

ARTICLE IV.

ESCHATOLOGICAL STUDIES.

BY PROF. J. A. REUBELT, INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

“THE diversity and confusion in the doctrine of the church [on the subject of eschatology] is due, in part, to the conflict of the views represented in the New Testament itself. It is impossible, I believe, to deduce from the scriptures of the New Testament a doctrine of the life to come; which shall fit all the texts, and satisfy all the demands of the subject; which shall harmonize the Apocalyptic vision of the ‘new earth’ and the new Jerusalem upon it, with Paul’s conception of being raised from the dead and caught up into the clouds to dwell with the Lord in the air; which shall harmonize any doctrine of final resurrection with the words of Jesus to the thief on the cross: ‘This day shall thou be with me in paradise.’”¹

Whoever regards the Bible as *the* book containing an authentic account of God’s self-revelation to man, cannot possibly agree with these utterances of Dr. Hedge, as they presume the existence of contradictions, hence of errors, in the Bible, even the absence of which would not necessarily prove its inspiration. Had he, however, made the same or similar remarks with regard to the eschatology of the church, present or past, he would have uttered an almost self-evident truth. For it is well known that not only the different branches of the church differ in their eschatological views, but also members of the same sects or parties; nor have the views of the same denominations been the same at all times, with, perhaps, the sole exception of the Greek church, whose characteristic, from the fifth century, has been immutability, or rather stagnation. The Latin church boasts, indeed, also

¹ Reason in Religion, by Dr. F. H. Hedge, pp. 373, 374.

of the same unchangeableness, but in vain ; and it is not to her disgrace, that this peculiar boast is unfounded, for where there is life there is progress, there is change — das Fertige is das Todte. It is, moreover, a fact of history, though deeply to be regretted, that in the great Reformation of the sixteenth century polemics, and other improper elements, mixed too largely with the subject under consideration, and prevented the truth, as it is revealed in the Bible, from being comprehended and appropriated in its totality by the Reformed church. — It is proposed to give in the following pages something like a consistent, though necessarily brief, statement of the Bible teachings on the subject of eschatology, setting forth at the same time, as we go along, the leading errors held on the subject, and their causes.

The large majority of Protestants believe and teach that the soul immediately after leaving the body goes to its final resting place — to heaven, if united by a living faith with the Redeemer, to hell, if impenitent and unbelieving ; according to the Roman Catholic church the soul goes to purgatory, if it is, indeed, in a state of acceptance with God, but not yet fit for heaven, on account of the unendured or unremitted temporal punishment due to forgiven sins, where it has to stay until, by suffering, a full fitness for heaven is acquired. These parties admit the resurrection of the body in some form or other, on the authority of the scriptures, without being penetrated, however, it is feared, by a sense of its absolute necessity.

Swedenborg, in keeping with his views of the universe, the nature of God, etc., denied the resurrection of the body, but believed in a setting free by death of the immaterial substance of the body from the coverings of the coarse material body, which immaterial substance serves, according to him, as a covering or body for the soul throughout eternity ; and this view is held by many, in a modified form, who do not accept the other peculiar views of the celebrated Swede. To us it appears, that one great and fundamental error underlies these and other more or less unbiblical views, making

itself felt at every step, although it is by no means consistently carried out in the various systems. This error is, in our opinion, the generally adopted Platonic view of the soul and the body as constituent parts of man; of the relation of soul and body to each other; on the nature of spirit and matter. It is well known that, according to Plato, the soul or spirit is a heavenly or divine essence, capable of living by itself in a disembodied state, and even having this disembodied existence for its normal state or condition; that the body, as consisting of matter, is the source of sin and corruption, contaminating the soul by its very contact, and therefore constituting a kind of prison-house for the soul, for which reason death, or the separation of the soul from the body, is a liberation, a setting free of the former, an advancement to a higher state of existence. It is in perfect keeping with such premises to take it for granted that the soul of the good man goes, immediately after death, to heaven to enjoy full bliss and happiness. The resurrection itself is in this case not denied, but it is merely received on the authority of some Bible passages; its absolute necessity, as growing out of the nature of the case, and as the necessary sequence of the work of redemption, which, without it, would be both subjectively and objectively not only partial, but even unreal, is neither felt nor admitted.

Now, as we understand the Bible, it teaches from beginning to end, not so much in isolated passages as in its whole tenor, as follows: that God is the absolute author of all things; that he created both the human soul and body, as absolutely necessary for each other, neither being able to realize its end or destiny without the other, neither being complete or fully happy without the other; that man came out of the hands of his Creator as a living soul, destined and constituted to become a quickened spirit; that the process of the spiritualizing of the body by the indwelling spirit would have been gradual,—would have constituted man's time of trial or probation,—and would ultimately have secured the transformation of the earth itself through the element

of divine light and love. In his original state man was, indeed, subject to the possibility, but not to the necessity, of dying; but with the ultimate transformation of the body even this possibility would have ceased. Man fell by his own disobedience, and thereby severed his life-union with his Maker; falling thereby out of the element of divine love into that of divine wrath, and if he had been left in this condition to himself, he would have relapsed into the state, out of which Omnipotence had called him, viz. that of non-entity or unconscious entity. But God, out of compassion for man's wretchedness, decreed to save him, in consequence whereof love mingled again with wrath, and a possibility was afforded to man to be transferred out of this mixed element into that of pure love. As the work of redemption could not be accomplished by any physical process, as it could be accomplished in no other way, it was accomplished by the second person of the Trinity becoming man, in order to go, as such, through that process through which fallen man could no longer go, and to re-open for man a new and never-failing fountain of life. The incarnated God, Jesus, who was not subject to the law of mortality, died a violent death; but both by the laws of his being, and by divine omnipotence, he rose from the dead—the same body that had lain in the grave, was quickened, undergoing, at the same time, a change that was completed by the ascension, thus becoming a spiritual body. By a living faith the believer enters into a real life-union with his Saviour, and becomes thereby a partaker of his life—the sin-ruined image of God in the soul is thereby restored; but as the body, owing to the workings of sin, is no longer fit material for being spiritualized, it must die, and rest in the grave to the resurrection morn, while the disembodied soul is, indeed, in an abnormal and unnatural state, but nevertheless in the presence of Jesus, enjoying as high a degree of bliss as her abnormal condition admits of. There will be a first resurrection, embracing a portion of the sleeping believers, accompanied by a simultaneous change of many living believers: the state of things

thus ushered in is the millennium, during which Jesus and the raised saints will hold intimate intercourse with the living saints, while sin will be checked, Satan being chained. After the lapse of the millennial period the powers of evil will be unchained, and, after a temporary victory, their final and total overthrow will come; then follow the general resurrection and judgment; after this there will be no further change from one state or element to another; believers will be in their raised bodies, in the enjoyment of perfect bliss, in the element of divine love, in the new heaven, and the new earth, in the new Jerusalem; while unbelievers, likewise re-clothed with their bodies, are in the unmitigated element of wrath and wretchedness. This we believe to be the essence of the eschatology of the Bible, and these several propositions we shall now endeavor to establish.

That the subject of the resurrection of the body has lost its proper significance in the religious consciousness of the English-speaking part of the church, appears significantly from the fact, that English theology has not created, nor appropriated to itself, a term pregnantly expressive of the great fact, as transfiguration, glorification of the body, as German theology has done, which uses *Verherrlichung* or *Verklärung des Leibes*, as freely as we use justification or incarnation. But while this is the case with the English religious consciousness more especially, it is a fact, that almost the universal Christian consciousness of our day has lost sight of the *παρουσία*, which held so prominent a place in the consciousness of the primitive church, and of the apostles themselves, of Paul, as well as of the older apostles. The last question the apostles addressed to their risen Master was: "Lord, wilt thou restore at this time again the kingdom to Israel?" and they received the answer: "It is not your (privilege) to know the periods and epochs which the Father has appointed in his own power." Paul (1 Thess. v. 1) uses the very same terms (*χρόνους καὶ καιρούς*): "But of the periods and epochs ye have no need that I should write to ye; for you know yourselves very well, that the day of the

Lord cometh as a thief in the night." The Lord before his suffering had most emphatically inculcated the duty of constant watchfulness, arising from the uncertainty of the time of his coming: "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh" (Matt. xxviii. 13). Our consciousness contents itself with saying, that the experience of eighteen centuries has proved the (partial) error of the primitive church in supposing the coming of Jesus to be nearer at hand than it was, and that each individual's death is for him the coming of the Lord; but the very ease with which we dispose of this apparent difficulty, and put things so totally different in place of each other, shows conclusively that the coming of Christ has lost its proper place in our consciousness; has become, as it were, a dead letter, a painted flame, shows how great is our apostasy from the faith once delivered to the saints. If it had not lost its significance for us we should oftener think of it, and thus realize all the salutary effects which the very uncertainty in which the scriptures leave it is so eminently adapted to produce. It is true, no believer in the Bible as a divinely inspired book will purposely or willingly pervert any of its texts; but as slaveholders succeeded in finding authority in the scriptures for holding, buying, and selling human beings as slaves, so can any unscriptural theory put constructions consistent with itself upon any text of the Bible.

A very fruitful source of error is the denial of the difference between the two testaments or dispensations. In spite of the positive declaration of the Saviour, that the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist (who was greater than all before him), which, as a matter of course, excludes him from the kingdom, we are told that the Old Testament worthies enjoyed all the Christian privileges, that they are called unhesitatingly Christians, and their condition after death is, of course, assumed to have been identical with the Christians'. In diametrical opposition to the theory combated are also the views of the Old Testament saints as to

their condition after death, which were far gloomier than even those of the Greeks and Romans. On this subject says Delitsch in his *Biblical Psychology*: "That we read in the Old Testament of no division of hades into hell and paradise, but hear such complaints as Ps. lxxxviii. 11-15, has its ground in this, that in Israel the sense of death as a divine punishment was much keener than elsewhere, and in the absence of positive declarations of Jehovah they dared not to entertain brighter views of sheôl."

We are very well aware, that passages like Isa. xiv. 9 and Ezra xxxi. 16; xxxii. 17, etc. are declared, by the theology which we combat, to be poetical, fictitious figures, that have no truth nor force; the citation of Samuel is got rid of by representing it as jugglery or diabolical deception, or, as was but lately done, as a case of clairvoyance. But it is self-evident, that in this case exegesis is based upon, modelled by dogmatics, and not *vice versa*, as it ought to be. Samuel is not allowed to have been actually summoned from hades, because if in hades, he would not be in heaven, where the theology in question maintains he was, perfectly unconcerned about what the Bible teaches on the subject; Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have had on their resurrection bodies when God called himself, in speaking to Moses, their God, because it is taken for granted, that the soul immediately after death puts on its resurrection body; others appeal to this passage for proof, that the disembodied soul is in an unconscious state.

But what was really the state of the departed saints of the Old Testament? Instead of multiplying passages, we shall quote the words of Delitzsch, which he gives as the result of his thorough examination of the subject. He says: "The souls of the Old Testament dead, both of the believers in God the Saviour and of the godless, went into hades. The souls of the former were indeed, in the midst of hades, in God's hands, but, nevertheless, in a state of need of redemption, and under the effects of divine wrath. Their condition excluded the sight of God, and, while it was not a

state of unconsciousness and insensibility, it was a dream-like existence in the (apparent) forms of their former bodies."¹

Olshausen says, in his comments on *Matt. xxii. 15-46* passim: "Although allusions to a continued state of consciousness after death are not wanting in the Pentateuch (*Gen. v. 24; xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xliv. 29, etc.*), yet this life in hades appears as a cheerless one; and the Pentateuch views are entirely different from those of the New Testament (*John xi. 25, 26; Phil. i. 23*). If Moses and the other Old Testament writers had represented the condition of the disembodied $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ as a desirable one, as Paul did, they would have told what was not true. The New Testament statements concerning the state after death apply only to believers, whose $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is illuminated by the Spirit of Christ, and thus prepared for the presence of the Lord. But even for believers this state is only a temporary, though relatively happy, one; they long for the redemption — ransoming — of their bodies (*Rom. viii. 23; 2 Cor. v. 4*)."

To this we may add that, in the times following the last prophets, the views of the Jews on this subject, as well as on many others, underwent considerable change. Their sense of God's holiness being less keen, both by the ceasing of the prophetic spirit, and in consequence of their more frequent intercourse with the Gentiles, they divided hades into the abode of the blessed and the receptacle of the wicked, answering to the Elysium and Tartarus of the Greeks. These their notions, however, had an objective basis, were founded, in part at least, in truth, as we learn from the parable of Dives and Lazarus (*Luke xvi.*) The former division was called Abraham's bosom or paradise, promised by the dying Saviour to the penitent thief, and cannot properly be said to have been in hades, since it was part of hades, as we learn from a number of passages, as *John xx. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6; Eph. iv. 9*.²

¹ *Bibl. Psych.* p. 268.

² We are well aware that these passages have received different interpretations; the reality of Christ's descent into hades has been flatly denied, and the corresponding article been struck out from the creed; Christ's preaching to the

Of the departed saints in the new dispensation says Julius Müller: "The apostle ascribes (2 Cor. v. 3) to the soul in its intermediate state—between death and the resurrection—the quality of *γυμνὸν εἶναι*, which state is expressed by other writers of the New Testament by calling the departed *ψυχαι*, or *πνεύματα* (1 Pet. iii. 19; Apoc. vi. 9; xx. 4; Heb. xii. 23). This view undoubtedly implies that certain limits are set to the disembodied soul's manifestation of its life, as also appears from the *καθεύδειν* of the soul, as opposed to *γρηγορεῖν* in life (1 Thess. v. 10, etc.; 1 Cor. xi. 30), of course both in unison with the *ζῆν ἅμα σὺν Χριστῷ*. But this *γυμνότης* does, evidently, not imply that the soul is entirely stripped of all bodily mediation—is a retrogression of the soul into a merely spiritual existence. Some medium of self-manifestation adheres to the soul even after death; but this is such that in it the full reality of human life cannot come to view, and compared with the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* not only, but also with the earthly life, it is a retrogression—a condition less perfect than either."¹

On the same subject Delitzsch says: "That the souls of those that die in the faith of the risen Saviour fall into a real sleep is an idea that has not even the least support in the scriptures; it ought not to be entertained for a moment by a believer in Christ; for believers are at home with Christ, where they longed to be; they are in paradise, where Paul heard inexpressible words; they stand before the throne of God day and night, serving him in his temple, as John sees (Apoc. vii. 15), while he receives the revelation of what

spirits in prison has been denied, and the most forced and unnatural interpretation been given to the texts which plainly teach it; and by the "lower parts of the earth," to which Paul says that Christ had descended prior to his ascension, his incarnation or burial is said to be meant. But we do not deem it worth our while to refute these wild theories, and to establish the true one; the language of the scriptures is plain, and whoever reads it in order to be instructed by it, not to make it fit his own preconceived notions, cannot mistake it. The "lower parts of the earth" is, in the Old Testament language, synonymous with *hades*, and without Christ's descent thither, his death would not have been real.

¹ Doctrine of Sin, Part ii. p. 407.

was to come to pass prior to the final judgment and the glorification of the world. They see God and the God-man. This degree of bliss is at least within their reach, and many souls actually enjoy it; although there can be no doubt that after the resurrection of the body the condition of even the best will be bettered in many respects. The death of those that die in the Lord has only the semblance, no longer the nature of death."¹ And again: "The redeemed soul's element of life is the Godhead, into which the Redeemer has returned as the God-man. They were in God, even in this life, as to their inmost personal life; and now, having left this body of sin and death, they are at home with him (2 Cor. v. 6-8). They are naked (2 Cor. v. 3), having put off the mortal body, and not yet put on the glorified body. But they are, at the same time, not naked, for, being in the confines of eternity and infinitude, they are, for this very reason, in the presence of Christ, whom they had put on here, and whose glorified body is in a higher degree than here the earnest of the glorification of their own bodies. This is the great difference between the condition of those that die in faith in the Redeemer and the state in which the Old Testament saints were before their resurrection — that the former are in personal union with the glorified bodily life of the exalted Saviour, which they have for their home, for their tent. But not only this; the grace of God in Christ, which had adorned them, even in this life, with robes of salvation, adorns them also in the intermediate state with garments of glory. The body of Christ, with its doxa, is their garment, in so far as they are within eternity and infinitude, and the white garments promised by Christ to the victors are their garments within time and space as penetrated by eternity and infinitude."²

In the main we agree with the views expressed by these eminent divines; but both Olshausen and Delitzsch have fallen into slight inaccuracies. The two passages quoted by Olshausen refer, not to the disembodied soul, but to the life

¹ Book of Psalms, p. 366.

² Ibid. pp. 383, 384.

on earth; and Apoc. vii. 15, as quoted by Delitzsch, seems likewise not to refer to the disembodied souls, but may be a vision of what was to take place in the development of God's kingdom on earth, or is a description of a scene transpiring after even the second resurrection. The passages wherein disembodied souls are unmistakably spoken of in the New Testament are very few, and they give but scanty information as to their state or condition, so that we are rather confined to analogy, to the life-connection existing here between Christ and believers, which the Saviour expressly declares is not severed by the physical death (John xi. 26 and *passim*). To the intermediate state refer the following passages: Apoc. xiv. 13: "Happy are the dead that die in the Lord henceforth; yea, says the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; but their works follow with them." Their happiness is more of a negative than of a positive character; they are exempt from all sufferings; they have, moreover, the consciousness of having done their duty in life, of having secured their eternal welfare. The same in substance is said to the souls under the altar (Apoc. vi. 9-11). A white robe was given to each one of them, and it was said to them that they should rest yet a little time — *ἀναπαύσονται*. By this robe Delitzsch understands not, as Dante and others do, a garment woven by herself out of air, but the self-manifestation of the soul by means of the power that is peculiar to her.

The apostle Paul speaks in two passages of his own intermediate state (2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23), which appeared to him, as long as he looked only upon himself in his then surroundings, preferable to his state in the body.

The Roman Catholic church of our day, underrating the resurrection, and carrying out her Platonic views consistently, sends the souls of believers that are not perfect to purgatory; and some Protestants, agreeing in principle here with Rome, assume, on the authority of the badly translated and worse interpreted passage Rom. ix. 28, that the believer who is not

perfect before he dies, is made so by the Lord in, or before, the moment of death.

Says Möhler, in his celebrated Symbolism: "It is a perfect self-contradiction to assume that the soul, whether covered or not, enters heaven while stained with sin. The question, therefore, arises: How is man finally set free from sin, and the principle of holiness within him thoroughly quickened? Or, if we leave this world with any sinful stain upon us, how can we be thoroughly cleansed from it?" His answer is, that this is accomplished in purgatory. But Delitzsch answers: "In him whose inward being is renewed by God's grace, after laying aside the body of sin and death, the life of the spirit, so far checked and impeded, breaks forth in the presence of the realities of the invisible world with such force that everything sinful and its consequences must disappear, as mist before the rising sun."

As to the resurrection of the dead, its reality is readily admitted by the great mass of Catholics and Protestants; but its necessity is scarcely felt. It is admitted into the creed, into the consciousness of the church, on the strength of the positive declarations of the scriptures; it is also allowed to add something to the bliss of the redeemed; but it is, at the same time, taken for granted that the resurrection is something superadded from without, and that the disembodied soul might be fully happy without the resurrection of the body. This theory, Platonic in its origin and essence, comes here in conflict with itself. Platonism, consistently carried out, looks on the resurrection of the body as an impossibility, and as something in itself undesirable, if it were possible. The theory under review would fain do the same thing, and, in order to be consistent, ought to do the same thing. If the relation of the soul to the body is that of the bird to the cage, if death is a setting free of the soul, the re-caging of it is certainly not desirable, no matter of what material the cage is made. That it admits the resurrection on the strength of the declarations of the Bible does not alter the case, but accounts for its ab-

normal position and the doubtful worth ascribed to it. That we represent the common view correctly appears plainly from the following extract, which may be taken as a fair specimen of the general notion about our subject. We quote from the Comprehensive Commentary on 1 Cor. xv. 12-19; the compiler says: "Another absurdity following from this supposition [that there is no resurrection] is that those who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If there be no resurrection, they cannot rise, and therefore are lost, even those who have died in the Christian faith and for it. It is plain, from this, that those among the Corinthians who denied the resurrection meant thereby a state of future retribution, and not merely the revival of the flesh; they took death to be the destruction and extinction of the man, and not merely of the bodily life; for otherwise the apostle could not infer the utter loss of those who slept in Jesus from the supposition that they would never rise more, or that they had no hopes in Christ after life; for they might have hope of happiness for their minds, if these survived their bodies; and this would prevent the limiting of their hopes in Christ to this life only. On supposition, there is no resurrection, *in your sense*, no after state and life, then dead Christians are quite lost. How vain a thing were our faith and religion on this supposition! And this would infer that Christ's ministers and servants were of all men most miserable, as having hope in him in this life only (v. 19), which is another absurdity that would follow from asserting no resurrection. All who believe in Christ have hope in him; all who believe in him as a redeemer, hope for redemption and salvation by him; but, if there be no resurrection, or state of future recompense, their hope in him must be limited to this life; and if all their hopes in Christ lie within the compass of this life, they are in a much worse condition than the rest of mankind, especially at that time and in those circumstances in which the apostle wrote; for they had no countenance or protection from the rulers of the world."

This extract, which fairly expresses a widely spread way

of thinking and feeling on our subject, fully justifies our representation of it. It is freely admitted that, if the apostle had reasoned from his own point of view, his conclusions would have been false, and a theology strongly tinged with Platonism will always pronounce them false. To him who considers the body the prison-house of the soul, and death the liberation of the latter, the apostle's reasoning must be absurd, as he can say with great complaisance that the soul that has found, through faith in Christ, pardon and the elements of a life of holiness not only can be, but actually is, happy in heaven, even without the body. But the apostle draws evidently his conclusions, not from the eschatological views which are imputed to his Corinthian adversaries, but from his own views of the subject; for, not to press the fact that only the Stoics and Epicureans denied a self-conscious existence of the soul after death, who were few in number, and most unlikely to be among the first believers in a crucified Saviour, the apostle's whole argumentation does not admit the view assumed in the above extract. For had those Corinthian errorists taken a view of the resurrection as giving alone a self-conscious existence, the apostle could have said simply, and undoubtedly would have said, that the soul can live and be comparatively happy outside of the body; and he would not have been at a loss for proofs for Jews and Greeks. No, the fact is, the apostle reasons from his own views of the resurrection, which his Platonic opponents denied as impossible, or, possibly also, represented as having already taken place; like Hymeneus and Philetus (2 Tim. ii. 18), spiritualizing it so as to destroy its reality. The apostle writes: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither has Christ been raised" (v. 13); "For if the dead are not raised, Christ has not been raised either" (v. 16); "But if Christ has not been raised, your faith is a vain thing; you are still in your sins; then, also, those that fell asleep perished" (vs. 17, 18). We call attention, in the first place, to the fact that in every one of these protases *ei* with the ind. is used, representing the apodosis as necessarily

given with the protasis, e.g. "if there be a God, he is good," i.e. goodness is a necessary attribute of the Deity, — without goodness there is no God; hence, without the resurrection of the dead, there is no resurrection of Christ; without the resurrection of Christ, there is no foundation for faith, no forgiveness of sin, and a loss of all the dead. In the apostle's argument the propositions "the dead rise not," and "Christ is not risen" are convertible terms, and we are fully justified in saying: "If the dead rise not, your faith is unfounded; you are yet in your sins; the dead in Christ are lost." But this reasoning our theology denies. Why? Because it conceives of a blessed existence of the disembodied spirit, of which the apostle has no idea. Forgiveness of sin, the restoration of the effaced divine image in the soul, are to the apostle not finalities, but means for a higher end; at most, links in a chain, which derive their real value only through the resurrection of the body. When God resolved to save mankind, this resolve embraced the salvation, the glorification of the body, not less than that of the soul, because the two factors are interdependent. Hence, if there is no resurrection of the body, God's whole plan is nothing, Christ is nothing, and any hope placed in him is nothing. The same train of ideas, and nearly in the same order, we find in Christ's teaching. John xi. 25, Jesus says: "I am the resurrection and the life; whoever believes in me shall live (*ζήσεται*), even if he should have died" (*ἐὰν ἀποθάνῃ*). And: "Every one that lives and believes in me shall surely never die." vi. 40: "But this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth in him, shall have eternal life, and I shall raise him up on the last day." According to our common theology, the introduction of the resurrection here is quite gratuitous; whereas, in the train of Christ's ideas it appears as the legitimate complement of the whole process of redemption; eternal life without the resurrection body being neither possible nor desirable.

On Matt. xxii. 32 the Comprehensive Commentary re-

marks: "If when Abraham died there had been an end of him, there had been likewise an end of God's relation to him as his God; but at that time, when God spoke to Moses, he was the God of Abraham, and therefore Abraham must have been alive, which proves the immortality of the soul in a state of bliss, and that by consequence infers the resurrection of the body; for there is such an inclination of the human soul to its body as would make a final and eternal separation inconsistent with the bliss of those that have God for their God." Our author proves, or tries to prove, with this passage, the immortality of the soul; and this is the general use made of it. The advocates of the sleep of the soul appeal to it in proof of their peculiar notion; others infer from it that at the time Jesus uttered these words Abraham, etc., must have been clothed with the resurrection body, whereas the Saviour proves thereby the resurrection as something future. The case supposed by the Sadducees had reference to the future: "Now, in the resurrection whose wife of the seven will she be?" They fancied to make with their supposed case a *reductio ad absurdum* of the resurrection theory. As they recognized the inspiration of the Pentateuch alone, the Saviour calls their attention to a passage which, if understood in all its bearings, demolished their whole position. Whoever sustains a life-union with his Maker cannot be a prey of death, because he is not in the element of wrath, but in that of love; and this includes the certainty of the life of both soul and body. This is taught by the passage, and nothing else. The self-conscious existence of the soul during the intermediate state is neither taught nor denied therein, but must be gathered from other passages.

If the views so far advanced as to the necessity of the resurrection of the body are correct, the very identity of the resurrection body with the natural body is a matter of course. If the soul should receive, immediately after death, or shortly before the final judgment, a new tabernacle, adapted to its constitution and adequate to all its wants, by a creation *de*

novo, as has been held at almost all times by some, and is in our day maintained with more or less assurance, one thing would be certain, viz. that the natural body is not redeemed by Christ. But the apostle declares positively, to quote only one passage out of many, that the body is as much the object of the work of redemption or ransom as the soul or spirit: "We ourselves groan within us, waiting for the (full) sonship, the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. viii. 23). By sin both spirit and body have been exposed to divine wrath, have been placed in the element of the divine *ὀργή*, and in order to a complete *ἀπολύτρωσις*, the body, as well as the spirit, must be redeemed. But this *ἀπολύτρωσις* and the creation of a new body are widely different things. The spirit in being redeemed is not destroyed, and succeeded by a newly created spirit; but its identity, the principle of personality, is preserved amid all the changes which the soul undergoes; and the same is the case with the body, whose identity is also preserved. As there is in the soul a certain something, called by the apostle (Eph. iv. 23) the *πνεῦμα τοῦ νοῦς*, which serves as the laboratory of the Divine Spirit, as the point of contact with the divine — so there may be a similar something in the body which proves the germ of the resurrection body; not, however, by a natural or physical process, but by the development of the principle of divine life obtained through faith in the Redeemer. As his body could not be held by the grave, but had to arise to life, to die no more, so the body of believers cannot, owing to their life-union with the Redeemer, remain forever in the grave. — It has been held by individuals at different times, that a like or similar body would answer all the purposes of the resurrection body. So Aeneas of Gaza makes use of the following simile: "If a half-destroyed brass statue of Achilles was totally destroyed and replaced by a golden one, it would be the same Achilles" (*ὀφθελή ἂν χρυσοῦς ὁ πάλαι λαλκοῦς Ἀχιλλεύς, Ἀχιλλεύς μέντοι*). That such a view falls far short of the scripture doctrine appears plainly from what has been said. Swedenborg's peculiar views have been

referred to before; and he protested against the ethereal body, which he gave to the saints immediately after death, being called or considered as a resurrection body.

Origen said: "*Λόγος τις σπερματικός ἐγκεῖται τῷ σώματι, ἀφ' οὗ μὴ φθειρομένου ἐγείρεται τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.* If from the *λόγος σπ.*, which remains uncorrupt, the rising of the body is to follow by a process of nature, the view must be rejected; but if the *λόγος σπ.* is viewed as likewise affected by sin, like the *πνεῦμα νοός*, but laid hold of by the Redeemer, sanctified and made by divine omnipotence the embryo of the resurrection body, the idea seems to be in accordance with the teachings of scripture. The apostle Paul uses the figure of the grain: "What thou sowest is not quickened if it do not die" (1 Cor. xv. 36). "And what thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that is to be, but a mere grain" (v. 37). "But God gives it a body as he pleases" (v. 38). Here divine omnipotence and the life-principle in the grain are the factors. This simile, like all other similes, does not hold good in every respect; the process being a nature process, and the product or result of the process not going beyond the nature of the parent grain; but these two points are different in the resurrection process, which is a process of grace, and not of nature. The whole subject is an article of faith, having been revealed to the apostle himself by a special revelation (*ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου*, 1 Thess. iv. 15), and hence is not discoverable by reasoning from any premises, nor by analogy, nor by any advance in science; for here we apply the words of our opponents, only in an inverted order: Where faith begins, there science ends; and it can, therefore, not be supposed that any known subject could have been named by the apostle that would furnish a full parallel. But in the case given the co-operation of the two factors — God's omnipotence working upon the *σπέρμα* of the body, quickening it and raising it in a glorified state to a never-ending life — is sufficient, and answers all demands of the case. Modern science teaches that the material elements constituting the properties of the body — bulk, weight, etc. —

are entirely changed, i.e. replaced by new ones, every seventh year. The ancient Fathers may not have known the exact length of the period in which the total replacement of the old by the new materials takes place; but the fact itself they knew, representing the principle of individual life which remains under all vicissitudes identical, as a rock in the current, against which the flowing waters constantly dash, forming foam and an eddy, leading the beholder to believe that the same particles of the element are constantly whirling around, while, in fact, they flow away, and are constantly replaced by new ones. This principle of life, which we would regard as a part of the (impersonal) spirit of God individualized, constitutes individual identity — the identity of the body; for it seizes upon and appropriates to itself, according to its own laws, the surrounding elements of matter. This principle, now, is as we conceive, laid hold of by Divine Omnipotence, and quickened and surrounded with glorified matter, which it lays hold of and appropriates according to its own individual laws; so that each spirit, on being united with its resurrection body, knows at once that it has entered the identical body from which it was separated in death.

From what has been said, it is sufficiently plain that the resurrection body is not immediately after death created, or raised for the soul. The time when this glorious transaction will take place is as much a subject of divine revelation as the transaction itself. High authorities, as Olshausen and Kurtz, have been referred to as teaching that the soul is immediately after death clothed with the resurrection body; and the following language has been quoted from their writings to sustain the appeal: "The idea of a purely spiritual existence throughout eternity is unknown to the apostle; without corporeity there is no happiness and no endless life of the creature."¹ A created spirit without a corporeal form to confine it to time and space, to bound its being and give it a species of form, must either be eternal, or, since this

¹ Olshausen, on 2 Cor. v.

is inadmissible, be dissipated into nothing and utterly lost. Hence within the province of created life the possession of a body is the condition of all things; without a body, without a fixed abode, the homeless spirit would be carried everywhere, and be dissolved into nothing—be utterly lost” (Kurtz). But it is well known that these two eminent scholars taught nothing of the kind; their language as quoted merely implies their strong conviction that the body is not a prison-house of the soul, but a constituent part of man, without which the soul could never be really happy; also that the disembodied soul creates for itself, after the pattern of the earthly body, some ethereal body to serve as its covering unto the resurrection morn. The New Testament represents throughout the resurrection of the body, both in the first and the second resurrection, as future.

There will be two resurrections, viz. the first, which is partial, and the second, which is universal, embracing all mankind.

Of the first, Paul treats in 1 Thess. iv. 15–17, saying: “We that live and are left till the parousia of the Lord, shall certainly not get ahead of those that went to sleep; the Lord himself will come down from heaven, and the dead in Christ shall be raised first; then we, the living ones, shall be caught up with them in clouds, toward a meeting of the Lord in the air.” The dead here spoken of are raised and clothed with the resurrection body, while the living believers put on the same resurrection body over their natural bodies, i.e. they are changed without having previously died. Of the same event treats Apoc. xix. xx. From xix. 19 we learn whom Paul means (1 Thess. iv. 15) by the *περιλειπόμενοι*; from Apoc. xx. 4–5 we learn who will be raised and who not on that occasion; those that will be raised will reign with Christ a thousand years. That the raised saints will be, during that whole period of time, with Christ in the air, as Dr. Hedge supposes, is not intimated by a single word. In the air the meeting takes place, and beyond this nothing is said; it is, moreover, neither said, nor is it probable, that

Christ and the raised saints will be all that time on earth, and maintain a perceptible intercourse with the inhabitants of the earth. Such grossly carnal views have thrown suspicion on the whole event under consideration; but whoever can get rid of the first resurrection, as detailed here, by his exegesis, can get rid of anything and everything in the Bible which does not suit his fancy. But we may be asked here, what becomes of the second or general resurrection, according to Paul? We say, that we find the latter indicated, though not detailed, in 1 Cor. xv. 24 by *εἰτα τὸ τέλος*. The *τέλος* takes place not only after the second coming (millennium), but also after the general resurrection, viz. when he shall have surrendered, *δταν παραδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν*, the kingdom to God, etc. In v. 25 it is said, that Christ must reign until the Father shall have put all his enemies under his feet (this reign lasts one thousand years), the last enemy that is destroyed is death. The destruction of death follows the general resurrection (Apoc. xx. 12-15); *then* the work of redemption is finished — all that could be saved are saved; and for those that are not saved, salvation is no longer possible; and *then* transpires what John speaks of in Apoc. xxi. and xxii., and from this we learn what Paul means by saying (1 Cor. xv. 28), “that the Son also shall be subject to him who subjected all things to him, that God may be all in all.” Christ’s mediatorial office ceases, he renders now, as it were, an account to God of his work; but personally he remains what and who he is, the God-man, or rather the Incarnated God, and the King of the redeemed, throughout eternity.

Before closing this Article we call attention to two more points. Christ is called the first fruits (*ἀπαρχή*, 1 Cor. xv. 23), which has reference both to rank and time. Before Christ no one had risen, and from the nature of the case, could have risen, so as to put on the resurrection body (John xii. 24); those individuals that had been raised by Jesus during his ministry, as well as those that had been raised by Old Testament prophets, died again a natural death, so that their case is specifically different from the resurrection

of Christ and that of the dead ; Abraham was in "Abraham's bosom," when God called himself his God, and this was in hades. Nor were Moses and Elias clothed with the resurrection body at the transfiguration. Of Elias it is, indeed, almost universally assumed that he appeared then and there in his resurrection body ; but there is absolutely nothing in the account of the transfiguration by the three evangelists, that legitimately leads to such a conclusion. By Matthew (xvii. 9) the whole event is called a vision (*δραμα*) ; Luke says, that the three disciples did not know what they said, meaning that they were in a trance, their powers of reflection being suspended, which state was necessary to enable them to perceive the two visitors from the other world ; but if they had been in their resurrection bodies this would not have been necessary, since the apostles and disciples saw their risen Master so often in a state of perfect wakefulness, and without experiencing any of those feelings of horror which seize upon human nature invariably when it is brought in contact with the spirit world. From 2 Kings ii. 11, etc. it merely follows that Elias was taken away in a miraculous manner from the living, but by no means that he experienced then and there a change similar to that described by Paul in 1 Thess. iv. The whole analogy of faith, and the express language of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 23), moreover, are against this theory. — We have purposely not referred, so far, to the celebrated passage 2 Cor. v. 1-9, not because we think that it contradicts the views advanced in this Article, but because it has received so widely differing explanations that we deemed it best not to refer to it in proof of any theory. Now, however, that we have stated, and, as we think, established our theory, we shall examine it as closely as we can in order to learn its real import. In examining the text and the comments of Christian scholars on it, the conviction has forced itself upon us, that the greatest difficulties arising therefrom have their origin in faulty or imperfect translations. We venture to give the following rendering, with a few explanatory notes :

1. For we know that if our earthly tent-house shall have been taken apart (at Christ's second coming, *ἐὰν καταλυθῆ*, which represents the thing as uncertain; i.e. the apostle does not know whether he shall live or not unto the coming of Christ), we have a building (which is) from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (hence, the apostle reasons, we shall not lose anything whether we die before that event or live to see its consummation).

2. For in this (tent-house) we also groan, earnestly desiring to put on (over our natural body) our house from heaven (i.e. we desire to put on the resurrection body without dying, and this involuntary groaning which we have in common with the whole creation (Rom. viii. 19, etc.) is conclusive evidence that our desire shall, in the main, be gratified).

3. Since, indeed, we shall be found (by the Saviour at his coming, if we die before that event) also clothed (with the resurrection body), not naked. (And yet we long to put on the resurrection body over our natural body.)

4. For we, that are in the tent, groan also, being weighed down, since we do not desire to put off (our earthly bodies), but to put on over (them our resurrection body), that the mortal may be swallowed up by the life.

5. But he who has prepared us for this very thing (the being clothed with the resurrection body) is God, who has given us also the earnest of the Spirit.

6. Being, therefore, always of good cheer, and knowing that dwelling in the body we are from home from the Lord;

7. For we walk by faith, not by sight;

8. (But being cheerful, we also prefer rather to dwell out of the body and to be at home toward the Lord.)

9. We, therefore, also strive earnestly, whether we dwell in the body or out of it, to be well pleasing unto him.

The apostle teaches us in this passage, according to our understanding it, the following: he knows, i.e. has the highest degree of certainty, that there is a resurrection body in store for every believer; this his certainty is founded on the sympathy of all nature, which, like human nature, in-

voluntarily longs for a total redemption from all the dismal effects of sin, and this universal longing will be gratified. The apostle does not know whether he shall live unto the coming of Christ; but he apprehends no loss whatever from this ignorance, nor does it diminish his present joy, because he will either live unto the coming of Christ, and if so, be clothed over with the resurrection body without dying, a blessing which he greatly desires; or he will die before that event, in which case he will be raised with the sleeping saints and put on the resurrection body even before the living are changed (1 Thess. iv. 15-17). The apostle's certainty is enhanced by the fact, that it is God who has commenced the work of redemption, and who will complete it, having given to believers the earnest of the Spirit.¹

The foregoing we believe to embody the substance of the eschatological teachings of the scripture, both of the Old and the New Testament, and the impossibility spoken of by Dr. Hedge, to deduce from the New Testament a doctrine of the life to come, which shall fit all the texts and satisfy all the demands of the subject, does, as it seems to us, not exist. The "new earth," and the "new Jerusalem" upon it, find in our doctrine their natural place, being the cap-stone of the whole edifice of redemption; Paul's "conception of being raised from the dead and caught up into the clouds to dwell with the Lord in the air," appears as a link of the wonderful chain of God's redemptive dealings with men; even the paradise promised by the dying Redeemer to the

¹ Our view of this passage agrees, on the whole, with Delitsch (Bibl. Psych., pp. 375, 376). Luther, Calvin, Hofmann, and Olshausen, understand by *ἐνδυσάμενοι* (v. 3), the putting on of the righteousness of Christ, taking *οὐ γυμνοί* as appositional to *ἐνδυσάμενοι*, and translate accordingly: "provided, that we shall be found (by Christ at his coming), as such that have put on his righteousness, not naked" (under which condition alone we shall be changed by him). Julius Müller (Doctrine of Sin, Part ii. p. 405) takes *ἐνδυσάμενοι* = *ἐνδεδυμένοι*, and translates: "Provided that we shall be found by Christ being still clothed with our natural body." But, not to press the fact that the part. aor. is not the same in meaning as the part. perf., this whole view rests on a mistranslation of v. 1, *ἐὰν καταλυθῇ*. Others, again, as Roos, Nitsch, and Martensen, understand by *ἐνδυσάμενοι* a putting on of an intermediate covering of the soul.

penitent thief has its proper place, and we doubt not, that each and every eschatological passage will, on trial, be found to find a natural place in the system, throwing more light on it and thus proving its truth.

We are, at the same time, aware that what we have set forth as the teachings of the Bible contravenes many fondly cherished notions of many good people. The condition which we assign to the disembodied soul, from the moment of its separation from the body unto the resurrection morn, may be especially unwelcome to many; they prefer taking it for granted that the disembodied soul is at once received by a convoy of angels, and conducted before the throne of God, to receive the approbation of the Supreme Judge, and to be perfectly happy at once. Others prefer believing that the soul is at once, at its entering into the spirit-world, clothed with its resurrection body. But with regard to these and similar views, we must say that we do not find them in the Bible; and the Bible is our only source of information on this all-important subject.

As to the possibility of disembodied spirits visibly or audibly reappearing to the inhabitants of the earth, we think that it is presumed in the Bible (Luke xxiv. 39), but, it being altogether useless (Luke xvi. 31), and evidently against the will and law of God, it ought not to be tested by any means whatever.

The foregoing was written when the Westminster Review for October came to hand. It contains a favorable notice of Schenkel's "A Sketch of the Character of Jesus, translated from the German," by which we find our views, expressed in this Article, fully confirmed. Schenkel denies the physical or bodily resurrection of Jesus, while he would fain believe in him as "the risen, the glorified, the exalted One, who is as such the living One in his community, and therefore with his community, until the end of the world." His translator says of the scope of the Essay: "Schenkel's work breathes a different spirit [from that of the works of Strauss and Renan]. He believes in the im-

perishableness and glory of Christianity, and in the incomparableness of the person of the Saviour. He intends, not to destroy, but to build up; not to oppose Christian faith, but to purify and renew it," positions which Schenkel himself will undoubtedly recognize as his own. We say, we find our views confirmed in this Essay; for Schenkel is consistent in carrying out his views of the body and its relation to the soul, which he holds in common with many orthodox, to their legitimate sequences. If the body is a burden to the imprisoned soul, if the soul is set free by death, and can get along, not only without the body, but even fare better without it than in it, — if this be the case, there is certainly no reason why the body should ever be raised; and this applies to the Saviour with as full force as to any son of Adam. And let the *necessity* of the resurrection be disposed of, and there is no difficulty in disposing of its *reality*. So far, then, Schenkel is consistent; but when he attempts to reconcile his theory with the scriptures he evidently fails, and shows great weakness. So he says: "Only thus [i.e. on the supposition that his disciples were convinced of the reality of his physical resurrection], it is thought, can be explained the sudden revival of the faith of the disciples, which by preceding events had been so much shaken." How does he storm this impregnable position? He says: "This entirely overlooks the fact that the women showed courage even before the resurrection of Jesus: that the apostles, on the evening of the first day of the week after the crucifixion, before they had had an appearance of Christ, were, according to the later tradition, assembled (Luke xxiv. 33) in Jerusalem, and therefore were neither scattered nor wholly disheartened." The women went, as early as their religion allowed, to the grave, in order to embalm the body of the beloved Master. In doing this they showed no more courage than many other women have shown under similar circumstances; but who in his sound mind can believe for a moment that they would have proclaimed the fact of their Master's resurrection, if they had found his dead body, as

they expected? But what shall we say of the other remark of Schenkel? Had he read Luke xxiv. 33, 34? And is not the very opposite of what he affirms said there? Did not the assembled eleven and their friends surprise the two remaining disciples with the news that "the Lord has been raised indeed, and was seen by Simon"? Would we not find it natural if the more intimate friends of the Crucified One had once more assembled by night prior to their dispersion, even without any reports as to his resurrection? And did not the words of the women, and especially those of a man like Peter, make it an imperative duty for them to meet? And yet the fact of their meeting under these circumstances is to be a proof that the conviction of the reality of the Saviour's bodily resurrection, on the part of the apostles, was not necessary in order to revive their greatly shaken faith! It is really heart-sickening to see that men of Schenkel's standing should impose so much upon themselves or others, in order to maintain a preconceived notion or theory. Nor does he succeed any better in what he affirms of the importance of the bodily resurrection in the estimation of Paul, when he says: "To a faith resting upon the external fact of a bodily resurrection of Jesus, the apostle Paul has denied all worth; for he says: 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth we know him no more thus. If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; the old has passed away; all has become new'" (2 Cor. v. 16, 17). Had Dr. Schenkel forgotten, when he penned this sentence, what Paul said in 1 Cor. xv. 8, an Epistle which he himself recognizes as genuine? Did Paul know what he was saying? Or had his views, in the short time intervening between the writing of his first and his second letter, undergone a total change as to the importance of the resurrection of the body? The one or the other of these positions Schenkel must take, or admit that he wholly perverts Paul's meaning. That he does the latter, no unprejudiced mind can doubt.