

*N<sup>o</sup> 3*

# WHAT IS IT THAT DIES?

A FEW WORDS TO THE

## SPIRITUALISTS.

BY

GEORGE GRAY.

LONDON:  
CALDER, 199, OXFORD STREET.

1867.

*PRICE SIXPENCE.*

LONDON :

PRINTED BY T. WILTSHIRE, 1A, GEORGE STREET, OXFORD STREET.

## WHAT IS IT THAT DIES?

---

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF VICTORIA

The Author of the following Essay puts it forth simply because it is on a naturally popular subject. Much of the material is derived directly from Rowland's Essay on "The Laws of Nature the Foundation of Morals," "The Literature of Dreams," and other works. Andrew Baxter's celebrated "Treatise on the Soul" has also been carefully perused; but it appears to the Author of this Essay that there is room for much more to be said upon the subject. His own ideas, such as they are, are offered to the consideration of those who like to think of our future existence, and desire to do so without too great reliance upon ancient dogmas.

## WHAT IS IT THAT DIES ?

“ We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.”

It is well known that the party of so-called Spiritualists, especially in America, lay claim to our belief in their creed, mainly because of the supposed apparitions of those already dead.

It is my purpose in this essay to consider what the condition, powers, and properties of disembodied spirits might be expected to be.

We know, to a certain extent, the component parts of men while alive, we do not know the composition of that part of them that survives the grave.

We may, however, by a careful examination of what we know of men during their lives, arrive at some theory of what survives, and what, therefore, we may by analogy expect to present itself if it should please the Deity to permit the spirit to revisit the scenes of its former dwelling upon earth.

I propose first to endeavour to trace out what we know of life in other animals as well as in man ; secondly, to point out the difference between man and the brute creation ; thirdly, to give the different theories of man's immortal part ; and lastly, to attempt to show what may reasonably be expected to be the properties of that immortal part after the death of the mortal part.

In these days there can be very little fear of any one denying the doctrine of the immortality of some part of us, of that part which carries with it identity and responsibility for the deeds done in the body, whilst it is part of the essential belief of Christianity that at a future day the immortal spirit shall reappear in a bodily form. With those who doubt either of these doctrines I have no concern, nor do I intend to meet any of their possible objections.

What is Life? In the *vegetable* we find life without voluntary motion. The *vegetable* has a circulation, respiration, and digestion, and it is an important part of our subject, and a curious one, that this form of life is continued day and night, summer and winter. The *animal* and man

participate in these qualities; with them, also, the circulation of the blood always goes on, breathing and digestion continue, whether they are asleep or awake, in motion or at rest, independently of the will. We cannot by the mere exercise of the will arrest the current of the blood, or the action of the lungs, or the digestive organs. We may check the current of the blood or the actions of the lungs for a few seconds or even minutes, but that is all; we have not the power over them that we have over our muscles or our thoughts.

Life in the *vegetable* also implies growth and the power of continuing its species—vital energy, as these qualities have been happily termed. The vegetable has *not motion or will, and but a feeble form of instinct* which leads it to seek the light with its shoots, and nourishment with its roots; and in this craving for light and nourishment it will assume a form and run to a length that in its usual condition would be unnecessary and monstrous.

In the animal we are at once aware of a new power, that of motion. Motion enables the animal to seek its food and its mate, and enjoy existence in a far higher degree than the vegetable. The glad and lightsome activity of the lamb or kitten, the intelligence and sociality of the ant and bee, the artfulness of the fox and chamois, the wonderful sagacity of the dog, and horse, and elephant, in turn arouse our admiration, our wonder, and our thoughtfulness. The intelligence also of the dog and other domesticated animals, and their capability of learning till they almost appear to think, and to act *after* thinking, would incline a cursory observer to attribute to them powers beyond instinct and akin to reason.

It is perhaps a proper place here to remark that life does not seem to depend upon *the possession of the body by a soul*; no one suggests that vegetables have souls, yet they have life, and the property of continuing their species. Some writers appear to have overlooked this entirely, and speak of the soul as the living principle of man. Life depends upon the presence in the circulating fluid of a power, call it vital energy if you will, which originated the circulation of that fluid and continues its circulation; as the Hebrew lawgiver says, "The life is in the blood," when the sap ceases to flow the plant dies. The breath may *cease* in man for a time and the lungs remain at rest, but as long as the heart beats or the blood flows there is life, and by artificial inflation the lungs may be set in motion, and the man may breathe again.

The animal, besides possessing motion, possesses the five senses, and through these organs it perceives what passes in the world around it. Motion in a living creature *implies* a will. The *will* receiving impressions through the senses and the appetites, governs the conduct of the animal when hunger compels it to seek food where its instinct teaches that food will be found. The will puts the muscles in motion to carry the body to that place. The eyes, the ears, or the nose bring the presence of food to its intelligence, and the will bends the mouth towards it. If danger from another animal arises the will again rouses the body to exertion to meet or fly from the danger. The will has the power to choose between self-preservation and the appetite's gratification. The wolf will retire from the carcase at the approach of the lion. The same will decides in choosing a mate and in choosing a place of repose. When the animal is stirred by fear, anger, jealousy, or love of its offspring, it has a power of decision, it is not urged mechanically. A cock that has been beaten one day will not renew the combat next day blindly, but waits till it has grown stronger or its adversary weaker.

The will, however, is not the vital principle, and although I have said that the will puts the muscles in motion it is not quite correct, for the muscles move when the will is asleep, or they move independently of the will when wounded, or cramped during sleep, or after death even. The will, too, in animals appears to be mainly guided by the faculty which we call instinct, which is an impulse urging each animal to act exactly as other animals of the same species have done before, to do the same, neither *more nor less*.

The swallow builds just the same nest as the swallow did a thousand years ago. The dog will follow his master and chase for him the stag or hare, or guard his house this year just as dogs did a thousand years ago, with no more or less intelligence. Horses show the same stubbornness or docility as their forefathers. The march of centuries has given the bee no greater cunning in preserving her honey stores from greedy man or voracious bears, nor ought diminished her obedience to her queen, nor a whit impaired her power of unerring return to her hive, however distant. The carrier-pigeon brought from York to London, when released, flies back no faster or straighter than the same species did in former ages. It is true one man could by careful breeding and judicious training, rear a horse to run faster, or a dog to find game quicker, than any other horse or dog, but the

qualities exhibited by this particular dog or horse do not arouse in other dogs or horses any spirit of imitation or emulation.

This would seem to imply that there are in animals no powers of perception and comparison, so as by *accumulation* of experience, to act differently at one time to the manner in which the brute animal has acted at another. The brute animal has, no doubt, memory; this enables the horse to retrace the road it has gone before; this enables the dog to remember what it has been taught; this enables the pigeon to find its own loft among a hundred roofs in the smoky streets of London; and this gives the hunted fox additional chances of escaping the dogs when chased through well-known fields. These lower animals have the passions of anger, jealousy, resentment of injury, cunning, and selfishness, and the faculty of attachment to their mates, their young, and the human species. We find among bees, ants, squirrels, dogs, and some few other animals the habit of storing food; a wonderful faculty which, expanded by the superior intelligence of man, becomes the source of accumulation of wealth. The love of the mate and their young conduces to the grouping of mankind into families. The power of attachment in the brute to other animals or to man is among mankind the source of friendship and hero-worship. The association of certain animals, such as the bee, the beaver, and the ant for the production of large works, becomes in man the source of society and the foundation of nations. The herding of cattle and sheep and wild elephants foreshadows the associations of men in companies, and the chase by wolves, dogs, and jackals in packs typifies men banded together for the chase or war. Animals profit by the superior strength of others; the jackal waits to finish the carcass the lion has struck down and is gorging upon; the crow looks for what the raven may leave. Animals have their parasites.

“ Each larger brute has another brute that haunts him like a brother,  
 And that brute has a smaller thing, and that one has another.  
 Each insect has a lesser one to worry and to bite him,  
 And that, too, has its parasite, *usque ad infinitum.*”

Animals have their architects. The wasp scrapes wood in little chips from decaying trees, and uniting them with gum, secreted by itself, forms an elegantly shaped dome beneath which to build its cell. Some bees scoop holes in a gravel bank and line the nest with rose leaves cut in semi-circles. A species of spider constructs a house with a door hinged at one side and

furnished with an elastic band that pulls the door to as he passes through. Animals have their leaders. Among gregarious animals one, not necessarily the strongest male, for it is just as often an old female, leads the herd in its wanderings, or watches, whilst they feed, against the approach of an enemy. Instances of sagacity and wonderful instinct could be multiplied, but enough has perhaps been related to bring to mind many other notable instances illustrative of the extent to which instinct in animals has been developed.

How does all this happen? Very little reflection upon the formation of the being that is possessed of life, motion, the senses, passions, and appetites, will lead us to see that there must be something in that being to form the connecting link between the rise of these qualities and their outward exhibition in the breathing body. This link has been traced to the brain, a wonderful thing placed in the head of each animal, and giving expression as far as we yet know to the various emotions and desires.

We cannot say, and I speak with great deference to others who have written on the subject, *that we find anything more than a material soul, if by soul is understood the invisible guiding principle of the visible.* As the vital energy of life is the origin and aggregation of the powers of the circulation, respiration, growth, and power of generation in the body; so is the soul of the animal the origin and aggregation of the affections, emotions, feelings, desires, propensities, and inclinations. The senses are the organs through which all outward objects act upon the brain. The brain is the source from which all manifestations of emotion first emanate. *The brain is material,* its action partly mechanical. Insects in which we can hardly trace brain must yet have something analogous, although it will be readily admitted that there is a vast difference between an insect and the higher types of animals; the latter are susceptible of attachment, and insects are not; even sexual passion is but momentary in them; they care neither for their mates nor their offspring. In such creatures the brain must be very small.

To use an illustration from holy writ, we may trace in animals the germs of faith, of love and hope, but very little, if any, of true charity. Yet the greatest of these is charity we are told. Consider the attachment that a faithful dog has for its master, how it watches for his appearance in the morning how delighted when he comes, showing



its joy by fawning, jumping, barking, and licking the hand, and then how patiently it waits for food whilst his master eats. The wonderful stories of the dog's patient waiting by his dead or wounded master, of the mode in which he tries to arrest the attention of other men who could aid his master, of his visiting his master's grave, and sometimes dying upon it, the well authenticated stories we have heard of this animal's wonderful sagacity in extraordinary circumstances, coupled with this strong personal attachment quite equal to the personal attachment of a slave or servant, compel us to think at times, in spite of our reason, that the dog must have a spirit in common with man, resembling his and alike immortal.

But on reflection, we may not share in the belief of the ignorant Scythians, the poetic Persians, and the North American Indians who people the happy hunting-grounds of their own future hopes, with the dogs and horses they knew and possessed when alive. Yet it is important to our argument to remember how much perfection, how much that is loving, sagacious, and intelligent is born only for this mortal life, and leaves nothing behind but the form enshrined in its owner's memory, or its fame in sporting annals. Those animals that are domesticated by man seem to have their intelligent powers much more developed, and they both imitate him and learn from him; but do not *accumulate* knowledge or *pass* it from one to another. "Each brute commences life as if he were the first of his species, every man begins life with the acquired knowledge of previous generations." Want of language is an obstacle; animals have evidently the power of communicating with each other, but not with articulate utterance. The communications of the hen to her chickens are various, and to a certain extent understood by them. In truth, all the powers of the brain in animals, all the ideas received by it, seem to be referred to and bounded by instinct, whilst in man the same powers and ideas are subjected to a higher intelligence that can mould them at its will, and produce from them new and varied forms.

I trust that we have now arrived at a stage of our inquiry at which we may fairly suppose, first, that life (or existence alone) is found in the *vegetable* form; secondly, that *animals* that have life and senses are guided in the inferior types by instinct, and in the superior types by the affections also; thirdly, that these superior types have the power of imitation, and also of learning from man to do certain things to which their instinct and even their affections would

not alone have guided them; fourthly, that the aggregate of their affections, hopes, desires, and passions may be termed a *soul*, an invisible part of *them*, yet residing in the *substance* of the brain.

I need hardly here enter at large upon the inquiry whether the lower animals have an immortal spirit. It would be quite repugnant to our feelings to feed upon animals if we thought they partook with us of immortality, and for what object could such a privilege be given them when we are taught that our knowledge of right and wrong (a knowledge which is our birthright, but which to animals comes only by painful teaching through us) is given to enable us to prepare for and appreciate a future state of existence, and that our powers of moral perception and consequent improvement, which have the same ultimate tendency, are denied to the lower animals. "The soul of the beast goes downwards into the earth." There is not the least evidence in nature to imply that the minds of animals survive their bodies.

Now, we know that in man the brain continues its operations during sleep, that this is termed dreaming. Do animals dream? It has been believed for many ages that animals do dream. Lucretius says:—

"The weary horse, as on the grass he lies,  
Oft sweats and pants laborious in his sleep,  
As though he still were struggling in the race.  
So, too, the hound, amid his soft repose,  
Starts up abrupt, and howls, and snuffs the breeze  
As though still he chased or tracked the antlered trembler.  
So, too, the lap dog, his inglorious sleep  
Breaks not unfrequent, rousing all erect,  
Urged by the semblance of some face unknown.  
Hence birds with flight abrupt will to the centre of the sacred groves  
At midnight hurry, in their dreams disturbed  
By hideous sight of hawks on outstretched wings,  
Hovering aloft and ready for the pounce."

I do not know that I have met with the observation anywhere before, but the monkey tribe in one thing may be said to be in advance of other animals, namely, in the possession of hands, by which they can grasp and use sticks, stones, and other missiles. Is it possible that before the creation of Adam—the thinking and speaking man—there was a race of beings resembling man in his power of walking erect and his use of implements for making huts, and cooking utensils, and implements for war and the chase, and yet dumb and uninhabited by immortal spirits? If it be objected that we have

not among the superior types of animals any capable of providing for future wants, we answer that bees and beavers provide, dogs store up bones and hide them, birds provide against winter by migration to another country. As Pope says :—

“ Who taught the nations of the field and wood  
 To shun their poison and to choose their food ?  
 Prescient, the tides or tempests to withstand,  
 Build on the wave or arch beneath the sand ?  
 Who bids the stork, Columbus-like, explore  
 Heavens not his own, and lands unknown before ?  
 Who calls the council, states the certain day,  
 Who forms the phalanx, and who points the way ?”

Instinct, as in the case of birds, insects, &c., may have instructed the dumb mortal man to provide and use implements, to cook, if cook he did, and to build huts ; as the birds and wasps, and also as certain baboons in Africa erect bowers in the trees, and live in communities. But the existence or non-existence of such beings forming the link between man as at present constituted, and the higher types of the present brute creation is unnecessary to the argument, and is only mentioned here as a possible solution of kitchen middens and flint implements.

Let us pass on to the consideration of the grand difference of man from and his superiority over his fellow animal creation. These consist in his possession of speech, reason, and, above all, of an *immortal spirit*. His gift of speech enabled him to communicate to others his ideas and experience ; and the acquisition of the arts of painting, sculpture, and writing, enabled him to transmit his thoughts and ideas to persons then unborn. His gift of reason enabled him, first, to see that he owed his existence to a mighty and invisible being whom he learned to worship and implore, whose works on earth he investigated ; whose works in the heavens he admired, learning the laws which govern their motions ; whose revelations he received with reverence, whilst he has striven in every age and country, in a measure, to conform his actions to what he rightly or wrongly believed to be his Creator's will—all which was impossible to the brute creation ; secondly, man's reason enabled him to perceive the difference between bad and good, and how that which was good might be improved to better, it enabled him to think and compare, and hold out to himself an ideal perfection, in striving towards which he went beyond the promptings of his bodily sensations and passions. The impulses of his body and soul, which man has in

common with the brute creation, would prompt him to many things which his reason enabled him to develop into better things.

Locke tells us that "The senses are the physical instruments employed to convey ideas to man and brutes. The ideas we have arise from our senses which convey them to the brain. Reflection furnishes the brain with other ideas arising out of its dealing with the ideas coming from the senses. All our knowledge begins with sense, proceeds to the understanding (or brain), and ends with reason." Rowland says, "What is the difference between man and brutes? If he has a larger brain, many of them have more acute senses. The physiological nature and organisation of man and brute is identical; the appetites are identical, but whilst these in the latter are employed to definite action, only to sustain life and continue the species, in the former beyond this they tend to develop labour by the necessity man is under to work for his food, to develop property by showing the advantage of storing up and accumulation of food, to develop, in fine (by the same gradual working of the laws of appetite), trade, society, the family, and government. The appetites are the foundation of man's moral condition and the sources of much of his happiness, but they are also the sources of all the moral evil he commits."

Reason teaches man to curb his appetites and render them subservient to higher purposes. Reason, man's nobler nature, gives him higher thoughts and finer impulses. "How is it that on the same foundations in man a structure so vast and so varied as human society is based and raised, and protected by moral law, whilst brutes remain passive occupants of one uniform round of animal existence, from which no brute has ever emerged? The capacity in man must have been given as necessary to raise the human race above its animal prototype, and could not have been accomplished without the gift of reason. Again, man is gifted with the *benevolent* affections exclusively. "No brute ever performed an action for the exclusive good of another of the same species." Man, again, is under the influence of conscience, and knows what is a criminal act, but a brute animal of itself is incapable of knowing what is crime; it can act only according to its nature. Again, brutes remain stationary, whilst the lowest of the human race are capable of improvement, and the whole race is gradually increasing its knowledge and improving its social position. Man could not be developed from an animal, but must

have been a new creation designed to rise to a state of social, intellectual, and moral existence unknown in the world before. Reason and the new system of man's existence upon earth were cotemporary and part of the same design."

Man, by means of his reason and his nobler aspirations, is capable of comprehending the general laws by which the world around him is governed, of acquiring the sciences of astronomy, geography, &c., of cultivating the arts, and further, which is of great importance in forming morality, a quality unknown in the brute, man is capable of comprehending *law* as a rule between man and man. Grotius says, "Natural law is founded on the knowledge that enables men to act similarly in similar cases, with a peculiar desire for society, and as an instrument of that desire, language is given to man alone of all animals. He has the faculty of knowing and acting according to general principles. Man naturally recognises certain laws, such as if we have in our possession anything belonging to another, the restitution of it is necessary, that promises should be fulfilled, that there should be the reparation of damage done by fault, and the recognition of certain things as meriting punishment, the judgment and power of estimating advantages and disadvantages, and in these both *present, and future good and ill.*" Butler and Hutcheson coincide in the two positions, that disinterested affections and a distinct moral faculty are essential parts of human nature. Mansel says, "Moral philosophy can in no sense be said to be superseded by revelation, it is based upon facts of human nature which existed from the beginning, those facts exist still and form its legitimate province. Revelation gives to moral philosophy a higher value and a deeper significance." Austin says, "Our happiness depends upon keeping God's laws, and he has not committed us to the guidance of our slow reason, but has endowed us with feelings which warn us at every step and pursue us with reproaches if we wander from the path of our duty; these feelings are styled the moral sense." It appears from these illustrious writers that man is considered to possess a power which, rightly used, is available to check and guide his animal propensities, and that this power called indifferently "the nobler part of man," "the immortal part of man," and "the spirit of man," belongs peculiarly and solely to the human race.

Man possesses life in common with the vegetable, a soul, senses, affections, and intelligence in common with the brute creation, and

a nobler immortal spirit peculiar to himself. We have, then, man, in his threefold nature of body, soul, and spirit. What is it that dies when the body dies? It has been a universal belief that some part of man survives, leaving the body and taking refuge in another world. As a great many persons argue for a separate existence of the spirit, from the fact that when the body is asleep the soul is awake, evidenced by the peculiar faculty of *dreaming*; it will not be irrelevant to our investigation if we notice the phenomena of dreams.

We are told by a modern writer that "Sleep is a state of the body in which the sense become inactive and, as it were, dead; while, at the same time, the nutritive system and the functions essential to life go on. Consequently, we lose during sleep consciousness, as far as externals are concerned; we lose all voluntary power over the physical and muscular frame; and all voluntary control over the operation of the mind; the mind still remaining active, however, and its operations going on uncontrolled by the will. What, then, is a dream? Ordinarily, the intellectual activity of a sleeping person which leaves its traces in the waking consciousness. The causes of dreaming are as numerous as the several faculties of the mind, the feelings, and the functions of the body. Dreams, though freakish, are not altogether the children of accident, they are modified by our present bodily sensations and especially by the internal state of our physical system, and secondly, by our previous waking thoughts, dispositions, and prevalent states of mind." Do dreams arise from and are they carried on by the sensations of vital force and the soul, with such powers as we see are in the lower animals? Do dreams belong only to the lower part of our human nature, our mental body? or has man's nobler part any share in them? Many have argued from a majority of our dreams, that there is no moral feeling in them, that we are never conscientious in our dreams, that we never know right from wrong. As although if we commit a crime in our dreams we frequently try to escape its consequences (so will a cat try to escape punishment of its theft); if we find ourselves undressed we feel ashamed; it is said that yet these feelings may proceed from the association of the soul and spirit when awake, for it is clear that the spirit does not generally govern our sleeping ideas. With regard to dreams, Dr. Hoffman says, "In dreaming, many things

previously obscure become clear, things long forgotten recur to the memory, and powers which nature seemed to have denied to us are developed during sleep." Cyrus is represented by Xenophon, as saying "Nothing more closely resembles the death of man than sleep; but it is in sleep that the soul of man appears most divine, and foresees something of the future, for then it is most at liberty." Sir Walter Scott says, in his "Demonology," "Enthusiastic feelings of an impressive nature occur which seem to add ocular testimony to an intercourse betwixt the earth and the world beyond it. For example, a son deprived of his father feels a sudden crisis approach in which he is anxious to have recourse to his sagacious advice; or the wretched man that has slain another is haunted by the apprehension that the phantom of the slain stands by the bedside of his murderer. In these cases who shall doubt that the imagination has power to summon up to the organ of sight spectres which exist only in the minds of those by whom this apparition seems to be witnessed? If we add that such a vision may take place in the course of those lively dreams, in which the patient is sensible of lying on his own bed at the time when the supposed apparition is manifested, it becomes almost in vain to argue with the visionary against the reality of his dream, since the spectre though itself purely fanciful, is *inserted* amid so many circumstances which he feels to be true. That which is undeniably real becomes a warrant for the reality of the *appearance*, to which *doubt* would otherwise have attached; and if any event, such as the death of the person dreamed of, chances to take place, so as to correspond with the nature and time of the apparition, the coincidence (though one which must be frequent, since our dreams usually refer to the accomplishment of that which haunts our minds when awake, and often *presage* the most probable events) seems perfect, and the chain of circumstances touching the evidence seems complete. Consider of what stuff dreams are made; how naturally they turn upon those who occupy our minds when awake: when a sailor is exposed to the danger of the seas or a beloved relative is attacked by disease, how readily our sleeping imagination rushes to the very point of alarm, which, when waking, it had shuddered to anticipate. The number of instances in which such lively dreams have been quoted, asserted, and received as communications, is very great at all periods. Yet, considering the number of dreams, the coincidences between the vision and real event are *far fewer* than a fair calculation of chances would lead us to expect."

Dr. Watts says, "Mr. Locke supposes that if the soul thinks while the body is sleeping, then it has its own concerns apart from the body." But I answer, the ideas of our dreams and waking thoughts, though they both exist in the mind, are yet occasioned by the motion of the same blood and spirits, and are the acts of the soul and body united. The actions of life, which belong only to the body, or only to the soul, are generally attributed to the whole man. We have no reason to think Socrates, asleep, to be a distinct person from Socrates awake, though the soul alone were engaged in thinking while he was asleep. Thomas Cromwell says, "If the ability to dream proves in man the existence of an immortal spirit, the dog, who, sleeping on your hearthrug, as plainly dreams as though he could tell you the subject that agitates his slumbers, must not be less allowed to possess it." Dr. Hartley remarks, "That those who walk and talk in their sleep have, evidently, the nerves of the muscles concerned so free that the vibrations can descend from the internal parts of the brain, the peculiar residence of the ideas, into them." Dugald Stewart is of opinion that "That in sleep the power of volition is suspended, but that the *influence* of the will over the faculties of the mind and body is then interrupted. Volition is painfully exerted during nightmare although the power of moving the body is suspended. The desire to move must not be confounded with the will to move." Do we not in dreams go through the mental part of the process concerned in walking, running, and using our hands, although the muscles do not respond to our desires? And in somnambulism the muscles obey this mental process, although the reasoning faculties are still dormant and do not guide the body; instinct alone guides and preserves it from danger. There is no influence of judgment in dreams, the relative consistency of the mental faculties is suspended, the mind may exercise the faculties of conception, memory, association, &c., individually, but there is no judgment to produce a perfect conclusion. All men, whilst they are awake, are in one common world, but each of them, when asleep, is in a world of his own." Such are the opinions of eminent men upon dreams.

The most important part of us remains in part, if not wholly, at rest; the senses are almost at rest, the will is at rest; the moral faculty, by which we discern good from evil, and by which we are chiefly distinguished from animals which have no responsibility, is also at rest. I am inclined to believe, therefore, that



dreams are the production of the animal part of man, the results of the perturbations and workings of the brain, acted upon by the animal spirits and functions of the body. Even memory, the most important faculty exercised, is a part of the animal nature, and is only *more* developed in man than the brute creation, because he has a larger scope for its exercise. If dreams are asserted to prove the distinction between mind and matter, they equally prove the dependence of mind on matter, and cannot be said to belong only to mankind.

The ancients seem to have clearly recognised the existence of some part of man after death. Their ideas are familiar to us through Homer and Virgil's poems. Man after death was only a shadow without muscles or substance; with great inconsistency, however, these shadows could speak and hear, could lap up blood, and had an interest in anything going on in the world they had left.

The Scythians killed slaves, horses, &c., on the graves of the departed warriors, that their shades might have slaves and horses. The North American Indians had their beliefs of another world, where the shades of Indians pursued the shades of deer and buffaloes. Other nations believed that the soul, on quitting the body of man passed into the body of a brute or another human body; such people considered, with greater wisdom than the people called spiritualists, that the spirit required a body to enable it to exercise its propensities and prove its existence.

It remained, however, for St. Paul to show the world how at a future time the spirit should rise again, or reappear in a bodily tangible form, to answer for what it had done under its human form, and to again enjoy existence in a more perfect manner than heretofore. It is hardly the place to enter upon theological discussion, but I may be allowed to suggest that Paul seems to have laid down the principle that the body is *mortal* and dies, that *another body*, resembling the first so far (in shape or some other attributes) that it may be recognised, as we recognise wheat to spring from grain, and a vine from a grape, but still another body, not the old one, not flesh and blood, shall be created for *each spirit in the resurrection day*. This would be in perfect conformity with the teaching of science and experience, viz.: that the present body entirely decays, crumbles, and is converted into dust. Yet many Christians to this day talk and write as if the *body* were *immortal* as well as the *spirit*, and that the dust into which it has fallen shall be at the resurrection

gathered up particle by particle, and be reunited, reanimated, and reinhabited flesh and blood as before.

Other ingenious writers have said that, as Paul tells us, that a seed is sown and apparently dies, but that a germ survives, and is the shoot of a future plant; so the body apparently all dies, but that a part of it, a part of the body, *really survives*, and is the germ of the future resurrection body. I would answer, that there is no reasonable ground for this theory, however plausible. Common sense tells us that when a body is burnt, as was the practice with the ancients, and is now with the Parsees, there can be no living residuum among the ashes. It seems far better to think that St. Paul meant that the spirit representing the important part of man survived the death of the body or husk in which it dwelt while on earth, and is the germ of the future man.

We are reminded in one of the Bampton lectures, by Dr. Goulburn, that "Resurrection must not be confounded with the miraculous reanimation of the old natural body, it is a development into a superior life, rather the adaptation to a higher than the restoration of a former state." "We believe heaven to be the abode of spirits without bodies of flesh and blood; will men have their old gross bodies restored to them when they are about to become coinhabitants of heaven with the angels? Space will not permit the enumeration of theories on this topic; enough perhaps, has been stated to show the universal belief in the immortality of the spirit after the body dies. What powers has that spirit when separated from the body?"

Here, again, we are met with a belief common in all ages, that it retains its consciousness, a certain existence, faculty of motion, affections, and interests in the world it has left, and a power of revisiting that world and becoming visible to the eyes of mortals. Upon this common belief the modern spiritualists found their extraordinary doctrines, that the spirit chooses also to make itself known to mortals by the puerile and ridiculous methods of touching them, playing musical instruments, moving furniture, writing upon paper, and answering by muscular raps upon wood such questions as may be put to them. In all ages superstition has had its votaries, whose credulity has kept pace with the imagination of their leaders. Spiritualists have answers ready to those who object to the purposeless character of their spirits' communications, and the clumsy mode in which those communications are made. To such believers it is of no use to point out that if a spirit

can write at all, it might write all its messages, and if it can use muscles in writing, table turning, playing the violin, and grasping the knees of believers, the same spirits might surely talk at once and exercise all as well as any of the senses ?

But we should prefer to take higher ground, and ask for proof, analogical or otherwise, that a spirit can exercise any muscular force whatever. Where do we find real grounds for supposing that a spirit has the power of motion, of visiting this world, or becoming visible to the eyes of mortals? The only arguments exist in the assertions of dreamers, those both of the night and of the day. To any one who will calmly think over the natural sequence of the death of the body, both in man and in the lower animals, it will appear far less likely that the apparition of a deceased man or dog should revisit the earth than that the soul or spirit of a living dog or man should leave its body and visit another soul yet in the body. Even this doctrine has had its believers; and, arguing from the known powers of man during dreams, trances, as well as in waking life, it would seem to be far more reconcilable to common sense and scientific analogy to hold that our spirit could quit its body temporarily during life, than that it should or could really appear in any form after death. Whilst in the body we have a will, affections, the senses, and the power of motion; we have human feelings, and may wish to visit, and warn, and console our absent friends. But apart from the body we not only do *not* know that we shall have the power of motion, but it is most reasonable to suppose that we shall be altogether in another part of the universe, and, until we are like the angels, have no power of leaving it.

And I would suggest, also, that if we should know what was passing here below, and retained our memory and affections, the knowledge of the conflicts and struggles of life, perhaps the illness and misfortunes of our friends, would be an unceasing bitter grief to us, a grief the greater because we could not help them, and could only mourn over their human failings. However nobly and virtuously the few (more advantageously placed among mankind) may be living and acting, it is to be feared that the masses do not live or act in such a manner as could command the respect or esteem of those who, having quitted this world, *must* look back upon it with loftier ideas and nobler feelings. Yet, if departed spirits know what is going on and retain their affections, *they* can not look back

upon the world and remain calm and happy. With this harmonises the passage of Scripture (Job, 14 c.), "Man lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be *no more*, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." And again, "It is sown a natural body ψυχικον σῶμα (an *animal* body), it is raised a spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν)." The *early* Christians treated the assertion of the Gnostics, "That the soul entered heaven *before* the resurrection day," as a heresy, until the theologians of Alexandria resuscitated the Gnostic system, which may now be said to be the prevalent opinion.

No hope is more satisfactory to man than that he shall one day live again with a body free from all the disturbing influences of this present one, though having human affections and friendships, and a mind capable of understanding what are now mysteries, and faculties of doing and knowing as angels do and know; yet a pure spirit would hardly seem to be capable of enjoyment apart from a will and affections.

Another world, constituted of spirits employing themselves according to the doctrine of the spiritualists, would be a world worse than the Hades of Virgil, and more to be shunned and dreaded than life as it is now endured by the Esquimaux or the savages of Terra del Fuego.

I see no ground for expecting that the immortal spirit carries with it into another world *any capacity* for *sensuous* enjoyment. I have shewn all its earthly powers to be partaken of in common with the brute; if we have a soul, the aggregate of the passions and feelings of the senses, so have brutes a soul. If our soul be immortal, so, it would seem, would the brute's soul be immortal. The arguments for man's existence after death with sight, and hearing, and affections, still existing and active, would apply equally, in my humble opinion, to the brute's existence after death.

I incline, therefore, to the belief that the immortal spirit of man sleeps after death until the day when it shall again possess a body and soul; and though I confess there is much connected with death that is still a profound mystery, it does appear to me that, to the question, "What is it that dies?" we must answer, "All dies in an animal that makes an animal; that only survives which distinguishes man from other animals, namely, his reason, his responsible and immortal spirit with faculties comprehending morality and capable of improvement, that part alone in which he resembles his great maker, who formed man in his own image, in his own threefold nature."

## NOTES.

---

Page 21.—Ψυχη-*Psyche-Anima*.—The soul, the animal cause of the actions and expressions of the individual body.

πνευμα, *Pneuma*.—The Spirit. The character of the individual, that by which he is known, that which he impresses on the age, or his fellow-men.

“No man knoweth the things of a man but the spirit of man which is in him;”  
*i. e.*, a brute does *not* know himself.

The appetites come from the body.

The desires come from the soul.

Aspirations heavenward from the spirit.

## APPENDIX.

---

### PROPOSITIONS.

That man partakes with animals of certain powers, affections, and instincts, the seat of which is in the body, which die with it.

That man's nobler part, with its recognition of the Deity, its sense of morality, the feeling of responsibility, and above all its individual characteristics, survives death and reside in his immortal spirit.

That this immortal spirit, in the language of the bible, sleeps till the resurrection day—having no form or substance.

That at the resurrection day this spirit will be clothed with a new immortal body, of substance and quality like the angels.

### DEDUCTIONS.

That the immortal spirit cannot reappear upon earth.

That all visions, supposed to be seen by men, of departed spirits are the creation of their own imaginations.

### REMARKS.

That it may please the Deity to work a miracle, and cause a departed spirit to reappear, as in the recorded cases of Samuel and Moses, but such are only exceptions to the general rule; and any man who declares he has seen a departed spirit should prove the necessity for the miracle.