

ence as "the word made flesh," but the eternal Word himself, whose being and activity are not limited by time; who, both before and since his incarnation, is always present with his Church, as the centre and source of her spiritual light and life; who spake first by "Moses and the prophets," and afterwards in his own person as "the man Christ Jesus;" and who, having returned to the Father's bosom whence he came, continued to speak by the lips of his apostles, and now speaks by his word and ministry "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven;" who is with his church always, from Abel to the trump of the archangel, and is always calling the children of men to himself.

This view comprehends all that is valuable of the views named in the beginning of this Article, and much more which they, in their narrowness, exclude; and by this comprehensiveness it commends itself as the true view.

ARTICLE VII.

THE FUTURE STATE.¹

BY REV. JAMES M. HOPPIN, SALEM, MASS.

THE revelation of a future state is given us in such a form as to be purely practical. It is to quell the sin and establish the faith of the soul. The 15th chapter of the 1st of Corinthians, that rich and wonderful leaf of inspiration concerning a future existence, is simply for this, that we may continue "steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." The whole is a divinely urged argument for the faithful service of God in *this* life. Its business

¹ A View of the Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State. By Richard Whately, D. D., late Archbishop of Dublin. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston. 1855.

is not to show heaven, but to bring to heaven. Like a glass that gathers the rays of heaven into one focus, it points and pours "the powers of the world to come" on the conscience and heart. They *are* powers, because they influence and hold us even in the world that now is. There is no theory in the word of God. Man theorizes, but God furnishes original truth. Man has a free and in one sense prophetic spirit. He has in him a basis of command over worlds that he does not see. From materials which he has, he throws out bridges and structures of thought over into that invisible region which he does not possess. He is not shut up in what he knows, but is allowed to go on into what he may know. He must philosophize, or deny his reason. From the nature of the mind, he is inly urged to complete the utmost circle of his knowledge, to follow truth back to its absolute cause, and out to its possible result. He may thus reverently theorize upon what is revealed of the future state, just as he does upon the nature of God and the principles of his moral government. But theory cannot add to revealed *truth* itself; even as science cannot add to the revelation of God's truth in nature. We may have "physical theories of a future life," but not new truths of a future life. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body may be philosophically studied, and the sublime fact may be relatively harmonized with all physical and psychological truth; but no new truth can be ingrafted upon the fact itself, or its circumstances, or the state of the raised body, or the reasons of its resurrection. Here is the falseness of Swedenborg's manifestation of a future state. It gives new facts. It is not a philosophy, but a revelation. It paints the architecture of heaven and hell, and lets us gaze into and scrutinize the apartments of glory and shame. The revelator says: "I can sacredly and solemnly declare, that the Lord Himself has been seen of me, and that He has sent me to do what I do, and for such purpose has opened the interior part of my soul, which is my spirit, so that *I can see* what is in the spiritual world, and those that are therein."¹ Phi-

¹ Quoted from Bush's *Memorabilia*.

losophy may indeed carry its rationalizing process in relation to revealed truth too far, while Cant cleaves off too much of liberty. There is sometimes an air of dictation in religious philosophizing, to which a simple believer of the Scriptures will not submit. After all its analysis of causes and development of laws, he says, "leave me to the honest Word of God." There has been much of this species of refined speculation in respect to the future life. Men are treated as unintelligent who will not assent to certain philosophical views of the next world, and to a kind of metaphysical immortality, and who even prefer the holy silence of inspiration.

Archbishop Whately's recent work on the *Future State* consists of lectures delivered to "a mixed congregation,"¹ and was intended to be "plain and popular;"² and it certainly is so in its transparent style and admirable arrangement of topics. There is not a word or sentence in it which a plain man could not comprehend. It has many of the unequalled qualities of Whately's writings, his precision in the use of language, robust reasoning, and sound common sense. The design of the book is distinctly said to be, "to clear and settle"³ the scriptural doctrine of a future state. It is to bring out the mind of the Spirit on this important theme. To give the theories and assertions of men is not the purpose of the work. The Christian world needs such a book; for, as the writer hints, even the familiar views of the pulpit on a future life are generally vague, contradictory, and unimpressive. Yet, instead of "clearing and settling" all things, has not the author left many wholly theoretical and conjectural views standing bald and unsettled, very troublesome rocks for his common-sense hearer to break the ploughshare of his thought and faith upon?

The opening chapter is upon the Immortality of the Soul. We stand as it were on the coast, and look on the dim ocean of eternity, before embarking upon it. The truth of immortality was revealed, the writer thinks, to the Jew, but not in

¹ Page 1, Preface.² *Ibid.*³ Page 29.

its practical power. God seemed willing to have rested in the revelation of His own being, and of a moral government over His people, which drew its energy chiefly from the narrower compass of this life. Moses pointed the people *principally* to temporal rewards and punishments. Job and his friends did not seem to use the key of immortality to unlock the problem of evil. "Sheol," in its shadowy boundaries, may have afforded to them and to the general Jewish mind, the hope of a lengthened vitality, and even of a higher spiritual life; but so weak in comparison with the vivid promises and threatenings of God for the present life, as to be of less moment. But there is a marked *advance* in the Psalms and Prophecies in regard to this truth; and the advance is ever in connection with a growing clearness of faith in a Redeemer. Christ can never be disconnected from the truth of immortality throughout revelation, even from its beginning. The believing minds among the old Jews, as was the case with Abraham, grasped the truth of immortality. These susceptible and inspired minds stood like the peaks of an Alpine range along the line of Hebrew history, tinged with the light of immortality from their elevation of faith alone; they caught the rising of the Sun of Righteousness; but the greater mass of minds were in the struggling gloom and light, the duskiness of the first dispensation. The instinct of immortality was visible even in the classic pagan mind, though our author is positive in asserting its impractical and hopeless impotency. His view here is much stronger than that of most writers on the rational argument for the soul's immortality, who see in Plato's reasonings something of the depth and spirit of New Testament truths, drawing the necessity of the soul's immortality from God Himself. Whately may be regarded by some as finding too little of immortality in the Old Testament; but if eternal life were fully revealed to the ancient Jew, and yet Christ as *the way of life* was not fully revealed to him, then of course eternal life was won or lost by him through his obedience or disobedience of the law. But this could not be; for obedience is a simple debt to God, not a ground for reward, and more than

that, of infinite bliss. "Eternal life is the *gift of God*;" and that "through Jesus Christ our Lord." Should not, then, the truth respecting the Old Testament be maintained, that it was a dawning light, in order that the glory of the gospel may be seen? "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel"—this is the rising of the sun; and, living as we do in its light and heat, we forget there ever was a time when it *had not* risen upon the earth. Whately has perhaps done good by his arguments in favor of the consummate glory of the gospel. We read the Old Testament from the higher point of view in the New. It is new to the Christian mind, just as a chaotic landscape of night is brought out and, as it were, *created* by the morning light. It was there before; but we see in it what the old Hebrew never could have seen in it. Our gratitude to the Lord Jesus should be the more intense. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." The lesser idea of immortality or incorruption is comprehended in the greater idea of "eternal life," which has a glorious moral truth, and which can even be begun to be blessedly realized in this life. The soul disconnected from God by sin is united in Christ to God, and has from Him a spiritual and divine life. "He that hath the Son hath *life*,"—not a mere continuous existence, but a living in the Good, a partaking of the Divine.

The next three lectures, forming a large part of the book, are upon the Intermediate State. There is and always will be a certain irrepressible desire to know where the soul, when it has left the body like a piece of kneaded clay, has instantly gone. What is its immediate condition? It is said at the outset of the lectures that there are two views of the intermediate state between death and the resurrection, the one that it is a condition of consciousness, the other, of unconsciousness. The arguments are then given in full for the two theories, the writer leaving them both standing without his decided approbation of either, but strongly leaning towards the theory of unconsciousness. Was this the way,

we venture to ask, "to clear and settle" so obscure a point to plain minds? Was the point itself one to say so much upon theoretically, when the Word of God, which was to be the sole guide, says so little upon it? These chapters are really unsettling. How many of those unlearned hearers knew before that there was such a theory as that the "intermediate state of the soul was one "of profound sleep, of utter unconsciousness"?¹ There is no proof adduced that this theory has ever been a general one. It is simply said that it "has been held by able and pious men."² But historically, it has been held by individuals here and there, who, in the earlier ages of the church, mingled materialistic ideas of sin with the Christian faith. In the instance of Justin Martyr, his Platonic views seemed to have led him to a theory of the gradual elimination of sin in a future state. But in the short fragment he has left us on this point, it is difficult to draw the conclusion that he believed in an unconscious state after death. In the case of Irenæus and also of Tertullian, their desire to save the doctrine of the resurrection of the body from the assaults of philosophy, drove them to the creation of a place for the detention or sequestration of departed spirits. They took up a kind of pagan underworld of shades, because they would keep back the army of spirits until the great voice of the resurrection met them, and permitted them to come forth. But even they did not hold the view of an unconscious state. Tertullian calls the abode of the righteous in the interim, "locum divinæ amœnitatis."³ He characterizes the intermediate state by the phrase "prælibatio sententiæ,"⁴ the enduring of a mitigated sentence. The idea with him, so often expressed, seemed to be that of a condition of vivid enjoyment or suffering, but not the consummate blessedness or misery of the completed state of bodily existence after the resurrection. Martyrs alone had the prerogative of entering at once into the full felicity of that heavenly state. The expression in the Burial Service of the English Episcopal Church, "those that are *asleep*," is

¹ Page 80.

² Page 49.

³ Tertulliani op. Apologeticus, 47.

⁴ Tertulliani op. de Anima, 48.

thought by Whately to favor the doctrine of an unconscious intermediate state.¹

The Scriptural argument for an intervening state of *sleep* is chiefly founded, according to our author, upon this expression, "asleep," or "sleep," as applied to death. It is said that it is singular that the word "sleep" should be used for an active, conscious condition. It should rather denote a

¹ "We have been asked once or twice, if the Protestant Episcopal Church believes in the doctrine of an intermediate state, between death and the general judgment. We take this method of answering, most unequivocally, 'Yes.' It is matter of great surprise that there should be the least shadow of a doubt on a matter which is so openly and plainly declared by all the standard writers of the church, such as Burnet, Tomline, Hobart, Whately, Burton, Sherwood, Waite, and others, as well as the Thirty-nine Articles. The dead in Christ do not go to heaven, but to *Hades*, where they remain until after the resurrection." — *Western Episcopalian*.

This is the first time we were aware that this was the general doctrine of the Episcopal Church. Clearly this is not Archbishop Whately's representation. He claims it to have been only the opinion of individuals. He says: "The authors of our Church-services, at least of the Burial Service, seem to have adopted the former of these opinions (that of immediate introduction to conscious reward or punishment), though they have nowhere insisted upon it as an article of faith; nor is the point noticed at all in the Creed (or Symbol) of our Church, which the Reformers of it drew up, and which is usually called the Thirty-nine Articles." — p. 49.

Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, uses the following language upon the Third Article — *As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into hell*: "Another conceit has had a great course among some of the latest Fathers and the Schoolmen. They have fancied that there was a place to which they have given a peculiar name, *Limbus Patrum*, a sort of partition in hell, where all the good men of the Old Dispensation, that had died before Christ, were detained; and they hold that our Saviour went thither and emptied that place, carrying all the souls that were in it with him into heaven. Of this the Scriptures say nothing; not a word of either of the patriarchs going thither, or of Christ's delivering them out of it. And, though there are not in the Old Testament express declarations and promises made concerning a future state, *Christ having brought life and immortality to light through his Gospel*, yet all the hints given of it, show that they looked for an immediate admission to blessedness after death. So David: "Thou wilt show me the path of life, in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore. Thou shalt guide me here by thy counsel, and afterwards receive me to glory." Isaiah says, that "the righteous when they die enter into peace." The Bishop remarks further, that this Third Article could only mean that Christ really died, and *was buried*; that his soul truly departed from his body, and went into the place of blessed spirits, where all the righteous would be with him. Surely a Christian wishes nothing more than this, call the *place* what you will.

state of profound insensibility, when the disembodied soul, deprived of the means of manifestation, remains wrapped in slumber.

The application of the term 'sleep' to death in the New Testament, is evidently taken from the Old. Job says, "now shall I sleep in the dust." David says, "lighten my eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death." It is not only a natural poetic analogon of death, but corresponds with the more dim ideas of the Old Testament writers, respecting a future state. The present life was the life of action with them, the time of suffering, enjoyment, toil. Sheol or Hades, signifying 'the whole future world', and not necessarily the grave, was not yet filled with the holy activity of Christ's presence and kingdom, or with the entirely clear light of an everlasting day. The light in it was rather that of night, starlight and shadows, the time of sleep. To be hid from all trouble in the pavilion of God was one of the highest conceptions of the ancient Hebrews, of another state. The use of the word "sleep" for "death" was very common among the Greek poets. Homer, narrating the sudden death of a warrior in battle, calls it "the iron sleep of death." Sophocles, in *Elec.* 509, uses the term "slept" for death. Among harassed, warlike nations a peaceful sleep was a state of blessedness. Dr. Livingstone, the African traveller, gives a curious illustration of this on pages 241, 597. Am. ed. of his work. And in the early days of the Christian Church, when to be a disciple of Christ was to be exposed to every earthly grief and pain, and to violent death, death itself was like a blissful. "sleep in Jesus."

But the idea of total insensibility would not quite apply to some of those passages of the New Testament where the dead are said to be "asleep." John xi. 11-14: "These things said he; and after that he saith unto them, our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep. Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit, Jesus spake of his death; but they thought that he had spoken of taking rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." That is, he is *not*

asleep in the mere sense of rest or unconsciousness, but the soul has left the body. Lazarus is *dead*. I will recall that soul to its body. I will awaken that bodily Lazarus. I will bring him again to earthly life. 1 Thess. v. 9, 10: "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." This language obviously refers simply to life and death. Whether the Christian be living or dead, he shall, at the sudden and unknown coming of the day of the Lord, be together with Christ; and it is presumed that after death he will have a more vivid consciousness of this union with Christ, than when in this lower bodily state. The use of the verb *καθεύδω* in Matt. ix. 24, "She is not dead, but sleepeth," is, according to De Wette,¹ a singular and unique use of the figure, which it is difficult to explain, since according to v. 18 the maid was dead.

The seeming difficulty of harmonizing the idea of a conscious intermediate state with the truth of the judgment, is noticed by Whately.² What necessity is there of a judgment, he reasons, if men are to go into a state of conscious happiness or misery immediately after death? They are in fact then judged. But is there any discrepancy between the consciousness of one's doom and the actual sentence being pronounced afterward?

A Christian in this life may feel assured of his pardon by God, and may have the foretastes of heaven, but the sentence of justification will not be passed upon him until the great day of the Lord Jesus. And so, "some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment;" and there is an anticipation of judgment which is as sure as the fact itself. Besides, the judgment day is for a broad and public manifestation of the character of God; it is, that the world may see that God is just. It is the official winding up of God's moral government of this race, and the completion of the work of redemption, when all the consequences of all

¹ Exegetisches Handbuch, Vol. II. p. 118.

² Pages 74—80.

actions shall have been consummated, and the whole case of every soul shall have been finished, and the entire influences of the atonement shall have wrought themselves out.

But the passages which speak of the immediate entrance of the soul after death into a conscious state of happiness or misery, present an objection to this theory. 2 Cor. v. 8: "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Literally, "we are of good courage and well pleased rather, to have travelled away from the body, and to be at home with the Lord." There is a strong expression of hope and desire here. How could this ardent wish of Paul to be *at home* with Christ, when on a journey away from the body, be at all satisfied, if after death he should remain insensible for uncomputed ages, and only be consciously with Christ when again joined to the body? Is it said that his desire leaped over the chasm of the intermediate state of unconsciousness? But his desire evidently only leaped over the remaining period of his earthly existence and his death, and over nothing else. Tertullian explains it by calling this desire the apostle's noble contempt for the body, and "*præstantiam martyrorum*,"¹ or the superior strength of the martyr's spirit, that yearned for and was allowed the immediate felicity of heaven. He does not doubt the instantaneous introduction of *Paul's* spirit into the presence of Christ, but treats it as exceptional. Luke xxiii. 43: "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Our author regards this account of the robber on the cross as "a peculiar case,"² which we cannot reason upon. But is it not just one of those cases that we can and ought to reason upon, because it throws light on a point where there is not so much light as upon other truths? Was it the manner of our Lord to make exceptional cases in the kingdom of faith? Did he not reprove that spirit? One such instance covering over this obscure ground, in the words and acts of Christ himself, ought to be sufficient. "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou

¹ Tertulliani op. de Resurrectione.

² Page 61.

comest into thy kingdom." This was a request betokening true faith, the condition of entering into Christ's kingdom. "And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, to-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, this language always prefaces something of great moment. Σήμερον, "to-day," is emphatic. It is granting more than the man asked, who wished a *future* remembering of him in mercy. In the comment of Grotius on this passage, it is said: "Pessimé fecerunt qui hanc vocem aut cum λέγω [dico] conjunxerunt, [quod aperté improbat Syrus] aut interpretati sunt σήμερον [hodie] post resurrectionem. Christus plus promittit quàm erat rogatus. Rogas, inquit, ut olim tui sim memor cum regni possessionem accepero; ego tam diu non differam tua vota; sed partem et primitias speratæ felicitatis tibi intra hunc ipsum diem repræsentabo; morere securus, à morte statim te divina solatia exspectant."¹ Μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ, "shalt thou *be with me*;" this in itself is the summit of the believer's reward and felicity after death, than which Paul himself desired nothing higher. Phil. i. 23: "I have a desire to depart and to *be with Christ*." It was carrying out the great purpose of the Saviour himself concerning his true believers. John xvii. 24: "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, *be with me* where I am." Ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, "in paradise;" not simply, as some have said, 'in the world of spirits,' which would not have been any new or great announcement to the anguished penitent, but 'in that kingdom itself,' in conscious blessedness and glory with the Lord. Christ spoke to the man as he, a Jew, would comprehend him. "Paradise" expressed to the Jewish mind the highest conception of heaven. It was that part of the world of spirits which was directly set over against 'Gehenna' or 'hell.' It was, in the language of Josephus, χώρον οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀγιώτατον,² "the place in the heavens where the souls of the blest were gathered together," where were Abraham and Moses and all the faithful. It corresponds with the expression "Abraham's bosom" in the Lord's parable. Says Grotius, on this phrase: "Putant veteres plerique

¹ Grotii op. theol. Basil. Vol. II. p. 460.

² Quoted by Grotius, Vol. II. p. 425.

‘sinum Abrahæ’ dici ‘regionem piis animis adscriptam’ quam Hebræi אֲרָם id est, παράδεισον.”¹ Lightfoot also considers them synonymous phrases in the estimation of the old Jews. In the Talmud, quoted by him, it is related that “holy Rabbi Judah” went, at his death, “to Abraham’s bosom, to the exquisite delights and perfect felicities of Paradise.”² Now where Abraham was, was the very highest heaven of the just to the ancient Jew. Paradise, according to Lightfoot, was in the Rabbinical books, “the *highest* heavens.”³ He quotes one passage from them in these words: “Those that dwell in Paradise, they shine like the stars of the firmament, like the sun, like the moon, like the lightning, like lilies, like burning lamps.”⁴ It was God’s abode, the garden where his infinite love blossomed, and where the human spirit in his sunlight flowered, as in Rev. ii. 7. The heavenly Paradise took its imagery from the earthly Paradise, the garden of Eden, with its tree, its fruits, its river. In brief, if there were any word that *could* express to the Jewish mind and to the mind of the dying robber, the perfect state of the blest, the highest abode of the righteous, of Abraham the father and type of all believers, it was “Paradise.” Lightfoot scouts the idea of the Jews entertaining any lower or divided conception of Paradise, as if it were a mere state of waiting for felicity, a prison, a limbo, a detention.

Matt. xvii. 3, 4. The appearance of Moses and Elias on the mount of transfiguration was either the appearance of real, conscious, glorified saints, or else it was their illusory presence. But can we imagine this? Would it satisfy the faith or reason of the Church of Christ? Would this scenic effect have been worthy of our Lord? Did not these heavenly spirits really talk with Jesus, of those things happening on earth, in which they had been all along intensely conscious and interested? Were they at that moment awakened out of sleep to know and hear for the first time, of Christ and of his great work? The difficulty of overcoming

¹ Grot. op. Vol. I. p. 424.

² Lightfoot’s Works, Lon. 1684, Vol. II. p. 457.

³ Lightfoot, Vol. II. p. 478.

⁴ Ibid

such passages as these is greater than the difficulty of accounting for a forestalled judgment. And what an idea in itself, that all who have died are now in one vast sleeping chamber! that since death they have never thought, nor stirred, nor dreamed! that the ceaselessly active spirits, who found this world too small, who explored its secrets, who swept over it like storms, who rose above it in their spiritual ambition, and took hold of the very mystery and nature of God, should now be held bound in some demi-earthly cavern of silence, to slumber till the universe grows old, and all things be ready to perish! How this lessens the victory of death, and sinks the rushing river of life into a stagnant marsh! Can we conceive of pure spirit under any circumstances becoming unconscious? Spirit may be numbed and deadened by the body, though even in the body it bursts the bars of weary sleep and of oppressive disease, and claims its freedom in wild dreams and in delirious thoughts; but when disembodied, how *can* it be inanimate or suspended? As well conceive of a pure flame ceasing to burn. As well think of life ceasing to be living. Consciousness is the soul's essence. Has the learned author therefore really benefited his readers by reviving a theory that wars with the obvious and universal interpretation of Scripture, that conflicts with our intuitions, and that subserves no high moral end? If the dead thus sleep, we would pray, let many of them sleep on. Let them never wake to their own evil consciousness and everlasting pain. We would be inclined to adopt the Romish doctrine of praying for the souls of the dead. The belief in purgatorial fires were more in accordance with Scripture.

The next lecture, upon "the Resurrection," is in the author's clearest style, dispelling at once a philosophic incredulosity and a superstitious confusion. Contending for the essentialness of this great doctrine, and scattering that thin and ghostly spiritualism which really unclothes the soul, instead of clothing it upon with a perfect body for its highest manifestation, he at the same time routs those crude and fleshly ideas, which are thick with the clods of the valley of

death. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit eternal life." The continuity of individual life in a renewed bodily organism evolved from the seminal principle of the old body, yet entirely different, as different as a magnificent plant that shoots from the little rotted seed in the ground,—a new, God-given and incorruptible body, is a thoroughly Pauline truth. The individuality of the man is in his whole nature, as soul and body. Here the bodily nature predominates and moulds the soul; hereafter, the soul predominates and moulds the body. The new body is a "spiritual body;" and, in the instance of the believer, the body which is developed from the sound renewed soul, takes on the form of all that is beautiful and glorious, even of Christ's own glorious body.

Another judicious and powerful chapter follows, upon "the Judgment." The writer justly makes much, in this solemn theme, of the idea, that not only will God then be perfectly manifested, but that *man* will be perfectly manifested, as 2 Cor. 4: 10, literally rendered, would indicate. The real love and faith which there are in a soul, will be revealed, as well as the real unbelief and hostility which there are in another soul. Conscience flashing with perfect faithfulness and simultaneousness upon all actions, like a veil drawn from a mirror, will be the revealing instrumentality. The Judgment has a bright as well as an awful side to it. There will be surprisals of joy as well as of woe. There is a simple explanation given by Whately, of the terms of the Judgment, which is characteristic of his clear mind. That class of texts which declares that the judgment will be according to the deeds, words, and thoughts of the man while in the body, must be harmonized with those numerous and definite passages which pronounce repentance and faith to be the only terms of salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." These deeds done in the body, these benevolences to the poor, these good words and thoughts, will therefore be judged of in the quality of the *fruits of that faith* which is really in the soul. If these deeds, words, and thoughts do not spring from this faith, from this subjective

principle of righteousness; but from some earthly root or motive, they are spurious, they are imperfect, they have no divine life in them, and they cannot stand the judgment of God. A man will, on that day (and how blessed that it is so) be justified by faith alone. How can he, indeed, be justified by anything else? How can he have any good deeds to bring to that bar, that have not come from this faith? "Without him [Christ] we can *do* nothing."

In the succeeding chapter on "the expected Restoration of the Jews, and the Millennium," the author refutes the opinion that the saints are literally to judge the world hereafter; but he considers the passage to mean, that true Christians, by their just life in this world, are really judging and condemning the evil world around them. He also discards the idea of two resurrections, giving the passage a simpler interpretation. He is opposed to the ideas of a literal restoration of the Jews, and of a bodily millennial reign of Christ on earth. He considers such ideas to be at variance with the general scope of the New Testament, and with the spirituality of the Christian faith. He thinks that the true way to interpret the unfulfilled prophecies of the New Testament, and especially of the book of Revelation, is to use the key of the actual fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. These have been thus far fulfilled spiritually, as in the case of the coming of Elias, and of the establishment of the moral kingdom and power of the Messiah. And he is of the opinion that a far greater and more splendid exhibition of the power of the religion of Jesus, a fuller breaking forth of the energy of His spirit and life, for a considerable period before the end of the world, will answer, and gloriously answer, all the requirements of these prophecies. The bringing in of the Jews, is simply the universal triumph of the Christian church, in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, but all are one in Christ.

In the chapter on "Rewards and Punishments," the scriptural truth is brought out, that the elevation of one will not imply the depression of another; that there will be no envy in heaven, because each one's spiritual capacity will be filled. Yet there is, in this chapter, the most objectionable feature

of the book, and one, we think, that is sufficient to counterbalance all its good. There is a subtle thread of argument introduced, by way of conjecture, or candid exhibition of opposing opinion, for the annihilation of the souls of wicked men. Let it not be understood that Archbishop Whately positively advocates this theory; but he introduces it and argues it fully. He says that in the passages in which the words "death," "destruction," "eternal death," are spoken of, these words *may* be taken as signifying literal death, real destruction, an utter end of things. The "unquenchable fire" *may* mean that fire which utterly consumes what it is burning upon. The "worm that dieth not," may be that which entirely devours what it feeds upon. "Everlasting perdition" may mean that perishing from which the soul cannot be saved, but it will be final, annihilating.¹ It is written that Christ "must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is *death*." This affords some ground for thinking, according to Whately, that there may be a "final extinction of evil and suffering, by the total destruction of such as are incapable of good and happiness. If eternal death mean *final* death—death without any revival—we can understand what is meant by death being *destroyed*, viz.: that none henceforth are to be subjected to it."² And he concludes this scriptural argument by this sentence: "On the whole, therefore, I think we are not warranted in concluding (as some have done) so positively concerning this question as to make it a point of Christian faith to interpret figuratively, the 'death and destruction' spoken of in the Scripture as the doom of the condemned; and to insist on the belief that they are to be kept alive forevermore." Is this a settling or an unsettling method? If the author is in favor of the theory of annihilation, let him say so boldly, and let him come out and be its champion on independent grounds; but thus to insert it advisedly in his lectures to plain men,

¹ These and similar arguments for the annihilation of the wicked are drawn out in greater fulness in the more recent work of C. F. Hudson on the Doctrine of a Future Life, a book of great learning and subtlety.

² Page 184.

and then to publish it in a book meant to clarify the doctrine of a future life, seems hardly right. To enter into the scriptural argument against the annihilation of soul, we have no space.¹ If the intensely active, continuous, and infinite idea of "everlasting punishment," could possibly be joined with the brief and hewn down truth of literal annihilation, then it were well to introduce such a doctrine to a "mixed audience" of good and bad, of believers and unbelievers. With the drowsy theory of unconsciousness to smooth the way and take off the edge of eternity, we may conceive that it would be on the whole quite satisfactory to those who have their "good things" in this life. Could our author himself desire that this view should become popular, — that the great hand of Almighty Justice and Love, stretching from eternity, and laying itself upon the passionate human heart, should at the end of this life quench that heart out forever; and that the wicked man should feel that he might revel here in evil pleasures, and bear down in iron-handed oppressions, and at the dying hour like Mirabeau, be crowned with roses and drowned in perfume, and sink into the abyss of annihilation? Would the writer annihilate the *moral* power of the future life? Has it not been justly thought that it was a great work of Christ to restore the law of holiness, to clear the mists from its celestial purity, to make men come up to it in Divine strength, to stamp sin with everlasting opprobrium, and to force the wicked, God-resisting conscience to echo back its own infinite condemnation? Is not the never-dying worm, the vile and terrible self-destroying death-energy of sin in the evil soul? It may be this, and more. Is not the unquenchable fire, the everlasting flame of pain and despair kindled in the mind made for God, but never giving up its sin? Then treading the depths of this overwhelmingly painful subject, we must lean alone on the arm of God, and keep close to Christ.

The chapter on "the Heavenly State," contains much strong sense and clear reasoning. Heaven is a *place* to

¹ Dr. T. M. Post in the *New Englander* of Feb. and May 1856, has presented this argument with exceeding eloquence, force, and Christian feeling.

the author's substantial mind. It is not a mere crystallized state of abstract virtues and apotheothized doctrines. It is vivified by the living *personal* presence of Christ, and by a spiritual oneness with him. The seeds of this heaven must be sown here, in the soul reconciled and made harmonious in its deepest will to God. "This *is* eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." This possession of "God in Christ," is the opening life of heaven. The child of God lives part in heaven on earth. Like the sweet indescribable silence that broods on the mind after an exquisite strain of music, so after a penitent prayer, or holy thought, or righteous word, or pure self-denying action which has Christ in it, the believer dwells, for the moment, peacefully and blissfully in heaven with the Saviour. But that Saviour's full love is inherited by the soul hereafter. And the soul is made capable of infinite love. Even here, how great is the capacity of the soul to love. Every new child given by God to a parent is enfolded in that fulness of parental love, nor is that fulness diminished. So in heaven, the human soul, separated from the contracting and deathly influences of sin, and nourished in the atmosphere of Divine love, learns to receive into itself all that is like God, and to love like God. But the Scriptures do not mean that we should know anything of heaven out of Christ. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth *not yet appear* what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be *like him*, for we shall see him as he is." The types of heaven all lead to Christ. The ever-bearing tree of life is Christ. The river of the water of life, is Christ. The new Jerusalem is the city actually lighted by the presence of God and the Lamb. The white-robed multitude therein, is composed of those whose souls are made white by a purifying faith in the great sacrifice of Divine love for sin. We are not told particularly about the employments of "the saints in light," beyond the general truth of holy and delightful praise of God. Every service will be praise. There will be an eternal progress of the soul, because led by Christ himself to the living fountains of truth. We are not informed about the meeting of friends in heaven;

though not a shade of doubt rests on this, from the pointing of many passages of Scripture, and from the whole meaning of life as developed in the broad, social, and affectionate light of the gospel; but the simple yet intense Scriptural idea of heaven as the union of those who love one another in Christ. Friendship will have pure objects, purged from all human weaknesses in the flame of the love of Christ. The family of Bethany, the brothers James and John, and the Marys, will meet each other again; but we are only told, in the Bible, that they loved Christ. That was enough.

Mr. Whately throws out a brief opinion, that the ministry of the blessed saints in acts of beneficence to man, is not entirely opposed to the tone of Scripture, although there is nothing in the way of positive proof. But he does not say, that the secret ministrations of God's love through these spiritual messengers, are ever made known to men themselves. Pure spirit could *not* manifest itself to men's bodily senses; could not be seen, or felt, or heard; could not speak, or lift, or strike. If it made itself known in any way through a material agency, it *must* appear in the body, and no one has yet risen from the dead except by miracle. God himself, as a spirit, has never yet been seen, or felt, or heard, by the bodily sense. "For a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye *see* me have." And even if the departed spirit visited earth again, it would not be to make revelations of the future state. The work of redemption could not be aided by this. "They have Moses and the prophets,"—Christ and his gospel,—and they would not be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." There is no necessity at all for any departed spirit to come back here to tell us anything. We have enough for our salvation, consolation, profoundest reason, and eternal responsibility. It would be bringing in human after Divine testimony,—a flickering ghost after "the strong Son of God." The susceptibilities of many respectable people, in these days, are taken up in the revelations of departed spirits. They do not, in some instances, look beyond *them*, to God and Christ. They rely on them, and make them their religion. They are comforted and strengthened by their appearances or messages. They would have the world

to be guided by them, and to depend upon them. But to rely on *human* beings, whether in or out of the body, is to neglect and reject a Divine Mediator; for the Mediator could not be a mere man, or an angel; and we are sometimes reminded of the apostle's words: "let no man beguile you of your reward, in a worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and *not holding the Head.*" That debatable ground between soul and body, where corporeal nerves and tissues run into their vanishing points of union with mind, has not yet been explored, and cannot be, perhaps, thoroughly. Science will clear up these mists of spiritualism, and of every new revelation, and the future state will be left, as the Bible sublimely left it, even its glories seen "as through a glass darkly."

The book closes with two sensible chapters on "a Christian death, and its preparation." There are many mistakes, even among intelligent believers, the author thinks, respecting a Christian departure. It is an error, according to his view, to suppose that there can be any such thing as the *sudden* death of the true Christian. If one be a loving, active Christian, he is always prepared for death; and it is thus in any man's power to secure himself against sudden death. Especially to prepare to die, is an unnecessary idea to the living Christian. We are hardly so ready to assent to the writer's opinion, that the approach of death should ever be concealed from an irreligious man, for the sake of leaving him a calm mind for religious choice and thought. We are reminded of the close of one of Wordsworth's thoughtful sonnets on a man condemned to suffer death:

"Then mark him, him who could so long rebel,
The crime confessed, a kneeling penitent
Before the altar, where the sacrament
Softens his heart, till from his eyes outwell
Tears of salvation. Welcome death! while Heaven
Does in this change exceedingly rejoice;
While yet the solemn heed the State hath given
Helps him to meet the last tribunal's voice
In faith, which *fresh offences, were he cast*
On old temptations, might forever blast."

There is much in the certain prospect of death which will make men think ; while the slightest hope of life, often serves as the stronghold of continued impenitence.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE SCIENCE OF ETYMOLOGY.

BY REV. BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT, M. A., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE very caption of this Article will astonish some and amuse others, who have been in the habit of regarding etymology as a mere mass of vagaries. That it has any such scope as to deserve the dignified name of a science, or any such interior frame-work of principles as to possess its essential nature, is quite beyond the general estimate of its character. In this country, indeed, and in England, as also in France and everywhere but in Germany, both vernacular and classical etymology are in the same rude, unmethodized state of first and partial discovery, in which chemistry and geology existed half a century ago. What facts are seen and appreciated appear to most, even of their admirers, but as isolated novelties and wonders, and have none of the charm or power of a splendid combination, of comprehensive and complicated affinities and relations.

Our modern languages are all derived from those of elder ages ; and these are found, when subjected to thorough analysis, to have been derived, in their turn, from those anterior to them ; while, on a wide and critical survey, all the tongues of the civilized world appear full of multitudinous correspondencies and connections.

The object of this Article will be realized, if the following topics, connected with the science of etymology, are presented in sufficient outline, viz.: