which our own good sense prompts us, and yet to flesh and blood it is most hard, full of loss and pain. It is a course on which we can only enter by a kind of death, and in which we can only continue by suffering death in many forms; and yet it is the one only course by which we can rise into a true life, a life which will prove itself to be true by flowering out into life everlasting. That it is our true life, and that it will blossom into life eternal, should be a sufficient "spur in the sides of our intent." But lest it should not prove sufficient, we are still further incited and encouraged by the assurance that, if we serve the cause and follow the example of Christ, God will "honour" us even here and now, and by honouring us bring a new strength and sweetness into our lives; while, hereafter, we shall infallibly reach that great home and city of the soul to which our path conducts, and arrive where He is in whose steps we have trodden, and there be changed into his image, satisfied with his likeness, and invested with his glory.

EDITOR.

THE GROWTH OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY AMONG THE JEWS.

"MARTHA said unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. And even now I know that, whatsoever thou shalt ask of God, God will give thee. Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again (ἀναστήσεται). Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει) at the last day" (John xi. 21–24). Now how did Martha know this? It seems to have been a novel doctrine to some of the Apostles. At the Transfiguration, when the Lord told the chosen three

to communicate the vision to no man until the Son of Man should have risen from the dead, they received the word with perplexity, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean (Mark ix. 9, 10).[1] But the Pharisees usually, like Martha, believed in a general Resurrection; hence St. Paul in their presence could appeal to this opinion with confidence: "having hope toward God which these men also themselves accept, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust" (Acts xxiv. 15), and could win over his accusers to his side by confessing himself a Pharisee, and declaring that he was called in question touching the hope and resurrection of the dead (Acts xxiii. 6). The Sadducees, in putting to our Lord the supposed case of the seven brethren (Mark xii.), take it for granted that He held this tenet; and Christ Himself speaks of it as one which his hearers believed, and condescended to offer proof of its truth only to professed unbelievers. Between the vague and obscure references to the Resurrection of the dead in the Old Testament and the open statement of the doctrine in the New, there is a world of difference. Without entering into a controversial argument on the subject, I will here give just an outline of the course of reasoning by which it is shewn that the earlier Scriptures are not silent concerning this great truth. We shall be thus prepared to trace its development in the interval between the close of the Old Testament Canon and the Christian era.

1. That the Pentateuch contains no reference even to a future life, much less to the Resurrection of the body, has been confidently maintained by many eminent scholars; and Bishop Warburton, as we all know, based his great argument for the Divine Legation of Moses on the assurance

[1] The words are: *συζητοῦντες τί ἐστι τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι*, implying a general doubt as to the meaning of the expression and not merely as to its applicability to the Messiah. Comp. verse 32.

of this fact. That Moses refrained from using the doctrine of future rewards and punishments as a motive for obedience in this life is certain. With the manifest interference of God in human affairs ever before their eyes, with their daily experience of his moral government, the Israelites needed no appeal to future judgment in order to stimulate their submission to present discipline. Another reason for the absence of any definite teaching concerning the disembodied soul, was doubtless the tendency to idolatry among the Jews. The Book of Wisdom (ch. xv.) shews how Hero-worship opens the way to this sin; and more precise teaching about the conditions of life in the other world might have led to an apotheosis of Abraham and Moses, and introduced that Polytheism against which Mosaic legislation was so strongly arrayed. Further, till the Hebrews were ready for the revelation of life and immortality through the Gospel, the thought of the other world and the soul's existence therein was not one of comfort and strength to this people, and could not be urged as an incentive to virtue in the present world. Yet this does not render it antecedently improbable that intimations of the great doctrine were conveyed in some degree to the early believers. In conformity with this idea, some theologians, while allowing that the great lawgiver did not formally enunciate the doctrine in any enactment or document, assert that he delivered it by tradition, and that it was thus handed down to successive ages unto Christian times. This, of course, is merely a theory invented to account for the existence of the opinion without apparent support from the Old Testament Scriptures. It may be true or false; but we have no direct proof for it, and there is much to be said against it.[1] On the other hand, certain passages in the Pentateuch are adduced by the Jews themselves as adum-

[1] See Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Bk. v., §. 5 vol. ii. p. 337 ff. ed. 1837.

brating the doctrine of future rewards and punishments and the Resurrection.[1] These are such as the following: "Ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments; which if a man do he shall live in them" (Lev. xviii. 5), where the life offered is not to be restricted to temporal prosperity, but is intended to embrace the eternal life of the whole man restored after death, even as Christ preached to the inquiring ruler, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt. xix. 17). We have the testimony of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. xi.) that no transitory promises satisfied the aspirations of the old Patriarchs; they looked for a city which hath foundations laid by God; they desired a better, that is, a heavenly country; they had respect unto the recompense of reward. And that they shall enjoy this heavenly city in a body restored from the grave was argued from another passage (Exod. vi. 4): "I also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." It is not said "to give *you*," or "to give your sons," but "to give *them*;" therefore because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must receive the promise in another life, "whereby," says R. Simai,[2] "the resurrection of the dead appeareth out of the Law." A similar argument is drawn from the form of expression in Deut. xi. 21: "That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children in the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them." "Non dicit *vobis* sed *illis*; constat itaque ex Lege fore resurrectionem mortuorum." We may think such arguments singularly weak and inconclusive, but they are interesting as shewing what was the character of the Rabbinical reasoning in favour of this doctrine. Of no great weight is the

[1] The great authority on this subject is Manasseh Ben Israel, *De Resurrect. Mort.* Amstelod. 1636.

[2] Quoted by Bp. Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. xi., note *a*, p. 638, ed. 1833. See also *Manass. Ben Isr.*, p. 10.

inference drawn from God's sentence on Adam (Gen. iii. 19). As Adam is already dust, he cannot be turned into dust; so the curse would signify, Thou art now dust and shalt be clothed again with dust ("return to dust") at the Resurrection. In the story of Joseph's dream (Gen. xxxvii.) when Jacob says to him: "Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?" it is annotated that the patriarch "observed the saying" ("sperabat rem ipsam") because, as Rachel was now dead, he hoped that she would rise again and return to earth. It need hardly be observed that it is not certain that Rachel was deceased at this time, and, if this were the case, Jacob's words may well apply to Bilhah, Joseph's quasi-mother. "I have set before you life and death," says Moses (Deut. xxx. 19), "blessing and cursing: therefore choose life." If to the carnal mind, dwelling only on temporal results, these words might seem to refer exclusively to the life on earth, yet a deeper view would see in them a reference to the promise of an immortal reward beyond the grave, even as they were understood by the author of the Second Book of Esdras (vii. 59) quoted further on. Again, the oft-repeated expression of "going to his fathers," "being gathered unto his people,"[1] implies a belief in the continued existence of the soul, not merely that the body was placed in the common tomb of a man's ancestors; for Abraham, of whom the phrase is used, was buried in the cave of Machpelah wherein none but Sarah lay, and Aaron found a solitary grave in Mount Hor, and the place of Moses' sepulchre was unknown. The same expression is employed in the narrative of the death of Jacob, though a long time elapsed before he was actually buried. So when our Lord, in proof of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, alleged the fact that God called Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac,

[1] Gen. xv. 15, xxv. 8, xlix. 29. Comp. Num. xx. 26; Deut. xxxii. 50.

and Jacob, He was using an argument in accord with the Jewish thought of the time; He was appealing to a truth which their own Scriptures taught, viz. that after death the souls of the faithful were in God's keeping still, and that in some way He would in good time perfect their personality. The man is not soul only or body only; he is body and soul united in one person; and if God is the God of Abraham and the patriarchs, long dead, He is the God of their whole selves, which must look forward to a restoration to their original complex condition. The devout Hebrew knew, in the words of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 6), that "the Lord killeth and maketh alive, He bringeth down to *Sheol* and He bringeth up;" and considering the many and stern enactments against magic or necromancy, and, it may be, having experience of the power exerted by professors of these evil arts over the disembodied spirit, he would seize any intimation of the hope of being freed from the power of the grave and re-united to the body and restored to light and happiness. Without this hope the mere continued existence of the soul in Hades was a gloomy and uninviting prospect. We see this in Hezekiah's poignant sorrow at the thought of death (Isa. xxxviii.), and in the many expressions of hopelessness and distress which meet us continually in the Old Testament.[1] *Sheol* in earlier days was regarded rather as a prison and the domain of the Prince of death, than as a place of rest and refreshment; and it was a much later age that could trust the dead to the "Lord, the lover of souls," knowing that "the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and that no torment shall touch them" (Wisd. xi. 26, iii. 1). Not to dwell too long on one portion of Holy Scripture in which the doctrine was supposed to be taught, we may just mention that it was found in Moses' words (Exod. xv. 1):

[1] For this gloomy view of death see Job xiv. 10–13, xvii. 14–16; Ps. xxx. 9, xlix. 19, 20, lxxxviii. 4–12; Eccles. iii. 18–22, ix. 4–6, 10.

"I *will* sing unto the Lord"; in the enactment touching the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv. 10), that every man should return *to his family;* in the bestowing upon Aaron the Lord's portion *for ever* (Num. xviii.), while he did not even enter the Promised Land; in the assertion that "all that did cleave unto the Lord are alive this day" (Deut. iv. 4), their adherence to God making them immortal; in the promise to Reuben (Deut. xxxiii. 6) "He shall live and not die;" and in the exulting assertion in Moses' dying song, "I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal" (Deut. xxxii. 39), where are declared not merely God's omnipotency and the deliverance of Israel, but the Resurrection of the dead.[1] It would have been more apposite to have adduced the translation of Enoch, taken in connection with the rapture of Elijah, but Manasseh Ben Israel omits this entirely in his citations from the Pentateuch. He also fails to notice in this connection the raising of the widow's son (1 Kings xvii.) when the prophet prayed, "Let this child's soul (*nephesh*) come into him again;" the resuscitation of the Shunammite's boy by Elisha (2 Kings iv.); and the story of the dead man revived by contact with the same prophet's bones (2 Kings xiii. 21); all of which speak to us plainly of the Resurrection of the body. The Jews indeed alleged the passages cited above as proving the immortality of the soul, but they seem to have neglected to notice that they also illustrate, if they do not prove, the resurrection of the flesh. They have noticed the connection between the sacrifice of Isaac and the Resurrection, herein agreeing with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 19), who speaks of Abraham "accounting that God was able to raise him (Isaac) up even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."[2] They took also the brazen serpent as a type of the Resurrection,

[1] See *Manass. Ben Isr.*, p. 11 ff.

[2] See Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.*, vol. i. in Matt. xxii. 32.

arguing *a minori ad majus*. As by the serpent who brought death into the world God effected life and health, so from the grave and gate of death He brings to birth a new and better life.[1] But they seem to have failed to see the teaching of the death of Abel, which has been noticed by Dean Graves. It is inconceivable that God would have permitted one who was acting with his express approval to suffer a cruel death, while his murderer was allowed to live, if body and soul were not to be compensated by a future life.

II. From various expressions in the Psalms the Jews might have gathered, and did gather, intimations of the doctrine of the Resurrection. When St. Peter in his first sermon quoted the sixteenth Psalm as bearing witness to the Resurrection of Christ, though most of his auditors would not agree with him in this particular, they were accustomed to see in the words a reference to the general Resurrection. Some[2] indeed inferred from the passage that David's body saw no decay; but this merely confirms the opinion that they held the doctrine of the Resurrection, since the indestructibility of the body would be void of significance if it were not to be joined to the soul and live again. The forty-ninth Psalm, which contrasts the lot of the worldly and the pious, suggests the doctrine. While the former are laid in Sheol like sheep in the stall, with Death for their shepherd, the latter can say with confidence: "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for He will receive me"; the grave shall have no power to retain the righteous; God will take them to Himself. Of similar character is the testimony of the seventy-third Psalm, wherein the seer considers the difficult question of the prosperity of the wicked, and finds his answer in the sanctuary

[1] Sohar in *Jalkut Rubeni*, fol. 144, 4, ap. Schoettgen in Joh. iii. 14.

[2] R. David Kimchi; and R. Isaac in *Midr. Tehillim*. Pusey, *Lect. on Daniel*, p. 502.

of God. As a dream is forgotten when one awaketh from sleep, so in the great awakening God shall despise them as nothing worth; but the pious are continually with the Lord, He holds their right hand, He guides them by his counsel in this life, and afterwards, in the great Hereafter, receives them into glory, takes them to Himself, who is the strength of their heart and their portion, not in this world only, but for ever. Such too is the assured faith of David; he is confident that he shall behold the face of God (Ps. xvii.), not in the flesh, for no mortal man can see God and live, but in the other life. "I shall be satisfied," he says, "when I awake, with Thy likeness." The awakening in these passages could only be predicated of that which slept, viz. the body. The continued life of the immortal soul could not be thus expressed.[1] So translating Psalm lxxii. 16: "They shall flourish out of the city like grass of the earth," the Jews argued that the Psalmist speaks of the bodies of the dead to be revived as herbs from the bosom of the earth; for it cannot be the fruits of the ground that are spoken of as arising "from the city."[2] The doctrine was confirmed by the expression in Psalm lxxxiv. 4: "They will be still praising Thee," where the future tense of the verb, and the word "still" imply a new and ever fresh praise, which shall be sung in the other world. Another passage adduced[3] is Psalm civ. 27–30: If after the spirit is taken away and the body is reduced to dust, by some miraculous change the spirit is to return to the body and the face of the earth is renewed, who, say the Rabbis, does not see that this must take place in the Resurrection? Commenting on the four things that are never satisfied (Prov. xxx. 15, 16), the grave, the barren womb, the earth, and the fire, the same teachers asked, what is the connection between the grave and the womb?

[1] For more on the subject of the Psalms, see Pusey, *ibid.* and ff.

[2] *Manasseh Ben Israel*, p. 20.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 21.

and the answer was: "Quemadmodum vulva recipit semen, et postea edit aliquod vivens, ita etiam sepulchrum recipit corpora defunctorum, et postea, die resurrectionis eadem reddit."[1]

III. As regards the famous passage in Job (xix. 25–27) we need not discuss the question of its most probable interpretation. The Jewish commentators seem for the most part to have seen in it no bearing on the final Resurrection; and those among them who have written on this subject, and have with curious ingenuity discovered the doctrine in the most unlikely quarters, omit all reference to the passage. The Septuagint version seems to favour the tenet: *οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀένναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέρμα μου* (*ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ σῶμα*, A.S.[2]) *τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα.* To the same purport is the strange interpolation at the end of the Book, for which the Hebrew affords no authority, but which is found, I believe, in all the Cursive, as it is certainly in all the Uncial, Greek MSS.: *γέγραπται δὲ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι μεθ' ὧν ὁ κύριος ἀνίστησιν.* There is no evidence to shew that this is a gloss introduced by a Christian hand; it is more probably to be ascribed to the same school which produced the Greek translation. The opinion of many of the Fathers on the genuine passage of Job is vitiated by their ignorance of Hebrew; but the sentiment of Clemens Romanus may well be regarded as embodying one traditional view when he appeals to Job in confirmation of the Resurrection,[2] and Jerome is a competent witness of the propriety of such view, regarded as grammatically possible, when he writes[3]: "Quid hac prophetia manifestius? Nullus tam aperte post Christum, quam iste ante Christum, de Resurrectione loquitur. Sperat Resurrectionem, imo novit et vidit." Just as Christianity gives its own colouring to isolated statements of Holy

[1] *Manasseh*, p. 24.

[2] *καὶ πάλιν Ἰὼβ λέγει· καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην τὴν ἀναντλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα. Ad Cor.*, xxvi. 3. [3] *Cont Joan. Hieros.*, § 3.0. II. 438, Vall.

Writ, which had quite another purpose in the view and circumstances of the writer, so the Seventy most probably imported their own later opinion into their translation of the paragraph in Job without considering the bearing of such rendering on the whole argument of the Book. The version therefore, and the interpretation, may be taken as representing the idea at which the Jews had arrived in the third century B.C. One passage from Job at least the Jews themselves adduce as supporting the doctrine of the Resurrection. When Job curses his day (iii. 13) and in his heavy storm of grief cries out, "Now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest"; this expression cannot refer to the soul, which does not sleep when freed from the body, but moves and energizes still; it must therefore apply to the body, which is said to sleep because soon to rise again.[1]

IV. As time went on, and God designed that men should understand his moral government to be one, not merely of temporal retribution, but extending into and consummated in the life beyond the grave, the prophets were inspired to give clearer intimations of the Resurrection. Thus Hosea (vi. 2) could say: "After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." There is nothing in the history of the ten tribes which fulfils this prophecy. They were never restored; no great favour was ever shewn to them after the captivity, which could be called by metaphor life after death. The utterance could only refer, as Christian commentators interpret it, to the Resurrection of Christ and of his members in Him, even as the Jews themselves explained it of the Messiah, though they knew not how it was fulfilled in Him. Their own gloss is this: "He will quicken us in the days of consolation which shall come; in the day of the quickening of the dead; He will raise us up, and we shall live before

[1] *Manasseh Ben Isr.*, pp. 23, 24.

Him."[1] And later comes that burst of exultation which Isaiah re-echoes and the Apostle takes up: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death. O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?"[2] No mere temporal deliverance could satisfy the scope of these great words; nor could the mere continuance of existence to the disembodied spirit be expressed in terms like these. The grave must give back its occupants, the body and soul must be reunited, to complete the ultimate design of this promised redemption. More plainly Isaiah cries (xxvi. 19): "Thy dead shall live, thy dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust! For thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead." Now whatever may be our opinion of the immediate subject of the Prophet's words, it cannot be doubted that his language would lose all its force if the hearers were not familiar with the doctrine of the Resurrection. Take the passage merely as a prophecy of the restoration of Israel to her country, her privileges and blessings, yet its imagery is drawn from the idea of the restoration of the body to life; it is illustrated by the Resurrection, and implies and demands a knowledge of the doctrine before it can be fully accepted and appreciated.[3] There can be no doubt, says Manasseh Ben Israel, that the vision of the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel xxxvii. implies the doctrine of the Resurrection. If the passage merely symbolizes the restoration of Israel, or pictures the revival of a certain number of dead persons, it certainly contains the idea of a general Resurrection, and shews that such notion was a familiar one to the Jewish mind, and could be properly used by the prophet as a topic of comfort under distress and despair. David Kimchi sees the doctrine also in the ordinances of the New Temple (Chap. xliii. 19):

[1] Targum, quoted by Pusey *in loc.*

[2] Hos. xiii. 14; Isa. xxv. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55. [3] *Manasseh Ben Isr.*, p. 15.

"Thou shalt give to the priests, the Levites, that be of the seed of Zadok, which approach unto me, to minister unto me, saith the Lord, a young bullock for a sin-offering," etc. This, he affirms, was never fulfilled in the second Temple, for Ezekiel died in Babylon; therefore, as God's promise stands firm, it must needs have its fulfilment in the world to come. And the Targum on Zechariah iii. 7 is this:[1] "Sic dicit Dominus, Si in viis rectis coram me ambulabis, et verbum meum observabis, etiam tu judicabis ministros meos in domo mea, et observabis atrium meum, et in resurrectione mortuorum vivicabo te." In plain words Daniel foretold the Resurrection of the just and the unjust (Chap. xii. 2), though this is not universally allowed by the Jewish commentators, some of whom most irrelevantly consider the persons spoken of to be those who were persecuted and slain by Antiochus. The prophet's words are these: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame, to everlasting contempt." As to the use of the word "many," which seems to militate against the idea of a *general* Resurrection, it is well observed by Corn. à Lap. *in loc.*: "Multi dormientium, hoc est, multi dormientes, puta omnes dormientes. Dicit tamen multi, ut notet hos omnes non fore paucos, sed multos, q.d. Omnes dormientes, qui erunt multi, et pene innumeri, resurgent, sive tota multitudo dormientium, quæ plurima est, resurget. Sensus est, omnes qui mortui sunt resurgent." And he instances the use of "many" for "all" in Matthew xxvi. 28: *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον*, and in Romans v. 19. The last verse of Daniel was supposed to adumbrate the doctrine of the Resurrection. "But thou, go thou thy way to the end; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Two things, says Manasseh Ben Israel, are here promised to Daniel by the angel: (1) that when he comes

[1] Schoettgen, *Horæ Hebr. et Talmud.*, in Joh. vi. 36.

to the end, *i.e.* death, his soul in the world of spirits shall enjoy the good reward of the just; and (2) that he shall be awakened in the end of the days, *i.e.* at the Resurrection, and be happy for evermore.

V. The doctrine of the Resurrection, though known to individuals in early days, and revealed, as we have seen, more or less clearly in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, seems to have gained more general acceptance in the time of the exile. It was held certainly by the Persians and the Chaldeans, who may unconsciously have influenced the belief of the Hebrews. Sojourning in a strange land, praying ever that the Lord would turn their captivity, with no comfort in their present affliction, what was more natural than that the Jews should direct their minds to the future, and look forward to another life which should compensate them for their existing calamity? In accordance with this idea we find in the works written after the Return which have come down to us, especially those composed in Egypt, a plainer recognition of the future state and of the Resurrection of the body. Very dimly expressed in some, very clearly in others, the great truth starts forth here and there, and prepares us for its full acceptance in Christ's day. It was persecution, martyrdom, suffering, that brought the doctrine into prominence, and caused it to assume the force of a moral motive in men's minds. The mode in which and the means whereby the Resurrection should be effected, were scarcely handled; the time of its consummation was vaguely declared; but the bare statement exerted a mighty power, which was not weakened by questions of detail. Whatever may have been the reason for the difference, the documents which had their birthplace in Alexandria are much more decided in their statements concerning the Resurrection than those which were produced in Palestine. The latter for the most part do not go beyond the received idea of a shadowy realm peopled

with spirits, into which the death of the body is the passport. "The dead that are in the graves, whose souls (πνεῦμα) are taken from their bodies," says Baruch (ii. 17), "will give unto the Lord neither praise nor righteousness." It could not have been from contact with Western civilization and philosophy that the Alexandrian Jews learned the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body. How utterly strange to the Greek mind it was, we see from the way in which the Athenians received it at the mouth of St. Paul (Acts xvii. 32). Æschylus utters the general sentiment of his countrymen when he says (Eumen. 651):

ἅπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις.

And Pliny only confirms the common opinion of antiquity in asserting that to raise a body from the grave was a miracle which even the Deity itself could not effect. The words are sad, but are worth quoting: "Imperfectæ vero in homine naturæ præcipua solatia, ne Deum quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem consciscere, si velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ poenis; nec mortales eternitate donare, nec revocare defunctos" (*Nat. Hist.*, ii. 5). Cicero, when he discusses the nature of the soul and its connection with the body, and adduces the various opinions of philosophers on this mysterious subject, never makes any allusion to the restoration of the flesh, or alleges that any writer ever held such an opinion.[1] And Lucretius writes (iii. 941):

"Major enim turbæ disjectus materiaï,
Consequitur leto; nec quisquam expergitus exstat,
Frigida quem semel est vitaï pausa sequuta."

In Homer, Achilles speaks, as of an incredible thing:

"Gods, I behold a miracle! Ere long
The valiant Trojans whom myself have slain
Shall rise from Erebus." (Il. xxi. 54 ff).

[1] See especially *Tuscul. Disput.*, I. 9, 10.

W. J. DEANE.