

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.¹

BY REV. JAMES B. MILES, CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

DR. HEDGE remarks, "The doctrine of Protestant sects in relation to this point—of those I mean which hold the resurrection of the body, and do not admit the intermediate world—is painfully confused and wavering." And he adds, "This diversity and confusion in the doctrine of the church 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 shalt thou be with me in paradise."²

Now, that the doctrine of Protestant sects in relation to the resurrection is painfully confused and wavering, we are

¹ An Exposition of 2 Cor. v. 1.

² Reason in Religion, by Dr. F. H. Hedge, pp. 373, 374.

obliged to admit. We must also acknowledge an unreasonable prejudice against endeavors to gain definite and consistent views on this subject to some extent prevails. There is, however, no doctrine of our faith in respect to which confusion is more fruitful of evil consequences, and in relation to which clear and consistent views would not exert a more salutary influence. But that the diversity and confusion in the doctrine of the church are due at all to the conflict of views represented in the New Testament itself we deny. We maintain that it is possible to deduce from the scriptures a doctrine of the life to come which shall fit all the texts and satisfy all the demands of the subject. It may be true that no Protestant sect holds a doctrine of the resurrection that meets what are now thought to be all the demands of the subject. But are we sure that even in this day of advanced biblical and scientific learning, all the demands of the subject are fully known? Indeed are we sure any sect has drawn from the scriptures all the knowledge they contain on this point? When the New Testament is charged with presenting conflicting views on this subject, we can but ask: Is it not possible that more light in respect to the doctrine of the resurrection is to be derived both from the scriptures and from the book of nature than has yet been gained by any religious sect or school of philosophers? Is it not possible that the views presented seem to some persons to be conflicting, simply because they do not employ a sounding line long enough to reach down to the depths of meaning contained in the inspired statements? The well is deep. Our present design is not an exhaustive treatment of the great theme of the resurrection. We propose to present the sense of one specific passage of scripture bearing upon this theme. In the prosecution of this design we shall necessarily refer to several of the texts relating to this subject, inasmuch as scripture is the only safe expounder of scripture.

How much now does the passage under consideration authorize us to affirm respecting the resurrection?

That the phrases *ἡ ἐπιβίωσις ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ ἀκήνου*, and

οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον, αἰώνιον, refer respectively to the earthly, perishable body, and the new glorified body is too obvious to require proof. A single remark of Olshausen explains these phrases: "There hovered before the apostle's mind a parallel between the tabernacle of testimony, the earthly, movable sanctuary, made by man, and the perfect tabernacle, not made by human hands, i.e. the spiritual building of the New Testament. To the former corresponds the earthly, perishable body, to the latter the new, glorified body."

It will be observed the passage expresses not merely a presumption, a conjecture, a supposition. The first and irresistible impression the reading of it makes upon the mind is that it is a real and decided affirmation. *Οἶδαμεν γάρ*, for *we know*, says Paul. His words denote belief in the highest degree, even perfect assurance. The apostle virtually says: (1) The subject-matter of what follows is the truth; (2) I have conclusive proofs of its truthfulness; (3) I confidently believe that truth. His state of mind is very far from being painfully confused and wavering. He expresses a confidence perfect and sublime, disturbed by no doubt, fixed and tranquil, like the repose of the divine mind itself. Our whole endeavor, then, must be to ascertain what he affirms.

(1) One thing of which Paul declares himself to be perfectly sure is, that he himself and the Christians whom he addresses are to exist after death forever as embodied beings: "Though our earthly house of this tent be dissolved, we have from God a building." Notice, here is an admission in regard to the resolution of the earthly body to its constituent elements, which extends even to the extreme limits of all that science has claimed, indeed, of all that science ever can claim on this point. Does modern chemistry vouch for the truth of the poet's words:

"Nor yet in the cold ground,
Where thy pale form was laid with many tears,
Nor in the embrace of ocean shall exist
Thy image. Earth, that nourished thee, shall claim
Thy growth, to be resolved to earth again,

And lost each human trace, surrendering up
 Thine individual being, shalt thou go
 To mix forever with the elements,
 To be a brother to the insensible rock
 And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain
 Turns with his share and treads upon,
 The oak shall send his roots abroad and pierce thy mould."

Has philosophy demonstrated that the human body is in a state of constant flux; that as often as once every seven years every particle of matter composing it is changed; that soon after death it is resolved into clay, limestone, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, phosphorus, and imponderable gases; that the dust to which it returns springs up in the varied forms of vegetable life; so that the beasts of the field crop the grasses and the herbs which derive their succulence from the constituent material of the bodies of buried men; that the particles which now compose one body have previously belonged to ten thousand other bodies? Paul concedes all this by the use of the word *καταλυθῆ*, *dissolved*, *disunited*, *loosened down*, or *apart*. Indeed, could chemistry achieve what chemistry can never achieve, take cognizance of each infinitesimal atom of the material body, and prove that each one of these is at death forever severed from its connection with the spirit, still the teaching of chemistry would not come into conflict with this statement of the apostle. There is no possibility that science, whatever may be the degree of its advancement, will find that the earthly body after death undergoes a change more complete and radical than is expressed by the word *καταλυθῆ*. And yet Paul affirms that the departed exist with bodies. His language necessarily implies more than the immortality of the soul. Says Olshausen: "The apostle in no respect recognizes the idea of a pure spiritual extension of life into eternity; without corporeality there can be no everlasting happiness or eternity for the creature." "We have from God a building, i.e. an organized body. There were some among those to whom Paul wrote who admitted the future existence of the soul, but who did not believe the soul was united to a body

in the future state. Paul explicitly teaches that the future existence of the spirit shall not be that of a mere formless and bodiless spirit. The saints shall possess forms, bodies." "We that are in this tabernacle [this earthly body] do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Though this earthly body fall off and return to its ultimate elements, yet we are not to be houseless and unclothed. We are not to be left shelterless, homeless spirits. We shudder at the thought of such a thing. Our instinctive cravings for a body are not to be mocked and denied. We are to be clothed upon. We are to be furnished with a building from God. In connection with this passage notice some of the apostle's expressions in his matchless argument in proof of the resurrection in the fifteenth chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians: "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." How could Paul more unequivocally than he does by these words declare that the product of the resurrection will be a real and proper body. According to the best authorities the word *σῶμα*, here translated body, denotes invariably, both in the New Testament and in classical Greek, only an organic, living body. It necessarily implies a material, living organization or structure. Qualified by the word *πνευματικόν*, it denotes, indeed, a body of a peculiar kind, a spiritual body, a body wonderfully refined and etherealized, so as to be adapted to the demands of the spirit in its exalted future state. But after all it is to be a material structure or organization. The words "spiritual body" admit of no other interpretation. To assert that *πνευματικὸν σῶμα*, spiritual body, means pure spirit, is to make Paul contradict himself. Besides, if the soul is not to be clothed with a body in the future state, this entire argument of the apostle falls to the ground. All his reasoning proceeds upon the assumption expressed in the declaration: "God giveth it a body." Not less explicit are his words to the Philippians: "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his

[Christ's] glorious body." What possible meaning can be attached to this language except that in the future state the saints are to possess spiritual, glorified bodies, — bodies that will perfectly subserve the wants of the spirit? Even as the earthly body is adapted to our life on the earth, so the spiritual body will be fitted to the economy of heaven.

(2) Again, from this passage we learn something in relation to the constitution of the future body. We are taught not merely that the saints are to receive from God a building. Paul intimates what kind of a structure it is to be. It is to be *οἰκίαν, ἀχειροποίητον, αἰώνιον, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, a house not made with hands, ever-enduring, and of a heavenly nature. Thus he describes the resurrection body by contrasting it with the present body. The present body is tent-like, only a temporary structure. The future body is to endure forever. The present body is earthly in its nature. The future body is to be heavenly. In his first Epistle to the Corinthians he presents this contrast in singularly striking terms. Over against the corruption, the dishonor, the weakness of the natural body he places the incorruption, the glory, and the power of the spiritual body. While he maintains that the product of the resurrection will be a real body, yet he illustrates the amazing contrast between that body and the earthly body by calling our attention to the essential differences between earthly bodies. He specifies the bodies of men, of beasts, of fishes, and of birds. Behold, he says, how varied their composition, structure, and powers. But even more striking than these contrasts are those between terrestrial and celestial bodies. The glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.

Precisely here arises the nice question: Is the contrast between the present and the future body so great as to destroy the identity of the two? Does the apostle's language, fairly interpreted, forbid us to believe the resurrection body will be in any sense identical with the body we possess here? We may not delay to determine the difficult philosophical point, — exactly what is essential to constitute identity. It is not

impossible to specify some things which are not essential for preserving the identity of the present with the future body. Obviously it is not essential for this, as some of the most popular objections to the doctrine of the resurrection imply, that the same particles of matter that are deposited in the ground or compose the body at death, enter into the composition of the resurrection body. We think and speak of our present bodies as the same bodies we possessed five, ten, twenty, sixty years ago, while there is not in them, not even in their bones, one particle of the same matter of which they were composed a few years since. How different in mind and body, in form and size, in all things, the infant and the man; and yet the person, through all its changes, has preserved its identity. That lordly old elm, you say, is the identical tree that half a century ago defied the blasts of winter, and among whose leaf-clad branches in summer the feathered songsters sweetly warbled their notes. But there may not be a particle of the matter which composed that goodly tree fifty years ago in it to-day. The traveller of to-day stands on the banks, or glides over the green waters, of the river Nile. This is the same old river, he says to himself, that, ages since, bore upon its "heaving bosom anon the cradle of Moses, the gay vessels of the undulation festivals, the stately processions of the mystic priesthood, the gorgeous barge of Cleopatra, the glittering, changing, flashing tumult of thousands of years of life." But yet that river is not composed of the same globules of water that three thousand years ago "waded tediously through the Egyptian plains, and so rolled down to the sea"; not even the same particles of matter compose its banks and channel, and the herbage that fringes its banks. The identity of the insect is preserved through all the transformations by which it passes from the chrysalis to the butterfly. These illustrations are sufficient to show that the raised body may be properly said to be the same with the one we now possess, even if it can be proved that not one particle of the matter composing the earthly body will enter into the heavenly body.

Suppose the historical connection between the future and the present body shall remain unbroken, and they shall be united by the power of a continuous life, just as the historical connection and the life are continued in the body of the same person from infancy to old age; suppose, also, the future body shall express the conceptions and emanations of the soul and obey the will, even as does the present body; why may not then the identity of the present and the raised body be preserved? The two bodies may be spoken of as one body, as "the same, and yet never the same." Does, now, the language of Paul represent the differences between the two bodies to be so great and radical as not to admit of the possibility of identity in the sense explained? He teaches us the present body is earthly, and that it is to be dissolved. The future body is heavenly and undecaying. More clearly to unfold his meaning he employs the illustration of the seed sown. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain, but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body." Our Saviour employs the same analogy in illustration of this point. "Verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it remaineth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." What, then, does the process of germination in the plant teach us? The seed dies, and is decomposed. How amazingly different in size, in form, in properties, and characteristics the plant or the majestic tree from the tiny seed from which it springs. And yet, science teaches us that in that tiny seed exists the embryo of the great tree, that something from the seed — it may be in some cases a particle too minute to be discerned by the help of the most powerful glasses — does certainly enter into the composition of the plant, and that the connection of life between the seed and the plant through all changes is preserved unbroken. Mark the testimony of an eminent scientist of our own time. His words are: "I know there are some who entertain a vague fear that the facts of chem-

istry conflict with this most cherished doctrine of the Christian faith, but so far from this I find that they elucidate and confirm it." And again: "The glorious doctrine of the resurrection modern scientific discoveries most fully confirm. As the grain sown in the furrow rises into the glory of the full-eared corn, so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, our natural body, sown in dishonor and weakness, will be raised a spiritual body, clothed in glory and power."¹

Modern science, enlightened as it is, cannot disprove the statement of Dr. South made centuries since: "There is a portion of matter in every human body that never passes by transmutation into any other animated body, but sinks into and rests in the common mass of matter, and there remains unchanged till the last day. What these parts are and what quantity of matter they amount to is known only to God." Neither science nor revelation teach us just how much of the material of our earthly house will be wrought into our heavenly building. But both science and the Bible are harmonious in affirming that something from the earthly may enter into the composition of the heavenly. Both warrant the assertion of the real and proper identity of the two bodies.

(3) In unfolding the sense of this passage, the next question which arises is: When does the saint come into the possession of his heavenly building, when is he invested with the spiritual body? Of all the questions suggested by the passage under consideration, this is the most difficult of solution. It would be presumption in us to expect to answer it in a manner satisfactory to all. Still we are not excused from an honest endeavor to search out the answer to this question so far as that answer may be known. Moreover, we must be allowed here to assume that the soul exists in a state of consciousness during the interval, whatever it may be, between death and the general judgment.

The proof that the soul in the full and conscious exercise of all its faculties lives on in death, through death, and be-

¹ Religion and Chemistry, by Prof. J. P. Cooke, Jr. pp. 104, 105.
Vol. XXVI. No. 104.

yond death, without interruption forever, we have endeavored to present in this Quarterly (Vol. xix., Art. 1). We now avail ourselves of the conclusions therein reached, namely, that the soul of the Christian at death enters into a state of enjoyment essentially such as it is to experience eternally. Our present question is: When does the soul receive its spiritual body? Does it come into the possession of that body at the instant of its passage through the gates of eternity, or not until after the lapse of an indefinite number of centuries, at a point lying on far away in the limitless future, almost or quite beyond the reach of thought, that point which is designated as the general resurrection and judgment, the time of the final consummation of the universe. All attempts to fix definitely that time have proved signal failures. The probabilities are, myriads of years will have rolled into eternity ere that time will arrive. If we may credit eminent astronomers, it will take eighteen millions of years for the heavens to complete one revolution around a common center. How many revolutions the heavens are ordained to make before they shall be dissolved we know not. It is natural to suppose a large number. If so, the period that is to elapse before the final judgment passes knowledge. Does the saint receive his heavenly building at the moment of death, or will he exist a disembodied spirit until all these ages shall have passed away? There are some considerations disposing us to answer, that he receives from God his spiritual body the moment he lays down his earthly body.

(a) One of these considerations is the fact that this supposition is more agreeable to our instinctive cravings than any other. As we naturally shrink with horror from the thought of annihilation, as we instinctively crave immortality, so we naturally shrink from the thought of existing in eternity as disembodied, unclothed spirits, so we instinctively crave a body. We would not be unclothed. We shudder at the very thought of having our spirits deprived of all covering. We would be clothed upon, and clothed upon all the time; that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now if these

inborn desires of our souls, these instinctive cravings, are referred to — and that they are thus properly referred to all admit — as affording a presumption that the soul is immortal, and will not exist eternally without a body, then they must be admitted to afford a presumption more or less strong that the soul will not exist for indefinite ages, for a period, which is to our thought and feeling almost or quite equivalent to eternity, without a body. In other words, the view that the saint receives his house of peerless beauty and glory the moment he is dispossessed of his tent-like abode, will be generally conceded, we think, to be more satisfactory to the feelings than any other view. The idea of being unclothed and houseless for indefinite ages is not pleasant to us.

(b) Again, this view may find additional plausibility if we consider what is essential to the personality of a finite, created being. Our conception of a complete created person comprises both soul and body. It is generally admitted that the scriptural references to angels are such as to justify the belief that they possess bodies, bodies transcendently etherealized and refined, “like light in rapidity of movement and appearance, and endowed with powers adequate to the duties and exigencies of high immortal, spiritual life.” But is corporeality an essential element of a finite, created being? In other words: Is an unembodied, finite creature a contradiction in terms? If so, our question is answered. Only one conclusion is possible. The spirit is clothed upon with its spiritual house the moment its tabernacle of clay is dissolved. It steps from its earthly abode, not out of doors, but into its heavenly house. There are metaphysicians who hold that a creature without any bodily form is inconceivable. Says Dr. Kurtz: “God alone is an infinite, an absolute spirit. He only exists above and beyond time and space. 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 like God, infinite, omnipresent, and eternal, — be God himself; or, since that would be irreconcilable with the idea of its having been created, be dissipated into nothing

and utterly lost. Hence within the province of created life the possession of a body is the condition of all existence; the corporeal structure is the instrument of all activity of the spirit; it constitutes a tenement for it, gives it a lodgment, and thus enables it to preserve its legitimate boundaries and identity — without a body, without a fixed abode, the homeless spirit would be carried everywhither and dissolved into nothing — be utterly lost.”¹

Isaac Taylor, in his *Physical Theory of Another Life*, expresses substantially the same sentiments. His language is: “We must affirm that body is the necessary means of bringing mind into relationship with space and extension, and so of giving it place. Very plainly a disembodied spirit, or we ought rather to say, an unembodied spirit, or sheer mind, is nowhere. . . . There is some reason to question whether sheer spirits could (except by immediate acts of divine power) be individually dealt with and governed, or could be known and employed, or could form lasting associations.”

Now, yielding all due respect to the reasoning of these and other eminent philosophers who coincide with them in opinion, we yet must be allowed to say, we do not feel compelled to accept their conclusions. Plausible as their theory may be, still we can but ask: Is the unassisted human intellect competent to decide this question? Does it not assume too much when it affirms dogmatically that a finite, created being cannot exist without a body? Let philosophy exhaust its powers, and after all must it not leave the question: When is the spirit invested with its heavenly body, an open question? We believe it must. We believe if we would find a conclusive answer to this question, we must appeal to revelation. If the scriptures, fairly interpreted, pronounce against this view, even though many considerations in addition to those hinted at may conspire in giving to it plausibility, it must be abandoned. What is the answer of infallible scripture? The particular passage we are discussing does not unequivocally indicate the time when the saint

¹ See “Bible and Astronomy,” by J. H. Kurtz, D. D.

is to come into the possession of his house not made with hands. Were we shut up to this text and the context, however, should we not naturally infer the spirit enters the heavenly body the moment it leaves the earthly? The apostle is finding consolations for the sorrows of his fellow-Christians and himself, in a contemplation of the momentary nature of their afflictions, and their nearness to eternal glory. Bearing this fact in mind, we read: "For we know that, though our earthly house of this tent be dissolved, we have a building from God." We notice Paul employs the present tense. He does not say we shall have, but we have, *ἔχομεν*. We read on, "For in this [house] we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." We observe how he shrinks from the thought of being unclothed; with what intense earnestness he strives to comfort those to whom he writes, by presenting in the closest connection with the idea of leaving the fleshly body, that of taking possession of the heavenly body. This passage, taken by itself, to say the least, does not oppose the view that the saint receives his glorified resurrection body at death. Candor obliges us to admit it is quite consistent with that view. But will this view satisfy all the texts of scripture? The scope of this Article forbids a minute and exhaustive treatment of this point. But we may say, without fear of contradiction, many of the teachings of scripture seem to favor this view. Such as the analogy of the seed sown, which has been so admirably expressed by Dean Trench: "The decaying of the insignificant and unsightly seed in the earth, and the rising up out of that decay and death, of the graceful stalk and the fruitful ear, contains evermore the prophecy of the resurrection, even as this is itself in its kind a resurrection — the same process at a lower stage — the same power putting itself forth upon meaner things" (Par. p. 19).

In the process of germination in the plant the new is evolved out of the old — the relation of the new to the old never being interrupted. If the resurrection is the same process at a higher stage, we naturally ask: Why then is not the new body evolved without any break in vital connection out of the old? Moreover, Christ and the inspired writers commonly speak of the departed as persons who have already entered upon their awards, or are suffering their punishment. Christ thus speaks of the departed Lazarus and the rich man. And mark his memorable reply to the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection. The case they referred to was that of the woman who had had seven husbands. They put to our Saviour the question: "In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?" Charging them with ignorance of the scriptures, he replies: "When they shall rise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels." His language, it would seem, refers to the body, and implies that the future bodies of the saints, while truly material bodies, will be wonderfully refined and glorified, in the likeness of those of the angels. Our Saviour goes on and says: "And as touching the dead, that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living." We can but ask, is it not the natural and plain sense of this language that the patriarchs had already arisen? What is the pertinency of the reference to them in this connection, if they had not risen from the dead?

Observe in general the phraseology of our Saviour and the inspired writers. They speak not of the resurrection of the body exclusively. It is worthy of notice that this phrase "resurrection of the body," which is frequently repeated in discussions on this subject, does not occur in the scriptures. The scriptures speak of the resurrection of the dead, and, in many instances, at least, in such a manner and connection as to favor the idea that the entire person by the resurrection passes on and upward to a higher state of existence.

Not to cite other passages which may be regarded as consistent with the view expressed above, we are bound to consider another class of inspired statements, which have been thought to teach conclusively that the soul of the saint will not be clothed with its glorified body until after the lapse of an indefinite number of ages. Such are all those passages in which reference is made to the resurrection of all the dead at the end of the world, at the day of judgment. Prominent among these passages is John v. 28, 29: "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." It is maintained by some interpreters that this and similar texts teach decisively that the body at the resurrection comes up from the grave, the place where it is deposited at death. They insist upon a strictly literal interpretation. But if we are bound to interpret this language literally, why not also the twenty-fifth verse of this same chapter: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead [*οἱ νεκροί*, the term ordinarily used to designate those physically dead] shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Moreover, what becomes of the bodies of vast multitudes, of a great majority of the dead, that are never placed in graves, that, through the agency of fire or water or different solvents are soon after death reduced to their ultimate elements? As the spirit does not descend into the grave, we are forced to ask these literalists: Does the body literally hear the voice of the Son of God? Entirely irrelevant is it to adduce the re-appearance out of their tombs of our Saviour and Lazarus, the restoring to life of the daughter of Jairus, and the youth of Nain. For their earthly house had not been dissolved, decomposed. Resurrection in their case was the re-animation, the revivification of the earthly body before decomposition had taken place. Our Saviour after his resurrection ate and drank and declared himself to be composed of flesh and bones, and Lazarus lived many years after his resurrec-

tion. As flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, the bodies they received at their resurrection could not have been their spiritual bodies. Consequently these instances prove nothing in regard to the literal coming forth from the graves of the bodies of the dead at the day of judgment, although they do, indeed, evince a power adequate to replace the earthly, perishable body with a spiritual body. We cannot avoid the inquiry: What do the inspired writers mean by the word "grave," as they employ it in these passages? Before we declare dogmatically that "no doctrine of final resurrection will fit all the texts of scripture," we are bound to consider whether the inspired writers by this word mean the literal grave of the body. Is it not possible they employ the word in these passages as they do in some others, in the Hebraistic sense, giving to it a signification like that of the Hebrew *sheol*, denoting an invisible state, the place of the departed, as in contrast with this world? This is a point upon which we cannot enlarge without extending this Article unduly. Before, however, we admit the charge that the diversity and confusion of opinion in regard to the doctrine of the resurrection existing among Protestant sects are due at all to the conflict of views represented in the New Testament, we deem it incumbent on us to consider candidly and fully several points now necessarily omitted, more especially this question: May not the doctrine of final resurrection inculcated in the scriptures be, for substance, the assembling by Christ for judgment at the end of the world of all the dead? It is possible this doctrine may consist with the supposition that the soul, at the time of death, is invested with its spiritual body. Possibly the meaning of Christ in the passage we have quoted is: Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that have departed this life, all whose mortal bodies have found a resting-place on the land or in the sea, shall hear my voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good *εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς*, unto the resurrection of life or the rising up to life, they that have done evil *εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως*, unto the resurrection of condemnation,

or the rising up for condemnation. To say the least this is one mode in which a doctrine of the final resurrection may harmonize with Christ's words to the thief on the cross: "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise"; while at the same time the judgment-day is not robbed of its solemn significance. It remains an occasion on which Christ, in presence of the assembled universe, manifests the glory of his redemption, vindicates his honor, and with solemn pomp assigns to all men their eternal awards.

ARTICLE II.

THE NATURAL THEOLOGY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

BY REV. JOHN BASCOM, PROFESSOR IN WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

NO. VII.

MAN'S INTELLECTUAL CONSTITUTION, AND THE GROWTH OF SOCIETY.

LIBERTY is the central and peculiar power of man. By it he is cut off from all other things and forces, and put over against them. New and great powers are indeed necessary to give play and completion to this power; but it is liberty, a free will, which is the citadel of manhood, affording under the assaults of physical forces a sufficient retreat to a spiritual personality. The possession of this power divorces man from the rule of the material world. Whatever may be the current of events flowing on here, however far back they may have originated, or irresistible may be their sweep in the present, they flow not over him, save by submission and defeat. Liberty absolves man from the government of physical forces; it reserves him for a higher field, and therein gives promise of new relations, new dependencies. Though standing on the boundary of a nobler realm, it is easy for man, by the false and abortive exercise of his new faculties, to sink to the lower plane, and become practically a slave of