

spared; whether Artemas or Tychicus it was not yet certain. So soon as his successor arrived, Titus was to hasten to rejoin his chief before the approach of winter should render voyaging in the Ægean precarious or impossible.

Such a rapid sketch as has now been attempted of the circumstances under which it was penned, appeared to be quite indispensable to any intelligent study of this Epistle. To an examination of the sacred text itself I shall proceed in my next paper.

J. OSWALD DYKES.

---

SCRIPTURE STUDIES OF THE HEAVENLY  
STATE.

II. WITH WHAT BODY DO THEY COME ?

THE fact that such a question as that we have prefixed to this article should have first been asked by the Church of Corinth has always seemed to us one of the most striking circumstances in the history of Christian belief. It shews that the reception of Christianity by the first converts was not the result of credulity. Here is a Christian Apostle putting into the mouth of his readers a rationalistic objection to one of the greatest mysteries of Divine truth, and proceeding to meet that objection with its own weapons. One would have thought that in a subject so mysterious, human reason would have received a very different treatment at his hands. We should have expected him to say on this, as on another occasion: "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" Instead of that, he finds fault with them for not having used their reason to better purpose. He tells his imaginary antagonists, not that the theme they have chosen for attack is one which is above argument, but that the argument lies on *his* side

of the question. He tells them, not that they are guilty of impiety in asking such a question, but that in so doing they are convicted of intellectual folly. They have failed to see that the doctrine of a resurrection is not only in harmony with the laws of the Universe, but is itself *based upon* a law of the Universe. The question, "With what body do they come?" is not a question to be answered by an appeal to simple faith, but one which may be solved by an interrogation of human nature. He who objects to Christianity because it teaches the doctrine of a resurrection is bound, on the same ground, to object to the facts of the visible creation; for the facts of the visible creation reveal all the wonders of the resurrection by exhibiting the old materials in constantly varied forms.

With a standpoint such as this, it will not surprise us to find that St. Paul's view of this subject is marked by great freedom of thought, or what must have appeared so to the adherents of Judaism. There is one thing which we must observe at the outset, because it sets forth at once the boldness of his position, and it is this: he will not admit that the doctrine of the resurrection requires a restoration of the same bodily structure which was put into the grave. According to him, that doctrine simply says of the soul, "God giveth it a body." It affirms that each human soul will have its *own* body; that is to say, the body which is needed to give it its own personality. But this does not necessitate an exact reconstruction of former elements. St. Paul's whole argument in this Chapter (1 Cor. xv.) is intended to prove the thesis that identity may exist with complete variety. To prove that thesis he passes under review the various fields of nature. He begins with the vegetable kingdom. He points to the seed when it is first planted in the soil, and shews that it has then a body of its own. He points to it again when it has reached its full growth, and shews that it has still its own body, but not the

same body. Indeed, what St. Paul means to say is this: If the embodiment of the germ in its full development were the same as that which clothed its incipient life, it would no longer have its own body; for it would no longer have the body suited to the change of its nature. The seed is sown in weakness, that is to say, in a frame suited to its own weakness; but when the seed itself becomes strong, it will need a frame suited to its own strength—a body “raised in power.”

Passing to the life of physical nature, St. Paul pursues his proof that identity is consistent with variety. What a number of forms, he says, may matter pass through without ceasing to be matter. There is one glory of the sun, there is another glory of the moon, there is a third glory of the stars; nay, star itself differs from star in glory. Yet through all these different forms, as well as through the still greater differences that separate the stars from the bodily structures of man and beast, matter remains the same; it is an identical substance which pervades these many forms. And what St. Paul means to suggest is, Why should it not be so with mind also? If matter does not cease to be matter in all its varied embodiments, why should mind cease to be mind, however changed may be its environment; will not its embodiment, whatever it be, be one that shall give true expression to its essential nature?

Lastly, St. Paul turns to the mind itself. He shews that even in this life man may be said to pass through two worlds—a world of nature, and a world of spirit: “That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.” There is an outer and an inner man; or, as St. Paul would say, there is an outer and an inner embodiment of the man; there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. The glory of the natural is one, and the glory of the spiritual is another; but through both glories the man keeps his identity. The infant is the sage in embryo; the sage is the infant in development. The outward world of the one,

including even the bodily structure, is entirely different from the outward world of the other; but into this difference the identity of the life has passed unscathed, and in the new house not made with hands the soul holds on to its continuity with the past.

Now the analogy in St. Paul's mind is this. Just as the child in his passage to the man is gradually clothed upon by a new covering more suited to the advance in his development, may not a still higher spiritual body be found to clothe our lives in their passage from the human to the divine? What St. Paul means by a spiritual body is a body in harmony with the spirit. In the present world he fails to find this. He sees body and soul dwelling side by side, and yet living in disunion; the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; the law of the members warring against the law of the mind. And that is the reason why he cannot accept the doctrine of a resurrection in which the present structure of the present body shall be reproduced. He feels that such a reproduction would be simply a perpetuation of the old strife. It would be a resurrection, but not a regeneration. It would not break down the ancient wall of partition between the seen and temporal, and the unseen and eternal. To break that wall there is wanted not only a resurrection, but a regeneration of the physical nature: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither can corruption inherit incorruption." Something must intervene to change our body of humiliation into the fashion of that glorious body which was ever in unison with the spirit of the Son of Man. The house that we wait for is not a house from the grave, but a house from heaven; not a tabernacle of nature, but a building of God.

What, then, is this resurrection body to which St. Paul looks forward? If it be a different structure from our present body, when and how does it appear? Now, when

we consult St. Paul's writings, we meet with statements concerning the resurrection body which at first view seem to be at variance. At times it is spoken of as something that is to be given to the soul only at the end of all things:—"the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible;" "from whence also we look for the Lord from heaven, who shall change our body of humiliation." At other times it is spoken of as something that is to be given in the hour of death:—"We know that if the house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." And, yet again, it is spoken of as a thing which the saint already possesses:—"God *hath* quickened us together with Christ;" "If ye *be* risen with Christ, seek those things that are above." Is there any way in which these statements can be reconciled? Any theory of the future life must of necessity be more or less imaginative; but in this case there is an advantage in *having* a theory. If imagination can discover any scheme that will fit the statements of Scripture all round, it must furnish a strong presumption that the seeming contrariety of these statements lies only in our want of the missing link. We ask, then, is there any theory or hypothesis which, if accepted, would bring into harmony the teachings of the Bible on the subject of a resurrection? We think there is, and we shall try as briefly as possible to set it forth.

The point to be explained is this: Why is the resurrection sometimes represented as a fact to come, and sometimes as a fact that is past already? now as an event for the hour of death, and now as an occurrence that is to mark only the completion of all things? And the explanation we take to be that, in the view of St. Paul, the resurrection is a *process*. It is not something which is begun, continued, and ended, in a moment of time; it is an event which is spread over the entire history of the

human soul. The new body, as St. Paul understands it, is a gift, which comes from God at the moment of regeneration, which at first exists only in weakness and in frailty, which has to grow from infancy to maturity just like the natural body, which reaches a certain stage of emancipation in the hour of death, but will only attain its perfect stature in that region of the unknown future which is described as the manifestation of humanity before the judgment seat of Christ. Such we believe to be the view that will fit all the facts of the case, the only view that will harmonize with every statement of Scripture, and the view that will best reconcile such statements with the conclusions of the natural reason. Let us examine it a little more in detail.

The conception of a regeneration, or second birth, runs through the New Testament from beginning to end. That a man, at some stage of his present being, must be born again, if he would be fitted for another and a higher being, is the doctrine alike of the Christian Founder and his apostles. We shall err very greatly if we imagine that either Christ or his followers intended the phrase to be a figure of speech expressive of a change of life. Regeneration, in the view of the first Christians, is no metaphor; it is a sober, a solemn, a most prosaic reality. So far from regarding regeneration as a metaphor derived from physical birth, these men would have certainly said that physical birth was but the metaphor or shadow of regeneration. Nay, in the view of the early Church, regeneration was *itself* a physical birth.<sup>1</sup> It was not merely a revival of the human spirit; it was a reconstruction of human nature—spirit and body alike. It was nothing less than the creation of a new substance in man. To be in Christ was to be, in the most literal of all senses, a new creature; it was to have the germ of a new body and the breath of

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul holds that through Christ all men are *physically* regenerated, 1 Cor. xv. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 10; cf. John i. 9.

a new soul. The Divine Spirit, by its union with the old nature of man, was to become the parent of a third life partaking in some sense of the character of both. It was to have in it the elements alike of the human and the Divine; the one derived from the motherhood of nature, the other from the parentage of the Father of spirits. It was therefore bound to have a life of struggle. That which was supernatural in it had to strive with that which was natural; the higher had to conquer the lower origin. Regeneration, in the Christian sense of that term, is a change coextensive with the whole range of human nature—body, soul, and spirit. It is a revolution not in any opinion or sentiment held by man, but in the constitution of man himself. It makes war upon the entire fabric of the first creation, and proposes to itself a task no less momentous than the formation of a new and a different kind of union between the body and the soul.

According to St. Paul, man was at first created in a state of physical imperfection:—"The first Adam was made a living soul," or, as it may be better rendered in English, "a living animal." The statement is theologically a bold one. It implies that the element of death existed originally in human nature. St. Paul says it existed originally in *universal* nature. "The creation was made subject to vanity," to corruption, to change, to death, "not willingly," not by any fault of its own; "but by reason of him who hath subjected the same," that is, by man: "in hope that the creation also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." In this striking passage St. Paul blends into one two theories which in modern times have been considered contradictory—the view that death is the punishment of sin, and the view that death is a part of the system of nature. On the one hand, he declares as strongly as any man of modern science that death did not begin with

the Fall, but was bound up in the original order of nature : —“ the creation was made subject to vanity.” On the other hand, he affirms that this subjection of nature to death is no fault of its own, but results from the fact that it is made to suit the wants of a future being who is to incur death by his sin :—“ not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same.” The creation, according to St. Paul, is placed from the beginning in a state of *designed* imperfection, because the being who is to form its climax is to be one who is to *choose* imperfection ; it is made subject to death because it is made for man. Accordingly, when man himself is created, he is created with the nature of death in him. He is fashioned not with a view to what he might have been, but in accommodation to what he actually was to be. Therefore he receives from nature a perishable constitution, a body liable to death, a being allied more to earth than to heaven ; he exists in anticipation of his fall ; he is made only “ a living soul.”

Can we see any deeper into the mind of St. Paul on this matter ? Is it possible to get a yet clearer view of what he meant when he said that the first Adam was made a “ living soul,” or *animal* ? It seems to us that we can. The reference of the Apostle is clearly to the narrative in Genesis ii. 7, where it is said, “ The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul.” Is there anything in this account that could have suggested to St. Paul the idea that man’s physical nature was not originally perfect ? Is there anything which could have led him to the belief that the human frame from the beginning had in it the seeds of decay ? If we look closely, we shall see that there is. Let us observe, for one thing, that in the view of Genesis, matter has the start of mind. The body of man is made before the spirit ; nay, there is more than that. It is distinctly implied that in the



first creation the physical or bodily element constituted the larger part: "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground." It reads as if, in his first state, *man's* essence—that which made him man—was his physical being. He is introduced to our notice as merely the highest product of that dust out of which had been fashioned all the previous orders of creation. True, there is immediately afterward something added to him; a new and a higher life is breathed down upon him from above, and it is nothing less than the breath of God's own life. All the same, this new life is something added to man. It is not a part of his original nature, nor is it in any essential sense joined to that nature. It is breathed only "into his *nostrils*." The idea is that of superficiality. It is meant to be conveyed that, with all the grandeur which pertains to the nature of man, he has not received the Divine breath or spirit into the innermost part of his being. This, at least, is the sense in which it was understood by the Jewish writers of a later age. "Trust not in man, whose breath is in his nostrils," is an utterance of the Psalmist which has become proverbial, and it furnishes a striking commentary on the account of man's first creation. It tells us that the original constitution of man was not a perfect constitution; that there was in him more of dust than of Deity, and that the portion of him that came from Deity had only penetrated into the crust of his being. It tells us that the reason why human nature is unworthy of trust is not merely that it has fallen, but that, even were it unfallen, it is naturally frail. The Divine breath or spirit which is in it simply hovers over its surface, and enters not into its life. It is but the highest of the living forms of nature, touching indeed the very rim of the Divine life, but, in itself, unable to incorporate that life, and therefore still liable to that vanity of the whole creation—death.

It will be seen, then, that according to this interpretation of Genesis, which is really the Pauline interpretation, any regeneration of the human soul must at the same time be a regeneration of the human body. It is not merely from sin that man wants deliverance; it is from the incompleteness of his original nature. He wants a perfect union of body and soul, a union in which the dust shall not get the start of the spirit of life, and in which the spirit of life shall not be breathed only over the surface of man's constitution; but where the spirit shall itself be the germ out of which the body shall be fashioned, and by which the man shall be constituted.

Now such is the gift which St. Paul promises to humanity as the result of the second birth. He says there has come into the world a new type of the human race; he calls him the Second Adam. The two types are differently constituted. The First Adam was made "a living animal"; the Second is made a "quickenng spirit." The First Adam was simply a life which, in one solitary direction, blossomed into a spirit. The Second Adam was from the outset a spirit which, by its power of infinite diffusiveness, has created for itself a body of natural life. The Second Adam, because He *is* a spirit, has fashioned to Himself a spiritual body—a body which can second the efforts and execute the will of his rational and moral nature. It is this body, and this spirit of the Second Adam which St. Paul promises to his followers: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation." The newness consists in the birth of an entire nature—a new body and a new spirit. The believer at the hour of his regeneration receives the identical Spirit which dwelt in the Son of Man; and along with his Spirit, he receives that which is indissolubly joined to it—a spiritual body. He is not said, indeed, to have the identical *body* of the Son of Man, but one "*like unto* his glorious body." The new body is that which makes the

“new creation”; it is something which is added to the sum of original being. But the point for us is that, in the view of St. Paul, this new body comes not at death, but at regeneration. The proof is, that in the writings of Paul the time of a man’s regeneration is often spoken of as the time of his resurrection: “If by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection of the dead* ;” “Awake thou that sleepest, and *arise from the dead*, and Christ shall give thee light.” Is it not to the same fact that our Lord Himself refers in the Fourth Gospel, where it is said: “The hour is coming and now *is* when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and they that hear shall live.” So, too, when St. Paul says of the seed, “It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption,” what do we understand him to mean? He is not surely speaking of burial in the grave, though perhaps he may have had that *metaphor* in his mind. More likely is it from every point of view that the sowing of which he spoke was the insertion of the Divine Spirit into the corruptible human nature. The hour of sowing was to Paul the hour of regeneration. It was the putting of incorruption into the heart of corruption. That which was sown was a new nature—the seed of a higher spirit and the germ of a purer body. The believer was already “risen with Christ.” He had even now been quickened, raised up, made to sit with Him “in heavenly places”; for he had even now been born again, not metaphorically, but truly; not only into the inheritance of a new life, but into the possession of a new form—the *image* of the Heavenly.

Why, then, will St. Paul not allow it to be said that the resurrection is past already? It is because, in his view, the resurrection is a process, and therefore slow of completion. He would not have objected to its being said that the resurrection was *begun* already; but he regarded the hour of regeneration as *only* its beginning. The new body, like the

new spirit, was as yet but in germ, and both had to fight their way against the original elements of human nature. The first and the second Adam now existed in the same soul, and such a co-existence meant war. To bring peace, there was needed another stage in the process of resurrection; the new nature had to be emancipated from the old in that act which is called death. The seed has been sown in dishonour; it must be raised in glory. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." To depart is far better than to remain, because it is to be with Christ. What do such passages mean if, in the view of the Apostle, death is not a second stage of the second birth? Nay, there is one very remarkable passage in which St. Paul seems virtually to say that, even if death were abolished in this world, it would be necessary to find a substitute for it: "Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, *but we shall all be changed.*" Let us try to grasp the thought of the Apostle. Some members of the Church of Corinth had denied the resurrection of the dead. They had been influenced in this denial by the hope that they themselves would never need to die; that they would live until the coming of the Messiah should put an end to death. St. Paul's answer really amounts to this: Even if it were so, even if you should live till the day when death shall be no more, you will still need a resurrection. If you do not die, you must be changed. Think you that you can enter into the celestial life without a resurrection body! Think you that your present physical nature is fit for the home of pure spirits? Will you not learn that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God?" Will you not learn that, if death be a penal power to the sinner, it is a remedial power to the saint? There is within your nature a want of harmony between body and soul; "these two are contrary." Something is wanted that shall remove the discord, and unite the outer to the inner man. That power has

been found in death. Death has served the cause of immortality; it has changed the corruptible into the incorruptible. If there were no death, there would still need to be the *work* of death. Come as it may, the change *must* take place. If this mortal would put on immortality, this corruptible must put on incorruption; and this can only be done by a process in which your whole being shall be transformed. In vain, therefore, do you look for the coming of the Messiah as a hope of perpetuating the present system of things. In the presence of the Messiah the existing order of things would vanish "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." "Those who remain until the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent," shall not get any advantage over, "those that sleep." To them, too, there must come a change; a change, equal to death in its power, and identical in its effect, whereby the old nature shall be translated into the new, and the body of sin and corruption shall be transfigured into that spiritual house which is not made with hands.

Death, then, or rather the change which accompanies death, is the second stage of resurrection. But it is not yet the final stage. We must here refer to that point to which we directed attention in our previous paper. We there saw that in the writings of St. Paul there are distinguishable two views regarding the state of the dead. We found them sometimes spoken of as in a state of rest, and sometimes as in a condition of increased mental activity. We came to the conclusion that, in the view of St. Paul, the state of the dead was itself progressive. We found that he recognized two degrees of glory in the life of the saint beyond the grave. There was, first, a stage of rest; and there was, afterwards, a time of action. The souls of the departed were at first *hid* with Christ. They were not in a state of unconsciousness, but theirs was the consciousness of contemplation, not yet of action. They

had passed into a life of glory, but theirs was the glory of vision, not yet of service. The soul's first experience after death was an experience in solitude. It was an experience in the garden, as distinguished from a life in the *city* of God. Each spirit was for the time separated from all other spirits. It was alone, absorbed in communion with the Source of its being, and perhaps more occupied with the retrospect than with the prospect of things. By and by there was to come a change. The solitude was to pass away. The hiding was to cease. The soul was to come out from a distinctively mental, into a distinctively bodily life, a life in which the physical universe would at last be harmonized with the universe of spirit, and where the principles of love and purity would embody themselves in a reign of "righteousness and judgment."

This, then, is St. Paul's final stage of resurrection. The new body is only *liberated* by death; it is not yet glorified. The chain is broken, and the obstacle to growth removed; but the growth itself is still to be perfected. The physical nature has been redeemed from slavery, but it is not yet ripe for the prerogatives of freedom. It wants time to mature; and that time is its state of intermediate glory. By and by it will be ready to take its place as one of the ruling powers in that great manifestation of an universal Theocracy which men have called the "Day of Judgment." The consideration of this important subject must be reserved for a future article.

GEORGE MATHESON.

---