

ARTICLE IV.

FIRST CORINTHIANS XV. 20-28.

BY PROFESSOR A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

THE New Testament contains two or three passages which may, perhaps, be termed "monadic" in their character. While most of the Scripture teachings appear in manifold forms and depend for their attestation on no single passage, in these the truth, as perhaps of less vital practical importance, is left to their single utterance. Such, if I rightly interpret it, is the passage in which Peter declares the personal preaching of the risen Christ to the impenitent victims of the Flood. Such, though not without one or two other probable allusions (as 2 Thess. ii. 3), seems the apocalyptic (symbolical, yet none the less real) revelation of the millennial glory of the church followed by a brief apostasy just preceding the final catastrophe. Eminently such, and more signal perhaps than either, is the passage indicated at the head of this article, which stands alone in revealing one or two remarkable features of that critical point when the scenes of time shall open out on the issues of eternity. These are the abdication by the Son of his temporary universal dominion, and the surrender of his vice-royalty to the hands

results of the abdication, I fear that my opinions are not shared by most interpreters. In the rest of the passage the most important question is, whether it teaches a double or triple *tagma* (*order, class*) in the resurrection; and thus, whether the *end* (τὸ τέλος) is the last act of the resurrection itself, or, as the language scanned more closely may imply, following this, the closing scene of the great eschatological drama.

But besides this another point. The memorable passage (ver. 20-28) which opens this unique glimpse into the world's closing scene,—the surrender of the Son's delegated sway,—is interposed amidst a glowing strain of reflection on the fact and the necessity of the Christian resurrection (ver. 13-19, 29-33); on the emptiness, apart from this, of the Christian hope, and the wretchedness of the Christian life. The persistent earnestness of this strain shows how deep a hold it has taken on the mind of the apostle; how the sufferings of the infant church are to him matters of the deepest and darkest reality. Follow for a moment his course of thought. The resurrection of the dead, he argues, is the logical condition of the resurrection of Christ (as the resurrection of Christ is the causal condition of the resurrection of the dead). If the dead rise not, Christ is not risen, the apostle's preaching is false, and the disciples' faith is vain. They that have fallen asleep in Christ have perished, and the believer, imperilled in the present, and hopeless of the future, is the most miserable of men. So from verses 12 to 19. After turning away for a moment to the brighter and glorious side, he resumes at verse 29, Since what shall they do who are baptized for the dead,—whose very baptism pledges them to death,—if the dead rise not? Why are they so baptized? Why do alike laity and apostles (2 Cor. vi. 4-10) stand in perpetual jeopardy, live a life of daily dying, contend in deadlier than gladiatorial struggles, and push aside the cup of worldly pleasure which a wiser atheism commends to their lips?

In this connection the meaning of the vexed phrase "baptized for the dead" would scarcely seem subject to reasonable doubt. If we credit the apostle with any logical coherency of thought, it has but one fitting interpretation, and that suggested as easily by the words themselves as it is by the context. The "baptism for the dead," alike from what precedes and follows, can only be a baptism which puts its subject into constant peril of death, which brings him as it were into companionship with the dead. It is no violent strain that this construction puts upon the words. In the energetic conception and pregnant language of the apostle, the disciple may easily be conceived as baptized on behalf of, in relation to, the dead; as belonging, henceforth, by pledge and by destiny, rather to the dead than to the living. Surely *they* may be easily described, as baptized for the dead, whose badge and condition is an ordinance which, as a *rite*, symbolizes the death and burial to which, as an *act*, it hourly exposes them. Our Lord, with whom the baptismal rite was not yet instituted, finds the pledge and trait of discipleship in the "bearing of the cross" under whose shadow he perpetually walked. So the apostle, addressing those of whose Christian faith the universal symbol and pledge was baptism, no less naturally finds in that baptism their vow of discipleship, and of devotion to the deadly peril that awaited them. The believer's characteristic designation is that of one baptized for the dead. Why, then, if there be a resurrection, should he shrink from death? But why, if there be no resurrection, commit the folly of being baptized for it? It matters not, whether the fact of baptism as the profession of a faith which subjected them to persecution and death, or the *form* of the rite which symbolized at once the death and burial and resurrection, be primarily referred to. In any case, how foolish to submit to the symbolical burial which pointed to a resurrection, but which brought on them the literal death without the resurrection which it prefigured!

Why be baptized into the great company of the dead who are only *dead*? It matters not, I may add, whether we take the phrase "they who are baptized," *generically*, for *all* Christians, of whose baptism this was the ideal import, or restrict it to those who suffered actual martyrdom—in whom the ideal possibility was actualized.

But that interpretation which refers it to a literal superstitious rite practised *over*, or *for the benefit of*, the dead (a short-lived, heretical practice which probably grew out of a misinterpretation of this very passage, and of whose existence at this time there is no evidence or probability), might, it seems to me, but for the great number of its vouchers, be dismissed without notice. It really has nothing in its favor but this array of opinions and the superficial notion that the apostle is gathering up various proofs of the resurrection.¹

It is, now, into this course of thought that the apostle has interjected at verse 20 the remarkable passage upon which I have undertaken to comment. It appears strictly, as a digression, as if he were turning away, in relief to himself and his readers, from that dark alternative to the brighter side of the picture; while, however, the digression carries forward his readers to the climax of his thought, the overthrow of death in the resurrection, and to another equally wondrous scene beyond. Christ, he hastens to declare, *is* risen from the dead, the forerunner of his people; the death-wound inflicted on the race by the first

¹ There has prevailed an idea that the apostle in this chapter is adducing a series of *arguments* for the resurrection. In fact, he has no such purpose. The fact that Christ has risen, as attested by many witnesses; that this rising guarantees the resurrection of his people; that, without these two mutually conditioning facts, apostolic preaching and Christian hope are vain, and the Christian life, with its nameless perils and hardships, equally wretched and foolish,—is the sum of the discussion from verses 1 to 34, excepting the wonderful digression from verses 20 to 28,—unless we are to believe that he has thrust into this simple, single, weighty line of thought a reference to an idle and superstitious ceremonial which is scarcely more relevant to his immediate theme than would be the blowing of the ram's horn around the walls of Jericho.

Adam, is healed by the second; and the glimpse thus caught and the vista thus opened into the future, he follows to an issue which we may doubt whether he had in contemplation when he started the digression. That altered governmental relation of the universe to its Father and its Redeemer which follows the resurrection, may possibly have now first broken upon the vision of the apostle. Reserving for mention another construction, yet not differing materially in the sense, of two or three verses, I render the passage as follows, making little change from the common version except to relieve the structure by throwing verse 26 into parenthesis:—

TRANSLATION.

“20. But as it is, Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep (or have fallen asleep). 21. For since by a man is death, by a man is also the resurrection of the dead. 22. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. 23. But each in his own class (rank, troupe, company); as a first fruits, Christ; then they that belong to Christ, at his coming (*parousia*). 24. Then is the end, when he delivereth up the kingdom to him who is God and Father; when he shall have abolished all dominion and all authority and power. 25. For he must reign, until he shall have put all his enemies under his feet. (The last enemy, that is abolished is death). 27. For he put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith that all things are put in subjection, it is manifestly with the exception of him who subjected to him all things. 28. And when all things shall have been subjected to him, then also shall the Son himself be subject to him that subjected to him all things, that God may be all in all.”

The first three verses of the passage (20, 21, 22) need no special remark. *Nυνὲ δέ* (*but now*) as often, both in the classics and the New Testament, is not temporal, but logical, signifying *but as it is, as the case stands*, in contrast here with the dark preceding supposition.

Ver. 23. *Each one* (not, *every man*: *ἕκαστος* nearly = *ἑκάτερος*, *each of two*) divides, I think, the subjects of the resurrection into two classes: Christ and his people, the first-fruits and the harvest; and the harvest consists of “them that are Christ’s,” who are to be raised at his coming. This would seem to include the whole body of believers, and not, as must be the case if it refers to an as-

sumed premillennial resurrection of the saints, to but a small part of them; for the number of the saints who should arise at the opening of that thousand years could hardly equal, or even nearly equal, the harvest of the righteous dead that, after a thousand years of the church's universal sway (and this all the more if the definite stand for an indefinitely larger period), would be gathered in the final resurrection. From the Apocalypse a correct exegesis rules out, I believe, a double literal resurrection, leaving a resurrection, twofold indeed, but twofold in character, and, analogously to the twofold deaths, a literal and a spiritual one. As the first and literal death is common to all and the second reserved for the impenitently wicked; so (in reversed order) the first resurrection is spiritual and belongs only to the righteous, the final and literal resurrection is common to the race.¹ So the apostle knows but a single resurrection, and that at the Parousia, when the Lord shall descend with a mighty shout; when the peal of the *last trump* shall echo through the universe; when in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the living shall be changed and the dead be raised, and earth and sea, death and Hades, render up their victims to the judgment. If, then, the Parousia is Christ's final coming,—as the sequel of this chapter, and 1 Thess. iv. 13-17, show it to be,—then *the end* (τὸ τέλος) cannot mark another section of the resurrection, widely separated in time from the first. It must mark, as the language plainly indicates, the next great event, viz. the Son's surrender of his delegated dominion; or, if it includes also the resurrection, it would be under its new category of a triumph over death, and his destruction as the last of the hostile powers.

¹ The symbolical resurrection of Rev. xx. 4 answers to that of John v. 25. The rest of the dead who do not share this triumph, have no first resurrection; they only share with the saints their literal resurrection at the final coming.

Ver. 24. *When he delivers up* (ὅταν παραδοῖ) and *when he shall have abolished* (ὅταν καταργήσῃ) may be taken as co-ordinate, or the second as strictly subordinate to the first. In either case they determine the τὸ τέλος, *the end*, declaring, the one, the great signal event, the abdication that shall constitute and mark it; the other, the series of events that shall precede and condition it—the successive destruction of hostile forces, reaching its climax in the overthrow of death. Meyer strangely and causelessly places this overthrow of hostile powers in the intermediate time, which he assumes between the Parousia and the final resurrection. Nothing is more remote from the simple Pauline and Scripture doctrine. This putting down of his enemies is the whole series of the Messianic victories from his taking the mediatorial seat. “Sit thou at my right hand” (Ps. cx.); “Ask of me and I will give thee” (Ps. ii.),—declare his final making of his foes his footstool in the destruction of the last enemy. All this is to precede the resignation, as the resignation winds up and crowns all.

The *kingdom* (βασιλεία) now surrendered is that which had been promised the Son in his incarnation (Matt. xxviii. 18) and bestowed at his ascension (Ps. ii.; cx. 1), when God conferred (ἐχαρίσατο, Phil. ii. 9) upon him the name (Κύριον, *Lord*) that is above every name. This dominion, this viceroyalty, received for a specific purpose and a limited time, he now surrenders to the Father, the absolute Deity by whom it was bestowed.

When he shall have abolished (καταργήσῃ), etc. This abolishment, following the investiture and completed in the resurrection, has been accomplished by the Son in his delegated dominion, and has formed the work of his entire administration. “Every dominion, authority, and power” forms a cumulative expression, including pleonastically all the forms of hostility, whether of men or demons, organized or unorganized, that may array themselves against the Messiah’s empire. Of course the terms

are not used with any definite discrimination.¹

Ver. 25. "*For he must reign* (*βασιλεύειν*) until he shall have put," etc. This verse declares categorically what the preceding verse implies, along with its Old Testament authority, the passages in Ps. ii. and cx., both of which declare what is the purpose and issue of his reign. Whether the *must* (*δεῖ*, *it behooves*) of this verse is the "must" of intrinsic or prophetic necessity, scarcely matters, as the prophetic necessity rests on intrinsic fitness. It is also indifferent that the subduing is in Ps. cx. attributed to the Father ("until I shall make," etc.), while here and in Ps. ii. it is attributed to the Son. The Son is exalted by the Father to his (all but) supreme dominion, that in his own person he may overthrow his own and his Father's foes. Their intercommunity of action is too often declared, to need illustration (John v. 22).

Ver. 26. "The last enemy that is abolished is death," or more exactly, "As a final enemy death is abolished." This verse, borrowing its terms "enemy" and "abolished" from the two preceding verses, is a passing, and I think parenthetical, application of the general statement of the Son's triumphs to the special closing and crowning one,—the resurrection,—without which all that preceded would be in vain. By enclosing it in parenthesis I do not think we deprive it of any of its weight as a natural restatement of the grand doctrine with which the mind of the apostle is full, a statement eminently pertinent in the form which the resurrection now assumes of

¹ To follow out in detail the series of the Son's triumphs over his enemies belongs not to my present purpose. I suppose that one of these triumphs is found in each individual act of human redemption. In a general way they may be hinted at when our Lord sees in prophetic vision "Satan like lightning fall from heaven," and "as the prince of this world cast out." So in the Apocalypse; the first restriction of his power is when he is cast down from heaven (his ejection from his dominion, perhaps, as god of this

an abolition of death, while its parenthetical form gives a degree of unity to the sentence which seems otherwise strangely incoherent.¹

Ver. 26. "As a last enemy," etc. Whatever its construction, the meaning of this sentence admits no doubt. It is the apostle's triumphant, and, in this stage of the discussion, final assertion of the resurrection under the as-

¹ Unless, indeed, we put verse 25 in parenthesis, which may possibly be better. But I wish to suggest a construction which for many years has seemed to me probable, but which I have seen adopted by none but the brilliant but often fanciful Hofmann. I should render as follows: "Then at the last [*τὸ τέλος* as adverb, 1 Pet. iii. 8], when he delivereth up the kingdom to God and the Father [or to his God and Father]; when he shall have abolished every dominion and every authority and power,—(for he must reign until he shall have put all enemies under his feet),—as a final enemy death is abolished. For, He subjected all things beneath his feet."

This construction, by an entirely familiar Greek idiom, takes *τὸ τέλος* adverbially, *finally, at the last* (1 Pet. iii. 8). The two subjunctive clauses with *δταν* form the protasis of a conditional sentence of which verse 26, "death is abolished," is the apodosis. And the subjunctive is thus more naturally explained than if constructed with *εἰτα τὸ τέλος*, in which case the indicative (present and future) would seem more natural. Verse 25 comes in as a parenthetical explanation of the protasis, while the force of the slow-moving but not cumbrous sentence comes down with weight upon that which is thus far the climax of the apostle's thought, "As a final enemy death is abolished." Meyer, while admitting this construction as grammatically possible, rejects it on rhetorical grounds, "involving in a violent way the simple, clear, and logically flowing sentences of the apostle," and holding it "unsuitable to put verse 25, although introduced with solemn emphasis, as a subordinate sentence of confirmation." (The validity of this objection, and the relative coherence and dignity of the two classes of passages, may be left to the taste and judgment of the reader). The two constructions do not differ, I think, in their bearing on the question of a double resurrection. The main difference of *thought* is that, in the ordinary rendering, the resurrection ceases to be the main topic, coming in only incidentally, though indeed weightily, at verse 26; and the abdication, with its preconditioning series of triumphs, coming at once into the foreground. In that here given the abdication, with its previous triumphs, is as yet subordinate, and only after throwing its conditioning weight on the resurrection at verse 26, subsequently emerges as the primary topic. It may seem an objection to the view I advocate, that the abdication in it seems to precede the resurrection. But the present tense "when he is (may be) delivering up" scarcely implies more than the close connection, the virtual contemporaneousness, of the two events, without fixing very definitely the priority of either.

pect of the destruction of death, as the grand foe of the Messiah's kingdom. Many questions which this topic raises it is not my province here to discuss. Whether this or verse 25 be in parenthesis, the scope of the following seems clear.

Ver. 27. For "he subjected all things beneath his feet." This verse is not introduced, as held by Meyer, with the emphasis on *πάντα*, *all things*, in proof that the sovereignty of Christ extends over death. Rather the matter of the resurrection has been disposed of, as the close of his series of triumphs, and the writer now recurs, in explanation of verse 25, to that sovereignty itself, its origin, limitations, and close, as his direct theme; as conferred by God, and supreme over all except the personage who conferred it. For this he finds a fitting Old Testament illustration in Ps. viii. 6, which he cites verbally (changing *thou* to *he*);—For thou didst subject all things beneath his feet;—in which the "all things" declares the extent of the authority, and the "thou didst subject," suggests its single limitation. The stream could not transcend its fountain. . In the original passage the being to whom all things are subjected is man. But Paul, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 5-9), finds in it a typical reference to the exalted Messiah as the representative of man. The subject is treated by the two writers with characteristic differences. The author of the Hebrews reasons it out after his own fashion. Paul takes it directly for granted, though doubtless his mind went through a like process of reasoning. With both, doubtless, the failure of actual humanity to realize the Psalmist's ideal, occasions its transference to the divine-human personage, the Son of man, in whom it is fulfilled. Here of course the subject of *ὑπέταξεν* is God; while above, in verses 24 and 25, and below, in verse 28 (*ὑποταγῆ*), the subduing personage is Christ. Here the reference is to the ideal headship of the Messiah, his formal investiture with the sovereignty; in them, it is the actual subduing of his foes in the exercise of that

sovereignty.

“But when he or it [viz. the Psalmist or “Scripture”] saith [may say] that all things have been subjected to him.” This I think a much more natural construction than that of Meyer and others, “when he [viz. God] shall have said,” etc. The former construction refers it to the preceding *ὑπέταξεν*, referring it to the investiture, the latter refers it to what God declares when the purpose of the investiture is accomplished and all things are actually subdued. The one makes the *πάντα ὑποτέτακται* (*all things have been subjected*) merely a necessary variation on the form of the previous *πάντα ὑπέταξεν*; the other refers it, as in verse 28, to the actual subdual. Either meaning is admissible enough; but it is much more natural and easy to find in it the author’s *reasoning* from the *import* of the expression, than the statement of an inference from the accomplished fact of subjugation. In this latter case the *ὅταν εἴπῃ* seems worse than idle. Why should Paul employ the awkward circumlocution, instead of saying “when all things shall have been subjected to him,” to say “when God shall have said that all things have been subjected to him”? Besides it seems less natural to refer to the close of the Son’s reign the exception which was actually made at its commencement.

“It is manifestly with the exception of him who subjected to him all things.” This, says the apostle, goes without saying. The Son’s authority was, even during that period of practically supreme dominion, still, in its ultimate character, delegated and subordinate. It was so from the nature of the case; from the very nature of the Being in whom it was reposed. He was infinite, but he was finite; he was God, but he was man; he held in his nature an element essentially and ineradicably inferior to the divine. He was allied intimately and forever with the creature and the finite, and to such a being it was, in the nature of the case, unfitting that the supreme administration of the universe should be permanently entrusted.

Authority must go back to its primal source, the eternal Father. In the very fact that it was the Father who put all things in subjection to him, is involved the idea of his subordination.

Ver. 28. "And when all things shall have been subjected to him, then shall the Son himself be subjected," etc. When the time and purpose of this vice-royalty, this delegated authority, shall be accomplished, this sceptre of apparently supreme dominion will be resigned. The subordination which before, in the Son's practically supreme rule over all creatures and destinies in the universe, had been latent, and as it were held in abeyance, shall become open and formal. The Son will formally and joyfully retire from the supreme sway which had been accorded to him, and assume openly and lovingly the subordinate place which belongs to him as a subject—in a nature and relation voluntarily and irrevocably assumed—of the absolute and universal kingdom of the Father. But it is evident that the *τὰ πάντα ὑποταγῆ* (*all things shall have been subjected*) of verse 28 bears a different sense from the *ὑπέταξεν* and *πάντα ὑποτέτακται* (*all things have been subjected*) of verse 27. There, the subjection is the ideal subjection, the *authoritative* subjection, which inaugurates the Son's mediatorial reign; *here*, it is the practical subjection, the actual subjection, which closes it. Now all enemies have been subdued and brought to naught, including the gigantic and final enemy, death.

But having thus abdicated his throne, into what does the Son retire? What relation does he henceforth sustain to the Father and the universe? Does his humanity disappear, and the theanthropic personage vanish from the scene, replaced, perchance, by the pre-existent Logos in his inscrutable and eternal relation to the Father? Of this the thought is not to be entertained for a moment. Deity allied himself with humanity forever; humanity, when it entered Deity, came to stay. Or, retaining his humanity, does the Son cease to reign, and sink into the level of the

loftiest of mere subjects of the divine kingdom? Or, descending from his sole sovereign position, does he become a companion with his Father in a sort of dual sovereignty, a half co-equal headship of the universe? Even this, I think, does not explain the scriptural position of the Son. He has ceased to be the universal, mediatorial king; but he has not ceased to be *king*. He has exchanged one form of sovereignty for another, to which that was but a stepping-stone and preparation. The *theanthropic nature* was assumed for a special purpose, but not for a limited time. The *universal theanthropic dominion* was conferred for both a specific purpose and a limited time. That specific purpose was the founding and rearing of a special kingdom—the Old and New Testament kingdom of God or “kingdom of heaven,” an *imperium in imperio*, a kingdom at once spiritual and material—at once inward and outward, commencing in an inward spiritual regeneration, but culminating in a congenial outward glory; embraced in, and swept round by, that larger empire over which presides the supreme and infinite Jehovah; but constituting its core, its centre, its brightest gem, and its richest ornament. This kingdom, originating in a stupendous plan of mercy and redemption, has drawn into itself, as it were, the resources, and involved the destinies, of the universe. For this kingdom the mediatorial kingdom was established; this kingdom, unlike that, is to be strictly and absolutely everlasting; and when that comes to an end amidst the quaking earth, the rending graves, and a dissolving universe, this, springing from the ashes of all the kingdoms of the world, and triumphing over every foe that has plotted its destruction.

of heaven, to the regenerated earth, the Son shall descend to rule in it and over it forever. This is the kingdom typified in the Old Testament throne of the Son of David (2 Sam. xiii. 16: "And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee ; thy throne shall be established forever"). It is the kingdom of Luke ii. 32, 33: "The Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David : and he shall reign over the house of David forever ; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

I think it is no objection to this view of the kingship of the Son that in the symbolical New Jerusalem the "glory of God" is united with the light of the Lamb in making its illumination. In the Son's pre-incarnate existence the Son's being God does not prejudice his special character as the "Word" of God. In his mediatorial reign his throne is established at the right hand of God in the heavenly Zion (Ps. cx.). So in the everlasting sovereignty over the church, that perfect harmony and essential oneness that have marked the whole previous revelation of Deity will still belong to the relations of the Father and the Son. United in creation, in providence, and in redemption, the undeniable though mysterious diversity in the triune nature shines forth in alternation with its essential unity. The only fitting, the only possible, relation for the incarnate Son to sustain in the peculiar and especial kingdom which he has founded in his humiliation, and has brought to triumph and perfection in his glorification, is that, in subordination to the supreme Sovereign, of its King and its Lord.

It may, perhaps, be interesting, in a brief recapitulation, to recall the various phases of the Son's existence and history in the light of the New Testament. He appears in

ity; the Word through which he spake; the light through which he shone; his organ of utterance and manifestation to the whole creation; the effulgence of the divine glory, and the perfect impression of his substance. On the mysteries of this existence the Scripture does not dwell, and attempts to shed no light. It lies back among the inscrutable secrets of the past.

The second, or theanthropic nature, discloses the Son's existence in three distinct stages. First, the stage of humiliation, in which he has assumed the form of a servant, and become obedient even to the death of the cross. Below the angels, the messengers of the old covenant; below Moses, the human founder of the old covenant; below the humblest of God's ancient servants, appears he who is yet to emerge in a dignity and glory infinitely transcending them all, and from the disguise of whose utmost lowliness shine forth perpetual flashes of divinity. He sinks on the ship into a purely human slumber, yet awakes at the cry of his terrified disciples to still, by his word, storm and billow into calm. He sinks on the cross helpless into the arms of death, and yet even then opens heaven to the penitent robber dying by his side.

The second is that intermediate stage in which he appears after his ascension, appointed by the Father regent of the universe; "head over all things for the church;" highly exalted by a name which is above every name; and guiding the affairs of the universe, until the special kingdom that he had founded in humiliation shall be consummated in glory. But even in this apparently supreme dominion—supreme to all else—yet by virtue of the lower nature which he bears, still reigning in subordination to the one absolute Deity, though here the subordination is veiled in his glory, as on earth his glory was hidden in his degradation. But when the purpose of this vice-sovereignty is fulfilled, and all enemies to him and his church are vanquished, he descends from his apparently supreme throne, to that glad outward subordination

to which his alliance with the creature forever destines him.

But in this third stage, still *to reign*; still to hold an *imperium in imperio*; in the bosom of the eternal Father, and under the administration of the absolute and universal King, still to hold the kingship of the church which he has redeemed, of the kingdom which he has founded, the anti-typal Son of David, in the anti-typal Jerusalem, on the regenerated earth. Nothing less than such a kingship can realize the declaration of God through the prophet to David, and through the announcing angel to Mary. Nothing less than this can answer to the language of the Apocalypse, where, in the New Jerusalem of the saints, the throne of the Lamb stands alongside the throne of God (Rev. xxii. 3, "the throne of God and of the Lamb"); "God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it; . . . the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof" (Rev. xxi. 22, 23). Thus in this consummated kingdom of God, the Father and the Son appear in the harmonious and united reign as in the Son's outwardly supreme mediatorial reign when he still has his seat at the right hand of God (Ps. cx.). Throughout every step and stage of this wondrous revelation, Father and Son appear in the most absolute and perfect unity—always distinct and always one. And that Christ—the theanthropic—always joyfully subordinate—must always reign as formal king over the kingdom which the theanthropic Servant founded, and the theanthropic Sovereign perfected, would follow from the nature of the case even if it were not matter of express revelation. "The kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph. v. 5) is the fitting designation of its joint sovereignty in their mutual relation. Here "Christ," in designating the formal relation, naturally stands first.