

dred tongues, and finds in its presence the indication of the course by which the Dravidians entered India.

The affiliation of the above mentioned languages may be considered as nearly settled. Mr. Hodgson's researches would also seem to connect together the various dialects of Eastern India, and refer them possibly to the nearest neighbors of the Scythian stock, while the un-Sanskrit portion of the northern dialects still awaits careful analysis.

We had hoped to mention the efforts of the East India Government and of missionary societies, to civilize and christianize these rude tribes. But the Article is even now, we fear, too long. Government has found that, among them, a kind word has been more potent than a hard blow; while missionaries of the gospel have found readier hearers among them, than where Brahmanism has benumbed the sensibility and steeled the heart.

ARTICLE III.

THE RESURRECTION AND ITS CONCOMITANTS.¹

BY REV. E. RUSSELL, D. D., EAST RANDOLPH.

THE discourse that fell from the lips of the great teacher of the Gentiles on Mars Hill at Athens, has never failed in power to excite thought and feeling in the human mind, and awaken discussion in every age. In the production of this effect, all the circumstances of time, place, the subject-matter of what was uttered, the character of the speaker and of those who listened, unite to secure. He stood in the midst of the city that was the "eye of Greece," and has been the

¹ *Authors to which reference has been had in the preparation of this Article — Anastasis, or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and*

school of the world. He spoke from the place, where the voice of the orator had so often —

“ Shook the arsenal and fulminated over Greece
To Macedon and Artaxerxes' throne.”

He stood in the presence of an immense assembly, in the midst of Grecian temples, surrounded on every hand with the creations of Grecian art, and taste, and learning, and sketched, in bold and graphic outlines, the theme of redemption by Christ. The records of oratory supply nothing that is a parallel in dignity, and grandeur, and interest, with what was here uttered. Into this discourse, the grand features of essential truth were condensed; and the image had more power to stir emotion and thought, than all the wonders of Grecian architecture, statuary, or painting. The audience to which it was addressed, the place where it was delivered, and the massive truth which it embodies, conspire to make it a monument that will stand beautiful, attractive, and sublime long after the last fragments of the Parthenon shall have crumbled back to dust. The audience, the most cultivated and intelligent, doubtless, in the then known world, listened to the speaker with apparent attention and respect till the resurrection of the dead was affirmed. The assembly then became restive, the discourse itself was suspended, and a further hearing at the great forum of Attic eloquence, was denied. To an Athenian, the doctrine of a future state of existence was familiar. It was to him no new thing. The doctrine of re-

Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University.

Eschatology, or the Scripture Doctrine of the coming of our Lord, the Judgment and the Resurrection, by Samuel Lee. Boston : J. E. Tilton & Co. 1859.

Resurrection of the same Body asserted from the traditions of the Heathen, the Ancient Jews, and the Primitive Church, with an answer to the objections brought against it. By Humphry Hody, D. D., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford and London, 1694.

The Apologetics of the Athenian Philosopher, Athenagoras. 1. For the Christian Religion. 2. For the truth of the Resurrection, etc. By David Humphrys, B. A., of Trinity College, in Cambridge, London, 1714.

Landis, on the Resurrection of the Body, 1846.

Landis, on the Immortality of the Soul, 1859.

tribution was not for the first time, in the year of our Lord fifty-two, learned by him on Mars Hill. The Athenian believed and he had been taught to believe, from the days of Homer and Solomon, by all the poets, philosophers, and orators of his country, that there was a scene of future and endless happiness, or of misery in reserve for every man in that world, to which death would introduce him. But the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and of the reunion of soul and body in that future world, was, for the philosophical Athenian, too absurd to be believed, too irrational and strange to command a respectful hearing, or receive anything at his hands but mockery and contempt. In this feeling many, in every age of our world, have sympathized; and many who have not shared in this sympathy, have felt difficulties and doubts in reference to it by no means easy to be removed or relieved.

The church of Christ, with almost entire unanimity, has believed and taught that the conversion of the world is to be effected through the instrumentality of preaching, accompanied by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; that the Saviour will appear a second time, not "to seek and save the lost," but to raise the dead, of all the generations of earth, and bring the entire world to judgment; and that, with this second advent of Christ, which is to take place in some unknown period of the future, the world itself will end, and the scenes of an eternal and perfect retribution begin. The doctrines of an intermediate state, of a resurrection of the dead, a final judgment, and end of the world, are the themes which, together, constitute what is designated a Christian Eschatology, and are really so connected or involved with each other, that all must stand or fall together.

The resurrection of the dead, or the resurrection from the dead, is the point of attack, therefore, that has been most fiercely assailed. Both of these phrases occur, repeatedly, in the language of the New Testament. The resurrection of the body is peremptorily and perseveringly denied. It is affirmed that the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, designates simply and only a future state of exist-

ence. The resurrection is declared to be an affair of every day occurrence. It takes place with every man at the instant of his death. As the globe, according to late estimates, is supposed to contain a population of some thirteen hundred millions, and as thirty-two millions die annually, and ninety or a hundred thousand daily, so some ninety or a hundred thousand pass daily to a resurrection state. At death, there is eliminated from these physical bodies, that have been transmitted to us from our first father, some subtle, ethereal, undefinable substance, in which the soul is enveloped while in its earthly tabernacle, so that soul and body enter, at once, on a changeless state of perfection and glory. We are not told exactly where, while in these physical structures, lie the germs of the body, that is to be thus eliminated — whether about the cranium, or above or below the diaphragm : we are assured, however, that they exist ; we are not informed by what microscopic power they become visible, or whether they can be made visible at all ; these germs exist, it is affirmed, in the bodies which we bear about with us, from day to day ; and the uninitiated, therefore, that cannot see, must walk by faith. It is further affirmed, that this resurrection body, that is eliminated at the death of every man, is developed by a natural law and not by the direct agency or power of God, as the scriptures unequivocally declare. There is, therefore, no intermediate state, no day of final judgment nor any end of the world, or termination of the present constitution of things in conformity with the uniform belief of the church of Christ in every age.

We have now stated the common and received doctrine in reference to the resurrection and its concomitants ; and the theories that have been avowed and urged in opposition to it. It will not be inappropriate, therefore, that we should state, in this connection, the grounds on which these theories are alleged to rest, and weigh their validity as arguments in opposition to the received doctrines. As we have intimated, it is the resurrection of the body that has been singled out and made the chief point of attack. On this have all the batteries of the enemy been opened. Hither have

all their missiles been hurled. They have rightly judged that, if this position could be effectually stormed and carried, the work of demolition along all the ramparts of revealed truth, would not long linger. Few doctrines, therefore, of the Christian scriptures, have encountered more objections than that of a resurrection from the dead. Against few, if any, have these objections been urged with more vigor, more learning, more of apparent thoughtfulness and respect, or more of a truly Athenian contempt. Natural science, in its every department, has been searched, and its results adduced (where they are supposed to have a disadvantageous bearing) to throw discredit on this doctrine of revelation. To these philosophical objections, as they have been designated, we now turn ; and, that no injustice may be done, we shall state them, for the most part, in the language which scepticism itself has sanctioned, if not rendered venerable.

1. This inquiry is submitted and alleged to be sufficient to settle the question of the resurrection of the body : How can the dead come forth from their graves, when they are not there ? The Saviour asserts that all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth. 'The sea, it is said in the visions of Patmos, gave up¹ the dead which were in it ; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them ; and they were judged, every man according to their works. But it is affirmed that the body, as life departs, reverts to dust ; that it is dissolved into the original or simple elements of which it is composed, and that these elements again enter into combination with the oak, the pine on the mountain tops, the grass, the flowers of the field, and with the herds and the flocks that graze the plains and the mountain sides. Let it be affirmed, therefore, by whom it may, is the defiant interrogatory, how can bodies come forth from their graves, when they are not there ? The dead that sunk to sleep on the fields of Waterloo, the thousands of widows that have been burned on the funeral piles of their husbands, the four hundred millions (as it has been estimated) deposited in the catacombs of Egypt, and taken from thence in great numbers, and, in

¹ Rev. 20 : 13.

the form of dried mummies, used for the purposes of fuel in the dwellings of the natives, or for firing engines on their railways, must have vanished, it is said, beyond all power of recovery. How are the bodies of all these, and of all the generations that will have lived and died on the earth, to reappear in the twinkling of an eye, when they must have become blended with an infinitude of other organizations of beast and bird and fish and insect, "that which no eye can see, no glass can reach." How are the bodies of the dead thus to reappear, when different human bodies must have equal claims to the particles which compose them? How are the dead to come forth from their graves, after being reduced to ashes on a funeral pile, or consumed in the fires of a railway engine?

Now in regard to this objection it may be well to note that the Saviour does not affirm that all are in graves. His language is not that of a universal, but of a particular, proposition. All that are in their graves, shall hear his voice and come forth. In Rev. 20 : 13 the sea, and death and hell, delivered up the dead that were in them. The Saviour's language, therefore, does not imply that all are in their graves; but, that such as are, shall hear his voice and come forth : while the Christian scriptures, taken as a whole, as in the passages here cited, assert, in the most positive and unqualified form, that the dead of the entire race of man shall come forth to judgment. On the supposition, then, that the fifteen or sixteen original or simple elements, of which every human body is composed, are to be collected from the four winds of heaven, at the instant of the resurrection, is there in it anything more adapted to excite surprise or wonder, than that these same elements, every day of our lives, should come from these same four winds, and become bone, and muscle, and ligament, and texture in the bodies which we bear about with us, from day to day? On the supposition that it is so — which we neither affirm nor believe — will it be a development so peculiar or unique in this universe, as to forestall all inquiry by the contradiction which it involves, or the absurdity which it bears on its face? Is there not a process, that has been in unceasing action with each of us

from the instant that the phenomena of life began, as unique and wonderful as such a resurrection of the dead? If the particles of matter, if the fifteen original substances which enter into combination in forming the structure of these bodies, have been gathered from torrid climes, from beneath the poles, from the depths of ocean, from the banks of the Mississippi, the Danube, the Ganges, and the spicy islands of the sea, why may not the same original particles be collected again, should occasion require, and become united in that incorruptible, immortal, vigorous, and spiritual body, which the scriptures affirm will rise up from every grave, from the ocean and the land, at the sound of the archangel's trump? If a particle of magnetic matter will penetrate what we designate a solid; if light will make, for itself, a path through a composition of silex and alkali, and in a second of time wing its way through two hundred thousand miles of space; if the substance electricity will pass among the particles of a copper or an iron solid, under ocean and over all the plains of earth in a twinkling, and proclaim to a world what has transpired, who shall say what may or may not be done with such of the original particles of these physical bodies as may be requisite to form the incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual body of the resurrection? The natural world has limits for intellectual powers limited like our own; boundaries, beyond which no ken of earth will ever reach, whatever progress may yet be made in unfolding the phenomena of the material universe and its laws. To the human mind, there are certainly mysteries in the facts, in all the ultimate facts of physical science. Among men, few are found who have much to allege against them by way of objection, but the incorrigibles and incapables of our world. As to any very grave doubts, which such persons may either conceive or express, or thick clouds with which they may envelop their own vision or that of others, we apprehend that their effect upon the whole grand movement of the universe of God, will be a little like that of the barnacles on the ship's bottom, which do not greatly disturb the ship's course.

But we do not affirm that, at the instant of the resurrec-

tion, there will be any such collection of the original elements that will have composed these bodies, needed. The scriptures call the event which is to take place at that hour, a mystery. "Behold!" says Paul, "I show you a mystery: we shall not all sleep; but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." Elsewhere, they describe it in this language: "who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself."¹ This same idea is again expressed by the same pen of inspiration in this form: "who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may become of the like form of his glorious body, according to the energy whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." The scriptures, then, say that the change effected at the instant of the resurrection, is a mystery. It is, therefore, like every other ultimate fact or truth in the universe of God, whether it be in the world of matter or of mind. The scriptures further say, it is accomplished by the "working of God," "by the energy of God, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." In other words, they assert that it is accomplished by the intervention of the direct agency and power of God.

The assertion, therefore, that the dead, at the resurrection, are represented as coming from where they are not, is a perversion of the language of inspiration, and the exhibition of a captiousness that ill becomes the theme itself, and the course of an honest inquiry.

To affirm further, that it is essential to the resurrection of the body that the original elements, of which it has been composed, should be collected from the four winds of heaven, is to assert what it is impossible to prove; since, if this be essential to a personal identity, there is not a human being on earth that has lived one, ten, or thirty years, who can make any pretensions to an identity of any kind, either personal or

¹ Phil. 3 : 21.

mental, if in fact there be such a distinction.¹ To affirm, again (in case it be essential to the resurrection of the body that the original substances of which "it has been composed," should be recombined), that there is no power which can accomplish it, is to forget the daily exhibitions of an agency, of a handiwork, of a power in the universe around us, that utterly baffles and confounds the most gifted intellect of earth.

If God be almighty, if he can create at all, if he can bring a single atom of matter from the abyss of nothingness into existence, it must certainly be difficult to set any limits to his power. If he had only to speak, and the confusion of chaos was hushed, and the world itself arose, in all its order and beauty and grandeur, then surely there is nothing impossible in the doctrine that all the millions that now, or shall hereafter, sleep in the dust of death, will spring to life again by the interposition of that same power which hung the earth on nothing in the empty space, kindled up the sun and the

¹ There is such a thing as organic identity in distinction from that of the mental or the vital principle, although resulting from the latter. The sameness of chemical composition and peculiarity of form and structure are the essential things that constitute organic identity. This organic identity consists in nothing else than sameness of chemical composition and peculiarity of form and structure. I pretend not, indeed, to describe how that specific and individual identity can be preserved amid the decompositions of the grave. But I do know that the specific characteristics of plants and animals are maintained in this world, under changes perhaps equally great; and when Jehovah declares that so it shall be in the resurrection of the dead, I joyfully acquiesce in the doctrine because I know that Infinite Power can accomplish that which Infinite Wisdom determines. (Dr. Hitchcock, *Bibliotheca*, April No. 1860.)

We suspect that all efforts to state in what either vegetable or animal identity consists will be a little like those of Locke in the same direction, not very clear or entirely satisfactory.

The same questions as in reference to the Athenian galley that was so often repaired as to leave not a vestige of the original materials of which it was constructed; and, in regard to the stockings that were so darned, will again be raised and agitated as long perhaps as that very grave one which once taxed all the resources of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, viz., whether the hog led the rope or the rope the hog, when the animal itself was conducted to the market.

Identity, either mental, vital, or organic, in whatever it may consist, must be recognized by the mind, perceived, felt, and can hardly be removed, therefore, from the phenomena of our intuitions.

stars, and evoked songs of joy from all the angels of God.

If the world, with all its minute and complicated arrangements, its order, with what we designate its laws, with all the mechanism and grandeur of these heavens that are over our heads, could thus spring into being, and be upheld hitherto by the same power that created, as they must have been, then there is nothing which the Maker of heaven may not accomplish in the fulfilment of his designs. In view of the agency or power that is to be employed in the production of this matchless result, there is certainly in the doctrine itself, no absurdity, no impossibility, nothing that should provoke a question or raise a doubt. If the universe of mind, too, could wake at the touch of this same power; by this same power the spark of immortality be enkindled, and powers of thought and feeling spring into being, that are to burn and glow when suns and worlds shall have passed away; then, no man, at the bar of reason, can be justified who forecloses all argument on this subject with the declaration that the doctrine is itself contradictory, absurd, or impossible. Much less is there in it anything to provoke an Athenian mockery, or inspire contempt. If God, at the first, collected the materials and formed the original pair of each genus and of each species of animals now found on the face of the earth; or if he made them of nothing; if he thus formed the first pair of the human family, so that they came, in perfection, from his hands; if he fixed the conditions or the law by which the successive generations should rise and depart from the world; then, in that very act of creation, are all the wonders and all the mysteries — and no more — which are found in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

To believe in the one and reject the other, is to wage a conflict with reason, and exalt and reverence absurdity.

2. But here another question is raised. What body, it is asked, is meant? What body of the man will be raised at the resurrection? Physiology and chemistry during the present century, have done much in the work of unfolding the principles and laws of our animal economy. As has been

already implied, chemistry by her processes of analysis, has resolved the composition of these earthly tabernacles into fifteen elementary substances, that have, as yet, never been decomposed, and are, therefore, in the language of the science, designated simple substances.¹ These substances are found in every mass of matter that is called man; and at death these substances, by decomposition, are thrown back into their original or simple elements. Death, therefore, is solely a physical change. It implies no mental or moral modification. It is the removal of the tent beneath which the occupant dwells. It is the taking down of the building in which infancy, childhood, and the youth of an existence has been passed, and the departure of the inhabitant to an invisible sphere. Now physiology has revealed to us the fact that these bodies in which we dwell are subject to a perpetual flux, to an unceasing composition and decomposition, to a perpetual decay and renovation. This process goes on, from the hardest bone in the system to the most slender texture: from the cartilagenous substance at the end of our fingers and toes, to the hair on the eyelash and the crowns of our heads. It has become a settled doctrine in physiology, that health depends on the ease or facility with which this process of decay and renovation of composition² and decomposition is accomplished; Liebig has shown that in case it be arrested, as it is by arsenic and all the metallic poisons, death is the inevitable result. As a consequence of this law of our physical economy, the particles of matter that in composition constitute these bodies, become often changed in the lapse of time. It is said, an entire change occurs once in seven years. It is, doubtless, much oftener that a complete renovation is effected. A man that has lived seventy years, therefore, according to the authorized supposition, will have changed ten times; so that not one particle of matter, in a

¹ See Liebig's, Stockhardt's *Chemistries*, Carpenter's *Physiology*. The substances are as follows: Oxygen, Hydrogen, Carbon, Nitrogen, Sulphur, Phosphorus, Chlorine, Lime, Potassium, Sodium, Iron, Magnesium, Manganese, Silicon and Fluorine. See also Hitchcock's *Anatomy and Physiology*, 1860.

² Liebig on *Metallic Poisons*.

bone or a muscle of his frame is the same with that of his boyhood or manhood, or even with that of the first waning years of his life. And on the supposition that this change is much more frequent, as it may be, the man of seventy years must have at least changed ten times and more, as the case may be. In view of these physiological facts, the question is asked: what body is meant, when it is said, The bodies of men shall be raised at the resurrection? Is it the body of infancy, of childhood, of manhood, or the body of seventy years? Is it the body itself that was committed to the grave? —the pale, worn, wasted, withered, decrepit, and possibly marred, mutilated, ghastly, mangled, and charred body, from which the soul took its exit from life? Is all the matter that has ever been connected with the body of the flesh to be raised? If so, then what masses, in the shape of men, will come up from the antediluvian world? Methuselah, and Noah, and Adam will indeed fill a large space in the world that is to come. Now, on the supposition that the objection here alleged is valid, and constitutes any difficulty at all on the subject before us, then, every person that has lived ten, twenty, or forty years on earth, ought to spurn and reject, at once and forever, the doctrine of his own personal identity. He may say, and ought to say, that he is not the same being that he was five, ten, or twenty years since, or at the period of his childhood; and, with Hume, affirm that he is not the same being that he was last month, or last year, and is, therefore, in no way responsible for any conduct of his past life. If the objection to which we now refer be valid, we may as well be in doubt, to-day, in reference to our personal identity, as to dream that we shall be at that coming period of our existence, when all the dead are to spring up, in a twinkling, from their graves. There is not a man on earth, whatever his age, and whatever the rapidity of this physical flux, this composition and decomposition, who does not know from intuition, that he is identically the same to-day, mentally and personally, with all this decay and renovation, that he was the first bright hour of his life, that has become chroni-

cled on his memory.¹ He knows it, and knows it as one of the revelations of consciousness. You may tell him of your chemistry and physiology as long as Vulcan was falling from heaven; you may look wise, as you discourse to him of nature and nature's laws; become grave and oracular as an Egyptian hierophant; yet the conviction that he is, to-day, one and the same being, mentally and personally, with that of his childhood's recollected dawn, is inseparable from his consciousness. This intuition or conviction, among men, is universal, immediate, and irresistible; and is therefore one of those primary truths, in reference to which no evidence, no human testimony, is ever required. To overlook and deny it, as some of our modern philosophers on the subject of the resurrection have done, is to outrage all the instincts and intuitions of the human mind and commit crime against humanity and against God. The fact of their own personal identity, men cannot disbelieve, if they would. In the same way, at the instant of the resurrection, will every being who shall have lived, of the race of man, be conscious of his own mental and personal identity, notwithstanding all the modifications and changes that will have passed on the body that is then incorruptible, immortal, spiritual, and fitted for the changeless abode of the undying tenant. Now, if any man is uncertain, or perplexed with doubts whether he be the same being that he was fifteen or twenty years since, when he drove a hard bargain, slandered a neighbor, or committed some act of shame, which has never and will never be effaced from the memory, then he will have some good reason to press this question, as it has been habitually urged, by way of an objection. Joseph's brethren, we suppose, were not initiated in modern discoveries. It seems that they had no doubt that they were the same beings in Egypt that they were in Canaan some twenty-five years before, when they put the victim of their hatred and revenge into the pit at Dothan, or sold him to the company of Ishmaelites for a slave. They had not learned this modern philosophy on the subject of the resurrection, and therefore be-

¹ Brown's Mental Philosophy, Chap. VIII.

lied in their own personal identity. We should not be surprised if some years should yet elapse before the principles of this philosophy should become universal in their application. To-day the conviction, without any argument, and in spite of all that is subtle, plausible, or imposing in any objections that may be raised, is irresistible, immediate, and universal, that we are, both mentally and personally, the same with the earliest recollected period of our existence, and so the conviction must ever remain, amid all the changes of the earthly and spiritual tabernacles, the rush of suns, and the crash of worlds.

3. It is asked, again, what relation has the body that dies to the body of the resurrection? This inquiry or objection (for such it is designed to be) must be based on the assumption that, if there be a relation, we must be able to see it; and, further, if there be no relation, then there can be no resurrection. Now, it would not be at all strange, if there should be to the human mind, even now, many, yea very many, undiscovered relations, in every department of knowledge. Who would have thought, some few score years since, of the relation of the single quality of the elasticity of steam to all the great business operations of the world to-day? Did Dr. Johnson, probably, discover any particular relation between what issued, rather violently sometimes, from the spout of his tea-kettle and the present state of things on this nether sphere? Who would have thought, when the present century began, of the relation of the electric fire to the proclamation of events half round the earth, under ocean and over land, on couriers formed of the lightning's wing? Men once did not see the relation between the power that brings the falling apple or stone to the earth, and that which propels the spheres, moving ceaselessly to the chime of their own music. Every one, now, knows that relations did exist, though unrevealed to the centuries that elapsed before their discovery. The fact, therefore, that a relation is not perceived or become known to any *savant*, does not prove that none exists. No affirmative conclusion, therefore, can be drawn from such a negative premise. There must be a far

more searching induction, and the whole field must be made to give up absolutely all that it contains, of properties or relations, before such a conclusion can rise above contempt. If, on the other hand, it should be admitted that there is no relation between the body that dies and the body of the resurrection, it would not follow, as a matter of course, that there would be no resurrection of the dead. Antecedent to all experience, we should not be able to see the relation between the larva and the chrysalis, or between both of these states and the butterfly sporting his newly-spread pinions in the sunbeams. Antecedent to all experience, there is just as strong a presumption against the acorn's becoming the oak — the monarch which, for a century, breasts all the storms and hurricanes of the hills; the egg, from its nest in the elm, sending forth a messenger to wing its way on the bosom of the air, and pour its sweet songs on human ears; just as strong a presumption against what may be regarded as nothing more than a pebble (instead of an ostrich's egg), in the sands of the desert, becoming a thing of life and speed unmatched by the proudest war-horse and winds, as there is against the fact that all that are in the graves are yet to hear a voice and come forth from the dust with which the mortal part has been, perhaps for centuries, mingled. Antecedent to all experience, there is no process in the physical, intellectual, or moral world, which is not to men improbable and as absurd as the doctrine of the resurrection appeared to be to the Athenians. Creation itself, in all its thousand departments, is, antecedent to all experience, an improbability. Prior to the revelations of science, who could have been made to believe that the globe, on which we tread, wings its way as with the lightning's leap, some six hundred millions of miles in its annual course round the sun, as it does; and moves, all the while, balanced on nothing, too? Antecedent to all experience, is there not, in this way, a presumption to the human mind against every law, change, or mode of action in the universe of God?

And is the presumption against the resurrection of these bodies from the graves in which they will have slept for cen-

turies, any stronger than against every process, law, or mode of action which God adopts in the changes of the physical, intellectual, and moral worlds? If he has power to send this ball of earth six hundred millions of miles through the eternal void around us, every twelvemonth, has he not power to wake the millions of every generation that shall have sunk to sleep in its dust? Suppose that we cannot see any relation between the body that dies and the body that is to be raised in the retributive hour: what then? Does it prove anything at all, except that mankind always have been, and are likely to be, most profoundly ignorant? Who, antecedent to any experience, sees any *relation* between the egg, in its nest among the rocks of some Alpine peak, and the eagle that soars to the sun or plunges and screams through the air? If all the processes in which animal life is propagated on earth are, antecedent to human experience, so improbable, and yet God, in spite of what men call improbability, presumption against it, absurdity, adopts it and acts upon it, without the shadow of a change, as we know he does, who has any right to say that because he can now see no relation between the body that dies and that which is to rise again, that all the dead will not yet stand up in the original, and in the sense before explained — identical forms in which they sunk to their iron slumber? The fact that pope Urban VIII. and his cardinals did not see the relation of the earth to the sun, nor which of these bodies it is that moves in an orbit through the skies, did not exactly annihilate the doctrines of the Copernican system; did not prove that Galileo was a heretic, and that he ought to recant or be burned. All such reasoning is much after the manner of the philosopher of Padua, who affirmed that, as there were only seven metals, seven days in the week, and seven apertures in a man's head, so there could be but seven planets; and when forced to admit the visibility of the satellites of Jupiter by looking through a telescope, he still sagely and profoundly reasoned, that, as they were not visible to the naked eye, therefore they did not exist, and that it would be a mortal sin to believe that they did. From such a negative premise, therefore, as that on

which this objection is alleged to stand, no conclusive inference or even plausible argument can be drawn against the resurrection of the body. The fact that we do not now see relations, cannot prove that they do not exist. If so, all the wonders of modern science should be expunged and razed forever. For, once it would have been thought incredible that there was any relation between the power that brings the apple to the earth, and that which raises the tides of ocean, turns the ten thousand spindles of the palace of industry and toil, wheels the planet in its orbit, and propels the comet in its course. The objection itself, therefore, is and must be baseless, void.

4. Again, it is affirmed that the scriptures do not define the body of the resurrection, so as to impart to men any conception of it, or idea. They are, it is said, so indefinite, vague, or obscure, that nothing can be known, and therefore it is very questionable what they mean to assert, when they employ language which is supposed to refer to it. But is there any ground for this objection? It is conceded that, in a physical inquiry, two and only two questions can be raised. In reference to a piece of carbonate of lime, for example, we may inquire: Of what is it composed? And when we are told it consists of oxygen, carbon, and lime, one of these questions is answered. But should we go further and inquire: What is carbon, oxygen, or the substance we designate lime, we reach a limit which has never been scaled. The philosopher lives not who can inform the world what the essence of carbon, of oxygen is, or what is the essence of any simple element of matter. The only reply which he can return here is, that they are simple elements, that they have never been decomposed, and that it is not known that they can be. There are limits to human knowledge and human inquiry which have never been passed — barriers which have never been and will never (whatever progress may yet be made in physical analysis) be scaled. There will — whatever analysis may yet accomplish — be simple elements, elements that will defy all decomposition. In this direction human inquiry ends, and the circumference of the circle that bounds human

knowledge is reached. The human being lives not, who can define or tell what is the essence of the smallest particle of matter which microscopic power brings within the reach of his vision. Now if all this be so, men know absolutely nothing of the fifteen or sixteen simple substances, of which these physical bodies are composed, that we hear about with us from day to day. They know the fact of their existence; but, in spite of all the revelations of science, they really know no more as to what they actually are, than an infant of a day.

The other inquiry that may be made, in reference to the carbonate of lime, is: How it affects other bodies, and how other bodies affect it? In prosecuting this investigation, the properties or qualities of the substance become revealed. And when, in every possible combination, I have ascertained how other bodies affect it, and how it affects other bodies; or, in other words, how it affects and is affected in every possible combination,¹ I have learned all that can be known in reference to it. Now, what is true in the case before us, is true of every physical inquiry that can be instituted under heaven. God, in describing or defining the spiritual body of the resurrection, has not told us what the substance itself, or the essence of this body is. He has said, it was not material: that "flesh and blood could not inherit the kingdom of God." But he has not defined or revealed what the substratum or essence of the spiritual body is, nor given us clew or hint for any discovery. All this is conceded. Nor has he revealed any more the essence, itself, of which these bodies of flesh and blood are composed. No torch of human discovery will ever enter this labyrinth. To human gaze it is forever closed. No searcher of nature's laws, however bold may have been his tread, will ever be able to tell what one of the fifteen original or simple substances is, in its nature or essence, which constitutes the bones, the muscles, the arteries, and blood, of his physical system. Now why should not men object to God's limiting

¹ Brown's Mental Philosophy, Vol. I., Physical Enquiry.

in this way — as he has done — the whole range of human thought, and to his “holding back,” here, “the face of his throne, and spreading a cloud upon it?” Why not urge objections here? And if not here, why complain because God has not revealed to us or defined the essence or substratum of the body of the resurrection? Why not complain, also, because he has not revealed or defined to us the substance, nature, or essence, of the tabernacles in which we live, or of matter in any of its thousand forms and combinations? If complaints or objections are pertinent in the one case, they must be also in the other. The truth is — it is as plain as the most palpable demonstration — that there is no ground for objection or difficulty here. God has done all that could be accomplished in the work of revealing or defining the body of the resurrection. To us, limited as we are in the powers with which we are invested, more could not be disclosed. If done, we could not, as we are, comprehend more. More than we now have, therefore, would be to us no revelation at all. God has distinctly defined the body of the resurrection. He has assured us, that it is spiritual, fitted, arranged, adapted for an abode of the immortal mind. He that has assured us that it is the body itself, not the soul, is thus fitted, made, or adapted. The soul is spirit, immortal, without a resurrection; needs none in order that its existence be continued; is not changed, in its nature, by death or by the resurrection. It is the body, therefore, that is raised a spiritual body, and not the soul of man, as has been asserted. It is the body of the dead that is raised incorruptible, indestructible, immortal, arrayed in power, in glory (in the case of the believer in Jesus), like the sun shining in his strength. In the work of describing the body of the resurrection, then, is it possible for the scriptures to accomplish more than they have done for the information of those who are yet to rush, in a twinkling, to the tribunal of the Son of man? Now if there be objections here, on the ground that the scriptures are indistinct or obscure, as is alleged, then we ought to object to the whole universe, of matter and of mind; for, all that we know, or can know, of the original

or simple elements of matter or of mind, is in the form of the qualities or properties revealed. And these, as we have seen, are never known, and never can (in any given case whatsoever) be, in perfection, known.

5. But, it is contended finally, by way of objection to the common or received doctrine of the resurrection, that there is a body or some third thing eliminated, at the death of every man, so that there will be no need of the resurrection of the body from the grave. The soul, as it leaves this dwelling of flesh and blood, wakes in a body that is neither spirit nor matter, but some third thing, upon which neither reason nor revelation has shed any light. In short, there is just as much evidence or proof that, at the death of every man, a kingdom, a throne, and sceptre of power will be eliminated; that *loci laeti et amoena vireta* will be eliminated, as that some third thing, which is neither matter nor spirit, will be evolved from the body the instant the breath departs and the process of dissolution begins. The scriptures, surely, give us no hints of any such transformation; and, on the theme itself, reason is dark as darkness itself. It is theory without proof, assumption without argument. It is a figment of the mind, a dream, and baseless as a night vision. The theory has been broached for the purpose of avoiding the conclusions in reference to the resurrection of the body from the grave, and the scenes of a coming judgment. On such grounds as this theory discloses, men are urged to reject the scripture doctrine of a resurrection of the body, the scenes of the final judgment, and to regard them as the myths and dreams of a pernicious superstition.

Such are the objections, that have recently been vigorously urged against the common or received doctrine of the resurrection. It has been our purpose to state them fully and fairly. The method of reasoning, that has been adopted by the opponents of the doctrine, is to submit their own hypothesis or theory, urge what they designate the philosophical objections or difficulties in the way of assent to the common faith, and then hew, and cut, and square, extend and contract, pervert and modify the passages of the word of God till they fit the Procrus-

tean bed of their hypothesis. It will be impossible, without exceeding the limits here allotted, to pass all these passages in a minute and critical review. We do not deem it necessary to do so for the settlement of the question. The whole subject, so far as the philology of the Christian scriptures is concerned, lies in a very narrow space. The term *ἀνάστασις*, the phrases *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* and *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, are the words on which the whole question hinges. The course that has been pursued by the opponents of the received doctrine of the resurrection, in determining the meaning of these phrases, is to infer something from the etymology of the word or words to which reference has been made, affirm what they ought to mean, quote the loose and rickety statements of Dr. Dwight in full, on the meaning of *ἀνάστασις*, and then blink the whole question of the *usus loquendi* of the language itself. There has not been a single principle, rule, or law of interpretation, fairly applied to the language of the scriptures on this subject, by either Prof. Bush or the Rev. Mr. Lee, in their treatises on eschatology. They are, throughout, examples of a perversion of all the rules or laws of interpretation, specimens of etymological sipping, of philological blinking and ignoring. Tacitus says of Galba,¹ "omnium concensu, capax imperii, nisi imperasset." These authors might have been deemed, perhaps, sound and accomplished scholars, had they not written and given to the world their treatises on eschatology.

What, then, is the meaning or import of the term *ἀνάστασις* as used in the scriptures? Any good Greek lexicon will, of course, explain its etymology and some of its significations. It will say, it designates a *rising up*, a *rising up as from a fall*, a resurrection of the body, a *return to life*: "women received their dead raised to life again," ἐξ ἀναστάσεως, Heb. 11:35. But the etymological sense, on which it is so convenient for the modern opponents of the doctrine of a resurrection to rely, does not by any means settle its *usus loquendi* and give its import. What did the Athenians, for example,

¹ History, Book I. Chap. 49.

in their market-place and on Mars Hill (Acts 17:32), understand to be the meaning of *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or of the resurrection of the dead? "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead," it is said, "some mocked, and others said, we will hear thee again concerning this." Did they, for the first time, hear of a future state of existence, on Mars Hill, from the lips of Paul? Was this, to them, a strange doctrine, as they said of his teachings in the market-place? Was this the thing that roused the impatience of an audience the most intelligent and curious, not to say refined, perhaps, of the then known world? Was it this that stirred them to mockery? From the days of Homer, at least, had they not heard of a future state of existence? Was it not taught in his immortal verse, and thus incorporated into the whole texture and web-work of Grecian thought and feeling? Did not Pindar, in lyric strains, bold, grand, and sweet as the honey said to have been hived on his lips, teach the doctrines of a future existence and of future rewards and punishments?¹ Did not Hesiod, and Aeschylus, and Socrates, and Plato? Even their history reveals, in this respect, the power of their convictions. Near the close of the Peloponnesian war, or four hundred and six years before Christ, the Athenians won a great naval victory,² over the Lacedæmonians and their confederates, at Arginusæ, in which seventy ships of war belonging to the enemy were captured, or sunk in the waters of the Aegean, and thirteen of their own, also, sunk or disabled. In consequence of a storm, that arose immediately after the action, the Athenian commanders were unable to rescue their dead and transmit them to their friends for the rites of burial. By the loss of these rites, it was supposed that the spirits of those who had thus fallen in battle would be compelled to wander, for a century or more, on the shores of the Styx, before they could be admitted to the happy fields or islands of the blessed. Of the ten Athenian commanders, that had charge of that sanguinary conflict, eight were condemned to death

¹ *Vide, Olymp. II. Theroni Agrigentino curru victori.* Plato's Phædo.

² *Vide Lysias oration against Eratothenes, one of the thirty tyrants of Athens. Xenophon. Hellen. L. I. Chap. 7, et. seq.*

for having neglected to rescue (as was alleged) the shipwrecked seamen after the storm, and collect the bodies of those that had been slain or drowned. Six of the eight were executed, and the remaining two banished, by the democracy of Athens, for not doing what was in the power (as was afterward admitted) of no human arm to accomplish. Was the doctrine of a future state of existence, then, either new or strange to an Athenian? Did the hearers of Paul, at this, become impatient and mock? Was it either new or strange, to those who then stood on Mars Hill, that men were to be judged in another world, and receive according to their works? So the Egyptians, from the days of Abraham, so the Greeks, so the Romans, so all the nations that dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean, from the time the Israelites crossed the Jordan and received the lot of their inheritance, believed not only in a state of future existence, but also in future rewards and punishments. These doctrines are natural, congenial to the very instincts and convictions of the human mind. Their reasonableness is perceived along with the awful consciousness of sin, which pervades the race of man in every nation and age, and perceived, along with the appalling wrongs and outrages that are known to be perpetrated and never to be redressed on earth. Without question, this is the origin of that strong, universal conviction among the first nations of earth, of a judgment to come in that unseen state to which they felt themselves rushing.

What, then, did the assembly on Mars Hill understand by the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, or resurrection of the dead? It was not any doctrine of Plato, of Pindar, or of Homer. If so, it could not have been new. It would not have been strange. The assembly itself would not have been broken up; and in mockery and contempt it would not have indulged. But one answer, under all the circumstances, can be given to this question. It was a return to life, the resurrection of the bodies of men, "at that day when the world is to be judged, in righteousness, by that Man whom God hath before ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

At Corinth, again, not sixty miles distant from the capital of Attica, where the same philosophy and the same learning were cultivated as at Athens, the doctrine was no less new and no less strange. It was no more satisfactory, but was alike repulsive to all their modes of thought and habits of feeling. As the doctrines of Christianity, at Corinth, had found a home in the bosoms of those who had been gathered into the fold of Christ, it was natural that opposition to the strictly revealed doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, should assume an aspect more determined, and enlist all the philosophy and learning, and all the wit and contempt, that could be summoned to the work of exploding a dogma, in the Corinthian view so absurd, and, to the Corinthian heart, so repulsive. The opposition without, it seems, was felt within the enclosure of the church itself; and these who had once received the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as an article of their faith, and now admitted the fact of the resurrection of Christ, were borne away with the current, and like the scoffing throngs of the rabble, of the philosophers and learned men around them, affirmed that there was no resurrection of the dead. All this is assumed as the basis, or ground work of the discussion in 1 Cor. xv. There is no reasoning in a circle here, as has been asserted. There is no attempt made to prove the doctrine of a future state of existence. Dr. Dwight affirms that the doctrine of a future existence was denied at Corinth; and that Sadducean infidelity had found a lodgment there. For all this, he gives us assertion for proof, and declamation for argument. There is not one particle or scintilla of evidence, that the doctrine of a future state of existence was ever denied at Corinth, or had ever been seriously questioned up to the time that the epistles to the Corinthians were penned. On the contrary, everything in the history, in the philosophy, in the literature and the arts of the then capital of the Grecian world, proves that there was no question in reference to a scene of future existence. The reality of such a state of future existence, was in fact a part of the national feeling and belief, and had been, through all the centuries of their history. Hence the position that is stated

and argued in the 1 Cor. xv., from the beginning to the end of that clear and powerful discussion, and stated and argued in opposition to everything in conflict with it, is the doctrine of a resurrection of the dead. It was the doctrine of the resurrection of the body that was denied, and not that of a future state of existence, as has been so absurdly and pertinaciously affirmed. This view of the case is supported in every part of that sublime discussion, without change or modification. Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, *ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται*, "I have preached this doctrine," Paul, in effect, affirms; "others have preached it to you; you have received it; you admit that Christ has risen from the dead; the scriptures declared, centuries before his advent in the world, that he would both die, be buried, and rise again. He was seen of Cephas or Peter, after his resurrection; then, of the twelve; afterwards, of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep; then, of James; then of all the apostles; and, last of all, he was seen of me also, as one born out due time. You admit that Christ is risen from the dead: you cannot deny the proof, reject the evidence, or discard the testimony. You allow it to be preached to you, and you receive it as a fact that cannot be denied, as well you may. How say some among you, in the church of Christ at Corinth, then, that there is no resurrection, no general resurrection of the dead?" Such is the logic of this discourse: Paul reasoned from their own admissions in reference to the resurrection of Christ. This was appropriate. To those, to whom the argument was addressed, it must have been satisfactory. Its force, at least by them, must have been felt. It certainly was adapted to this end. There was no reasoning in a circle here, as has been so often affirmed. If Christ had been raised from the dead, then the dead, of course, of all the generations of earth, might be thus raised; yea, would be raised in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. One event was as certain as the other. The power that effected the one, could as easily accomplish the other. If there was to be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ was not risen, as they admitted or believed that

he was. Their faith, on this supposition, was vain. They were unpardoned : they were yet in their sins ; all who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished ; all who had borne testimony to the resurrection of Christ, and preached a risen as well as a crucified Redeemer, were false witnesses of God, and the condition of believers in Jesus the most pitiable of the race of man. The premise of this argument, therefore, was what the Corinthians themselves believed, in reference to the resurrection of Christ. This they admitted, and yet denied the resurrection of the bodies of men ; and, by adopting the interrogative, put their denial in the most positive form. "How are the dead raised up, and with what bodies do they come ?" is the language of unbelief, not only in the first, but in every century of our era, on the subject before us. It is impossible, one might well suppose, not to see, here, what was denied at Corinth, and what, in fact, constitutes the subject of the sublime discussion in 1 Cor. xv. It was not the immortality of the soul, or the doctrine of a future state of existence directly ; but that of the resurrection of the bodies of men.

The mode of this denial, the form in which the objection is stated, and the reply to it by the great teacher of the Gentiles, settle forever the meaning of *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15 : 12, 13, 21, 42. It is the body that is to be raised incorruptible, not the soul, of man. It is the body, the mortal part, that is to put on immortality ; the body, that was weak, that is to become "clothed in power ;" the body, dishonored and buried from the sight of men, that is to be arrayed in glory ; and the body, that is to become spiritual, as well as incorruptible and immortal. All the race of man that shall ever sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake and live again. For, since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead ; for, as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ, shall all be made alive." As certain as is the event of death, to the race of man, so certain is the resurrection of all the dead of earth's generations.¹ We may safely chal-

¹ It is admitted that there may be Christians whose theoretical views of religious truth, are very defective. The minimum of knowledge, essential to any

lence the production of an instance, in the whole field of Biblical philology, where the meaning of a word or phrase is so distinctly defined and so unmistakably clear and palpable as in the word *ἀνάστασις*, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15 : 12, 13, 21, 42. It implies a future state of existence, without any question. But its primary and distinctive meaning is the resurrection of the body, that reverts to dust at death. It implies, not only the immortality of the soul, which no Corinthian or Athenian denied, but also the future existence of the body itself. But still its *primary, distinctive* and *positive signification* is the resurrection of all the dead that will have slept, for centuries, in the dust of death. This was denied by Athenian, by Corinthian, and by some, too, who bore the name of Christ in a church gathered under the auspices of the apostle himself.

In this connection it may not be improper to state— what has been so distinctly affirmed, in 1 Cor. xv. in reference to the resurrection of the bodies of the righteous— that the wicked, also, will be raised, at the resurrection of the last day. “They will come forth,” says the Saviour, “unto the resurrection of damnation.”¹ “As, in Adam, all die; so, in Christ, shall all be made alive.” “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake: some, to everlasting life; and some, to shame and everlasting contempt.” “All, that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.” “Fear him,” says the Saviour, “who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” And have hope to-

evangelical faith, it must ever be difficult to determine. But what kind of Christians must those have been at Corinth, who rejected from their articles of religious faith, not only the doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies of men from the grave, but also that of a future state of existence, which lies at the foundation of Christianity itself? If *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15 designates merely, as Dr. Dwight, Prof. Bush, and the Rev. Mr. Lee affirm, a state of future existence; then, there must have been French infidels in the Church at Corinth, who were addressed by Paul as Christians. Now, what kind of a Christian is he, who believes that death is an eternal sleep? Can anything reveal more distinctly the absurdity of the construction thus put upon *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* in 1 Cor. 15?

¹ John 5 : 29. 1 Cor. 15 : 22. Dan. 12 : 2. John 5 : 28. Matt. 10 : 28. Acts 24 : 15.

ward God which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." It is, therefore, as unequivocally and positively affirmed that the bodies of the wicked, or unjust, will be raised, as it is in the case of those of the righteous. But they will be raised for the accomplishment of a very different end. It will be done for no purposes of good, or of happiness, in respect to themselves. Body and soul, in their case, will be reunited, not for the purposes of bliss and endless glory, but for those of shame and everlasting contempt. They, too, will be raised from the dead incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual, in reference to the bodies with which they will be invested. But it will be that every sight may become appalling, every sound harsh discord, every taste bitter, odor offensive, and touch pain. It will be that every sense of these indestructible tabernacles may become the seat of an anguish that is never to end. They never, in the flesh, employed a single sense or power, a single faculty of body or of mind, in the service of their Maker; and it will be right, therefore, and the inevitable result of the laws of the physical, mental, and moral constitution under which they live, that they should reap the consequences of this abuse of all their powers, in the world to come; in other words, that they should be destroyed, both soul and body, amid those eternal retributions that await those who shall pass their lives without God and hope in the world.

The meaning of the term *ἀνάστασις*, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, in the instances cited, cannot be mistaken. They do not signify a future state of existence, except by indirection. They imply it as a result or a consequence. But, primarily and distinctively, they connote or designate the resuscitation, the living again, or resurrection, of the bodies of men that have been dissolved in the dust of death, and a reunion of soul and body, on the part of the dead, that is never to be sundered. It is impossible for us, here, to pass in review the whole forty-two passages, in the New Testament, where the word *ἀνάστασις* may be found, nor will it be necessary to do so for the purpose of settling the *usus loquendi*

of the term or the phrase to which we have referred. In every instance, with two exceptions, it designates a living again, a standing up, a coming forth from the grave, as in the case of Lazarus, of Christ and the saints that came out of their graves after his resurrection. It designates a coming back from the dead: "Women received their dead raised to life again," ἐξ ἀναστάσεως.¹ These exceptions are found in John 11:25 and in Luke 2:34.

In the first of these passages, Christ says to Martha: "I am the resurrection and the life;" which signifies, of course, that Christ himself—a sweet and blessed truth—is the sole ground or efficient cause of the resurrection, in every case; that it is by his power or his agency, alone, that it is to be effected. It is here a predicate of Christ, and affirms of him a power which, when the time for its manifestation shall have come, will invest him with a glory surpassing that, in view of which the angels of God once shouted, and the morning stars sung. It is in this sense, without any question, that the term is here used.

In the other case, the import of the word is different: "And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary, his mother, 'Behold! this child is set for the fall and rising again, εἰς ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.'" In the sense of rising again from the dead, it is not here employed; but is used to designate, in its appropriate and secondary application, a moral or spiritual resurrection—a resurrection from the death of sin. Indeed all the seeming exceptions do, in fact, but confirm and strengthen the primary and distinctive use, meaning, or signification of the phrase which is the subject of our inquiry.

In this connection it will not be inappropriate to refer to the noted passage, Matt. 22:31, 32, and to the parallel ones, Mark 12:18—27. Luke 20:27—38. In the first of these, Christ, in reply to the Sadducees, says: "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you, by God, saying, 'I am the God of Abra-

¹ Heb. 11:35.

ham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' God is not a God of the dead, but of the living."¹ The Sadducees admitted the divine authority of the books of Moses. They began their separation from the Pharisees in the days of John Hyrcanus, by rejecting the mass of traditions to which the Pharisees adhered; by limiting themselves to the written word; and, as many suppose, from Josephus (Ant. bk. xii. c. 10), rejecting everything but the writings of Moses. The Saviour, therefore, conducted his argument with the Sadducees, on the basis of their own admissions. As they assented to the divine authority of the great Jewish lawgiver, an appeal to such an authority, in a case in which their feelings and interests were so deeply involved, must have sealed their lips in silence, if it failed of carrying conviction to their minds. It is important, also, to keep in view, here, what the Sadducees disbelieved, or rejected, in the common faith of their religious countrymen. They denied the resurrection of the dead; they denied the existence of angels, and affirmed that there was no such thing as a spirit; while the Pharisees, who were the religious teachers of the age, admitted the reality of each of these propositions. They were, therefore, the French infidels or materialists of their times. And if this is, of itself, a proof of aristocracy and preëminence in anything but sin, then the Sadducees may, in conformity with Mr. Lee's declaration, have constituted the aristocracy in wealth, in learning, and in influence, among the Jews. This is entirely a modern discovery; and its glory, we presume, Mr. Lee will be allowed to share alone. Now the fact is here obvious, at a glance, that the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*, in this passage, is used in its common acceptation; and that it does not here, as has been oftentimes affirmed, designate a future state of existence, except by implication. This is proved, in the first place, from the articles, not of faith, but of disbelief, on the part of Sadducees, which were three in number. They did not believe in a resurrection; they did not believe in the existence

¹ 3 : 6, 15. At the time this declaration was made, Abraham had been dead 329 years, Isaac 224, and Jacob 198.

of angel, or the existence of spirit. It is, further, obvious that the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν* is used in its common or received acceptation, and means, here, a resurrection of the body; as, without bodies, the Sadducees themselves would not have deemed it very important, probably, whether the woman should have a husband or not; or the husbands themselves have wives, in the resurrection. This, as we conceive, must settle the question as to the meaning of the phrase *ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν*, in Matt. 22 : 31, 32, the parallel ones, Mark 12 : 18—27. Luke 20 : 28—38, and Acts 23 : 8. In these passages the phrase does not designate a future state of existence, and could not do so without involving a tautology not found elsewhere in the Christian scriptures. Here, therefore, as in the forty out of the forty-two instances of the occurrence of the term or phrase in the New Testament, its primary, characteristic, and distinctive signification is the resurrection of the body from the dust of death.

Now the Saviour, as has been intimated, conducted his argument with the Sadducees on the basis of their own admissions. They denied the doctrine of a resurrection, of a future state of existence and its retributions; and yet admitted the divine authority of the teachings of Moses. The Saviour, therefore, avails himself of this admission, and quotes the declaration of God to Moses at the burning bush, and lays before them the sublime reality that Moses taught, and distinctly taught, the immortality of the soul of man, and all that was involved in an immortality of being. It may be said, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is only indirectly proved, in the argument of Christ with the Sadducees. But if so, there is nothing in the fact of the method of proof being indirect, that invalidates the proof itself, or renders the demonstration, in the least degree, incomplete. The exact sciences, in instances not a few, resort to the method; and there is never a dream or a suspicion, on this account, of uncertainty or doubt, as to the result of its introduction. The Saviour, in his argument with these Jewish sceptics, asserting, to all intents and purposes, the truth of their own admissions, swept away all the foundations on which they

rested, and of course proved the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with that of a future state of existence, in this overthrow of the Sadducean faith.

Now unless this term or phrase can be divested of its primary and distinctive import, the modern doctrines that the resurrection takes place at the death of every man, that there is no intermediate state, no general judgment, no end of the world or of the present order and constitution of things, fall, and fall beyond the power of any recovery, unless the scriptures are a fable, and inspiration itself a myth or a dream. On the contrary, if this be its signification, its true and only import, as its *usus loquendi* affirms, almost without change or modification, then there is yet to be a resurrection of the bodies of men : the sea, the caves of ocean, the grave-yards of earth, the valleys, the hill-sides, the rock-ribbed mountains and glens, are yet to give up their dead ; there is an intermediate state ; there is yet to come a righteous and general judgment ; and the scenes of this wretched world of sin, and suffering, and woe, are to have an end. The term *ἀνάστασις*, therefore, or the phrase *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν*, does not mean, and cannot, without a perversion of all the laws of language, be made to designate, simply and only, the immortality of the soul, or a future state of existence, as has been affirmed and reiterated, again and again, by men who profess the profoundest regard for the scriptures of inspiration.

The Biblical history of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the scriptural proofs of the intermediate state, and the reasons or grounds for a future, general, and righteous judgment, with the objections with which these themes themselves have become recently so much overlaid, cannot be canvassed within the limits of this Article ; and must be left, therefore, for some future discussion.