

Correspondence.

BISHOP BERKELEY.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—If I have unconsciously done “less than justice” to Bishop Berkeley’s methods of thought, I am inclined to think that Mr. King has, equally unconsciously, done rather less than justice to what I said, kindly as his criticism is expressed.

Probably anyone reading his letter would imagine I had, with surprising ignorance of my subject, credited the Bishop with a fondness for abstract general ideas! But in one of the very sentences criticized I stated that “he persistently inveighed against abstract general ideas as a principal root of all error and confusion.” I remembered this statement at once, but I was surprised to find it in that very context; and I venture to submit that it should have led Mr. King to express what he meant in clearer terms.

He is quite right to claim the remarks about the abstract idea of a triangle as a proof of the Bishop’s robust common sense. I quoted them as an amusing illustration of his fondness for subtle questions; and I dare say Mr. King’s application is much more logical. I am sorry that I did not provide against the allusion being taken in the way indicated—unless, indeed, the passage quoted above should have been sufficient provision.

I have an impression, by the way, that Leslie Stephen himself mentions this very example in a “chaffing” sort of way, somewhat as I meant to do. It was, in fact, this impression that led me to refer to it. But I have not the book at hand to verify the reference. And, of course, he may have mentioned it in a different connection.

W S. HOOTON.

12, KING EDWARD’S DRIVE,
HARROGATE.

ST. PAUL’S DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Estwick Ford’s paper in the January CHURCHMAN on “St. Paul’s Doctrine of Resurrection” calls for drastic criticism from first to last. May I be allowed one or two brief fragmentary comments?

1. Mr. Ford teaches *resurrection by dribblets*, those who die in the Lord being, according to him, immediately clad in their final and everlasting body. He seeks to establish this by the wholly unwarranted interpolation of “then and there” in his paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 1, and of “in the very act of death” in his paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 2-4.

St. Paul tells us in 2 Cor. v. 1 that we have a “house not made with hands,” etc. In another place (1 Cor. xv. 23) he tells us *when we shall get it*, namely, at Christ’s coming. Mr. Ford, however, is disposed to agree with Hymenæus and Philetus that the resurrection is past already in the case of

the blessed dead. But to call their return to earth with Christ, already clad in bodies which some of them had possessed for thousands of years, by the name of resurrection is a misuse of language.

2. If Scripture teaches anything clearly, it is that resurrection takes place *from the grave*, not from Paradise. John v. 28 is not to be so cheaply explained away as in this article, and its teaching is, of course, amply confirmed by other Scriptures—*e.g.*, Dan. xii. 2—where “dust of the earth” cannot possibly be an Old Testament designation of Paradise, nor can “dwell in dust” in Isa. xxvi. 19. Moreover, we have an instance in which our Lord, by a kind of rehearsal of the day of John v. 28, actually *did* call a dead man from the *grave*. “Lazarus, come forth!” and he that was dead came forth.

3. Mr. Ford asserts that the disciples at Emmaus saw no wounds in the Lord’s hands. But surely the fact that they recognized Him as He blessed the bread rather points the other way. His wound-prints became noticeable in the act of handling the bread, and that clinched their identification of Him. To say, as Mr. Ford does, that the exhibition of the Lord’s wounds to the disciples in the upper room was an unreal assumption for a purpose is incredible. Shall we believe that Thomas was invited to thrust in his hand, etc., into wounds that were a mere sham? And that when our Lord challenged them to “handle” Him He was seeking to prove the most momentous fact of our religion, namely, His resurrection from the dead, by what was after all a mere deception?

JAMES I. COHEN.

10, SANDYMOUNT DRIVE,
NEW BRIGHTON, CHESHIRE.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—We may well thank Mr. Ford for his paper on “Pauline Eschatology.” It should carry conviction to all candid minds. And since “the *exception* proves the *rule*,” that *exception* I venture to submit to his judgment. Let us render verbatim, and in Greek order, 2 Cor. v. 3 as thus: “If, that is, actually clad—not denuded—we shall be found.” The Apostle *hopes* for himself, amongst other believers, that he may survive until the advent of the Great Change, in which case he expects to be “clothed upon,” much as when a surplice is put over one’s common garb; and he adds, “*that is, if we shall be found in our (fleshly) casing.*” So would the *mortal* garb be, in some mystic way, *merged* in the imperishable one. It is a wish which, as we know, he suggests more than once elsewhere.

Personally, as one who is not sanguine of the *imminence* of “That Day,” and, quite against my will, I feel compelled to expect disembodiment; and I fail to find one hint of St. Paul’s to the contrary in the whole passage under discussion.

CUTHBERT ROUTH.

Vicar of Hooe, Battle.

