead behold from the under side of the world, the judges of the world".

Babylon was the astronomical centre of the world in ancient times. It arranged the calendar, ^{and} the religious beliefs of the people were, no doubt, connected with their astronomical theories. The traces are evident in all nations who accepted this calendar. Thus e.g. the Egyptians were polytheistic, investing the natural powers with divine natures. Thus it seems that the belief originated in Babylon, but Egypt brought it into its greatest prominence. The crafty

priest-hood of the nation used this doctrine as an instrument of power over the benighted people. The lower classes were kept in a state of utter subjection by the priests, whilst the latter usurped the power and maintained themselves in control of the minds and property and rights of the people. The greatest development was given to this teaching of Immortality in Egypt. Here it was surrounded with so much mystery. Here the future was outlined with a bold hand. Nothing was omitted which could inspire terror as to the future fate. Thus resulted the extreme care for the body after death and the maintenance of magnificent burial cities. - So that Prof. Rawlinson could say with justice, that "the religion of the Egyptians clustered rather about the tomb than about the temple".

Thus amongst all nations, the belief received a different treatment. The origin was probably the same. But the development was in accord-

ance with the habits and longings of the various peoples. Thus the Persians, who were a moral nation, teaching, even in this life, the triumph of right, made virtue the supreme good, which, striven for and unrealized in this world, must be attained in the world to come. The Greeks, surrounded as they were by a beautiful nature, in harmony with their being, loving the good, the true and the beautiful, desirous of perpetuating on earth a race of physically and mentally healthy men, conceived their deities as men, more beautiful and stronger than found on earth. Their future, being a departure from a life, at once so fair and congenial, was to them a calamity, so that it is reported of Achilles, that he preferred to be a dog on earth, rather than a noble shade below, so wretched and miserable was their condition.

We have already referred to the theory that

(that) this doctrine of a future life originated in man without any experience, that it was innate. This cannot be established; but the wide spread of this doctrine has argued somewhat in its favor. In the preceding chapter, I have discussed the question as to how much weight ought to be attached to this argument. Now it seems best to find some other ^{Explanation of the} origin of this teaching. It is not a natural instinct in men, unless all men possess this same belief. If each individual in the world had this same trust in a life immortal, without any argument or experience, we might grant that the idea is inborn in man. But the world's history brings contrary evidence. Not only have not all men ^{Imagined} believed in Immortality, but many have flatly denied the future even after argument; and many exist to-day, in whose souls no longing for, or even an idea of life eternal, has ever entered. If the idea is innate, it ought to be found in all

men, at all times.

Therefore it is advisable to attempt another explanation of the origin of this idea. Perhaps man, being satisfied with his earthly career, shunned the thought of a final departure^{and} thus wished for a continuance of life. Perhaps "the wish became father to the thought,"^{and} man reflected on the possibility of a life to come. This reflection as to his future fate, turned his attention to seek parallel phenomena in the realm of nature. Many can be found, in which the apparent destruction of a present existence, is but the unfolding of the wings for higher flight in a higher world.

Or the thought may have come to man in considering the fact of dreams. In his dreams there appeared to man, visions of himself in unknown^{and} unexperienced positions, visions of his friends^{and} fellow-men, who were absent in flesh, ^{and} oftentimes visions of those already departed.

from this earthly life. What more natural, than a conclusion that this working of the fancy was some reality, that this vision of our friends was an actual visitation from the departed spirit. Such a belief would necessitate confidence in a continued existence of the soul. This might have been the origin, especially as the resurrection of the body was usually believed together with future existence. If we accept the innateness of the idea of Immortality, shall we also accept the innateness of a belief in bodily resurrection, which was equally wide-spread.

It is more rational to present another origin, whether we say from dreams, or from experience, or from our desires, or from inferences made from nature's phenomena.

Wolfgang Menzel, the well-known authority on this subject, holds the latter opinion.

The movements of the sun, moon, stars^{and} planets

and the various phenomena in nature all affect the human mind; each heavenly body was endowed with special power. Likewise the various forces in nature, e. g. the wind, were invested with superior powers. Divine spirits were supposed to inhabit each plant and tree. But gradually, a necessity was felt that this vast number of spirits must be in harmony. If not, a conflict of power would inevitably result and the beautiful harmony of the Universe would be disturbed. Then was recognized the need for a governing influence to preserve the unity and order in the world.

Man's mind reached out from the earth to the heavenly bodies, and as it reached out into space, it extended itself in time until there arose in the human heart, the longing for a future existence. How it was cherished and how it spread throughout all lands has already been stated. But the longing once present,

all nations began to differentiate according to their surroundings. The influence of climate, of the manner of life, and the purpose of existence, altered the conceptions of the future life, among the various nations. Thus it happens that the truth, originally the same for all mankind, lost its simple character and became modified by the thoughts and customs of the people who embraced it.

While speaking of this theory of a physical origin for this thought, I append a quotation from Charles Darwin, which speaks for itself. - While in the midst of the grandeur of a Brazilian forest, he wrote: -

"It is not possible to give an adequate idea of the higher feelings of wonder, admiration and devotion, which fill and elevate the mind." - In all justice, I will add the remainder of the quotation, in which he says that these scenes in nature, no longer lead him to such thoughts.

"But now the grandest scenes would not cause any such feelings ^{and} convictions to rise in my mind. It may be said that I am like the man, who has become color blind; ^{and} the universal belief, by men, of the existence of redness, makes my present loss of perception of not the least value as evidence." This argument would be valid, if all men of all races had the same inward conviction of the existence of one God. But we know that this is very far from being the case.

Influence of belief in Immortality.

The question of a future existence has aroused so much discussion in all times^{and}, amongst all people, that it is but natural that we should desire to know what difference it makes to us. Why has so much attention been given to this subject? Surely not in the hope of the establishment of a truth or an actual fact. Even the most sanguine adherers^{and} promulgators of this doctrine, do not hope to give real evidence of a real future existence. What then is the aim of all this labor? It is to create a trust in the life to come, which shall influence our earthly actions.

Man, if not believing in future life, would make earthly happiness^{and} earthly prosperity his end. He would become egoistic^{and} could make no sacrifice for duty. Worldly possessions^{and} worldly bliss would be sought after. Human esteem^{and} worldly honor would become the prizes. How far these are from the true^{and} proper aims of life needs no

explanation here. Immortality has inspired
 in the human heart, ideas of the good ^{and} the
 worthy, which are not dependent upon, nor
 confined to earth's narrow domain, but e-
 levated above ^{and} beyond worldly considerations,
 the human mind has realized the higher
 ideals of existence. Happiness does not consist
 in the possession ^{and} enjoyment of material wealth.
 Supreme happiness ^{and} supreme delight is
 found in the performance of duty, in the seek-
 ing after right, ^{and} in the avoidance of evil.
 Without a trust ^{and} hope in a world to come,
 men would become egoistic; the world's heroes
^{and} martyrs would become selfish, base-minded
 men. Thus, in a few words, we can express the
 influence of the belief that a world to come
 exists, ^{and} that, in the future, happiness shall
 depend on our earthly conduct, on man's actions
 in this life.

Its influence is seen in the Jewish history; the

idea developed from rude to higher forms. At the same time, the regard for earthly existence sank, so that finally man's care was for the future world. Many biblical characters illustrate the strong attachment for life, that existed in the hearts of the people. Life or death, - this life, with its varying joys^{and} sorrows, or Sheol, with its gloomy aspect, - the choice was easy. Man was unwilling to die! - On this account, a change in religious belief was easy, if it furthered earthly bliss. After the Babylonian exile, when this idea of Immortality received a higher expression, the Jews could cling with greater firmness to their religion. Despite persecution, despite oppression^{and} in defiance of death, they adhered steadfastly to the faith of their fathers. Witness the Maccabean struggle,^{and} later the persistent fight against the Romans. And still later, the life of the Jewish race became one misery^{and} yet they were not disheartened. No pleasure existed for them on earth. Driven about from place to place, persecuted^{and} abused,

it became natural that they should turn from earthly blackness, from human misery ^{and} wretchedness, to a vision of brightness, of future happiness ^{and} joy. This was to them the balm of consolation, that the joys ^{and} sorrows of earth were fleeting, that real joy was to be their portion in the life hereafter. Future life, future happiness, future glory, was theirs!

And yet, though their hearts were ever directed heavenwards, though they longed for the future, as the relief from earthly sorrow ^{and} pain, this life was not entirely disregarded. Our duty on earth was recognized, that men should labor on earth to receive a heavenly reward, that the seeming inequality in men's fortunes, should be the assurance of a future adjustment, that the distress ^{and} suffering of life, should be the harbingers of peace ^{and} happiness unending, in life eternal.