

These various notices, and the facts here collected together furnish, it must be admitted, no inconsiderable amount of evidence in favour of the view that *Missa Catechumenorum*, of which our ante-communion office, with the Epistle and Gospel and sermon, is the lineal descendant, is really nothing but the service of the Jewish synagogue transferred to the use of the Christian Church.

EDGAR C. S. GIBSON.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

II.

(1 COR. xv. 42-44.)

By the help of analogies from nature the Apostle has been able to meet three difficulties attending the belief that there is a resurrection of the dead. The dead rise, he had said; and it followed that, so rising, they must have bodies, for without a body no man can be thought of as existing. The first difficulty therefore had been, With what kind of body do the dead come? How can they be thought of as having bodies at all, when the bodies which they possessed during the life in which we knew them have returned to corruption? If they may have bodies, had been the second difficulty, will these bodies be adapted to the condition of a heavenly world? If they will be so adapted, had been the third difficulty, and thus be so different from what they were, can personal identity have been preserved? These three questions have been answered, and the application has now to be made in a more positive treatment of the subject.

This application is made at ver. 42: "So also is the resurrection of the dead"; that is, the resurrection of the dead follows the same order and law as may be seen in

the analogies of nature that have been spoken of. We have here one of those instances of breviloquence which are common in all languages, a thought implied though not fully expressed. In speaking of the plant which sprang from the seed, St. Paul evidently did not think of the mere fact of the springing alluded to. He thought also of the plant itself as a living plant, and of the new state into which it was introduced. He thought of the life that was in the new form, and of which the new form was the expression. In like manner he does not think now only of the *act* of rising from the dead, but of the *life* which follows it. Something of a similar kind, although there the tense of the verb used makes the meaning clearer, is to be found in ver. 4 of this chapter: "And that He (Christ) hath been raised [not 'was raised' of Authorized Version] on the third day." Not merely did Christ rise, but His resurrection was to ever-enduring, eternal life.

If what has been said be admitted, it may help us over a difficulty connected with the next following words, rendered in both the Authorized and Revised Versions, "It is sown in corruption," etc. The subject spoken of, it is said, is the body, which indeed is expressly named in ver. 44: *σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν*. *Σῶμα* is therefore to be taken back to the beginning of ver. 42, and the "it" of the English rendering is to be understood as "the body." So most commentators. But there are difficulties in the way of accepting this view; for (1) Although the apostle has been treating of the body, it is less the body alone than the body regarded as the outward organ and expression of the man that he has in his eye; (2) The *σῶμα* of ver. 44 is too far off, and we ought to find it mentioned in ver. 42. Even when it first meets us in ver. 44, it is a predicate, rather than directly the subject of the sentence; (3) If supplied as proposed, we shall hardly be able to avoid thinking of death and burial as the moment at which the

sowing takes place, and not a few commentators who advocate its introduction as *subject* at the beginning of ver. 42 allow that this cannot be done.¹ Another rendering accordingly has been suggested, in which *σπείρεται* is treated as an impersonal verb.² "It is sown"; that is, "There is a sowing in corruption," etc. The point need not be enlarged on; for, on the one hand, a reference to the body cannot be denied; and, on the other hand, there is a sufficiently general admission that the Apostle must be understood to speak of the body, not at the instant only when it is buried, but as the habitation of man during his present earthly life. When, in the first clause of ver. 42, he says, "So also is the resurrection of the dead," he has in view, not simply the act of rising, but the resurrection state into which believers enter. In like manner, when he speaks of the *νεκροί*, though the immediate reference is to their death, he is really thinking of their whole mortal in contrast with their whole immortal life. All the earthly course of man, from its beginning to its end, from the cradle to the grave, is the time of his being sown; and truth is that

"Which we are toiling all our lives to find,
In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave."

No other interpretation does justice to the context. The terms "dishonour" and "weakness" are too wide to find a suitable application to the body only when it is committed to the dust; while it would be extremely unnatural to call it a *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, a body with a sensuous life, at the very time when that life has left it.

Thus then, contrasting the life of man in his earthly body with his life in his resurrection body, St. Paul proceeds to point out how infinitely more glorious is the latter than

¹ Comp. Ellicott, Edwards.

² Comp. Moulton's *Winer*, p. 656; Hofmann *in loc.*; Godet *in loc.*

the former. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." What is the meaning of these appellations?

Godet, adopting the right reference of the sowing, not to the act of burial, but to all the earthly life of man, supposes that, in the terms thus used, the apostle travels backwards in thought through the different stages of a mortal pilgrimage from death to birth. "Corruption" thus refers to death and dissolution in the grave; "dishonour" to all the ills and miseries which precede and prepare the way for death; "weakness," to the helplessness of infancy when the child is born; while the word "natural" (*ψυχικός*) carries us still further back to the instant at which the breath of life is communicated to the physical germ about to be developed into the instrument and organism of the future life on earth. The explanation can hardly be looked at in any other light than as fanciful and unnatural. Had the apostle been alluding to the different stages of man's earthly life, he would surely have begun at the beginning, and have passed onward to the end. But there is no need to think of stages. Each term used is applicable to human life as a whole, and the progress lying latent in the words is one, not of time, but of thought.

Thus the glorified body which man is to possess at his resurrection and in his resurrection state rises before the mind of the apostle "in incorruption"; and he exclaims, "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption." He has no thought of sin in saying so, but only of liability to change and to dissolution. Here all things pass away. Years, as they sweep over us, and especially when they bring us near the great step which transfers us to the eternal world, bring with them only increasing infirmities, more multiplied tokens that the tabernacle in which we

dwel shall soon be altogether taken down. There, "incorruption": no insidious approaches of sickness or disease, no colour fading from the cheek or light from the eye, no wearied frame hardly able to bear the burden of itself, no palsied limb, but the blessed glow of health and strength diffused through the whole man, and to be enhanced rather than diminished as the ages of eternity run on. Next, "in glory:" "It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory." Again the Apostle has no thought of any positive dishonour inflicted by either God or man upon the body during the present life; and surely still less does he think of any later contempt poured upon the thought of it, as if it were supposed to lie in the grave unremembered and unloved. "Dishonour" is simply in contrast with "glory." Twice in other passages of his writings does St. Paul use the word, when he would express the nature of those meaner vessels of a great house, which are either made of wood or stone, instead of gold or silver, or which, if made of the same material as others, are less elaborately finished and adorned.¹ The true parallel to the thought is to be found in the contrast presented to us in the Epistle to the Philippians between the "body of our humiliation" which is to be fashioned anew, and the body of Christ's glory to which it is to be conformed. Such is the lowliness of man's body now. Fearfully and wonderfully as it is made, it is yet a poor frame in comparison with what it shall be when "the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," and when they shall be clothed with a glory corresponding to that of the "new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Once more, St. Paul sees the body of man in "power:" "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power." Here it is frail, helpless, exposed to infirmities and diseases of all kinds.

¹ Rom. ix. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 20,

There it is possessed of power, and has gained a complete mastery over every ill.

In all this, as especially appears from the words that follow, and have still to be considered, the Apostle is not thinking of the effect produced upon man's earthly state by his fall from the condition in which he was originally created. He has in view a state of matters which existed previously to the fall. No doubt there is a sense in which it may be said that sin has brought into the world "death and all our woe." But it seems to be the clear teaching of St. Paul throughout the passage now under consideration, that the "corruption," the "dishonour," and the "weakness" of which he speaks are properties of our present human frame in itself, properties that belonged even to the frame of our first parents in their state in paradise. No ethical idea therefore is to be attached to the words. Man, even in his best estate, had been fitted for life in this earthly, material scene, in which he was to work out and to pass through his preparation for a higher. That higher scene now shines brightly before the eye of the Apostle, as he places himself on the other side of the river of time and death; and it is one of "incorruption," of "glory," and of "power."

At ver. 44 of the chapter St. Paul continues his description of the contrast between the present and the resurrection state of believers, yet with an important change in his line of thought. Hitherto he had spoken of the contrast in its more outward features, and the arrangement thus indicated might have been nothing more than an arbitrary arrangement on the part of God. Without regard to any deeper principles of His government, God might have simply willed that the change to take effect on the bodies of His saints at the resurrection should be from corruption to incorruption, from dishonour to glory, from weakness to power. At the point of the argument which we now reach new

ground is occupied, and the nature of the body to be bestowed upon believers when they rise from the dead is brought into connexion with everlasting principles of the Divine administration of the universe.

1. The fact meets us. "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." The words here used, "natural" (accepting that translation in the meantime), "spiritual," and "body," cannot be examined in a paper such as this with that fulness of statement which their importance might justify or seem even to demand, but a few remarks upon them must be made.

(1) What is the conception to be attached to the word "body"? Certainly not that commonly entertained, that it is the mere covering of the soul, standing to the soul in a relation similar to that of the shell to the kernel of a nut. The connexion between the two is much more intimate. The body is an organism, and its organized existence depends, alike in its beginning and in its continuance, upon the fact that a vital power not only dwells in it as in a house, but permeates or interpenetrates it in such a way that all its different parts or members constitute one whole (1 Cor. xii. 12-26). From the head "all the body fitly framed and knit together through every joint of the supply, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body" (Eph. iv. 16). This vital power however may be of entirely different kinds. It may be spiritual or carnal, heavenly or earthly. There is no closer connexion between the body as such and any one of the forces by which it may be animated and used, than between the body and any other of these forces. The *σῶμα* is not the *σὰρξ*. The latter may be the ruling principle in the former, and may become so identified with it that when the *σῶμα* is spoken of, it may, as in Romans viii. 10, include the *σὰρξ*. But the *σὰρξ* has no necessary relation to the *σῶμα*. Its power may be destroyed while the *σῶμα* still

remains the *σῶμα*, employed as their instruments by good instead of evil principles. Hence, accordingly, the *σῶμα* may be "holy," which the *σάρξ* can never be; it is "for the Lord, and the Lord is for it" (1 Cor. vi. 13); "it is even the 'temple'—the *ναός*, the innermost shrine—of the Holy Spirit in believers" (1 Cor. vi. 19): it is to be presented to God "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, our reasonable (or spiritual, Revised Version, margin) service" (Rom. xii. 1): nay, it was the instrument fashioned by the Almighty for the eternal Son, that by means of it He might complete the work of man's redemption (Heb. x. 5).

The idea therefore apt to be entertained by many, that there is an incompatibility, or even a contrariety, between what is spiritual and what is bodily, is wholly false. In St. Paul's view there is no such opposition. With him spiritual is opposed to what is either carnal or belonging to the same category, and the distinguishing feature of what is called the "body" is, not that it is better fitted for what is evil than for what is good, but that it is the form in which either the one or the other is made manifest.

Again, we are nowhere taught that the particles of which the body is composed are necessarily heavy and sluggish, ill adapted to the activity and life of the spirit. For aught we know they may be of an entirely different description. Not their weight, but their relation to one another, their dependence upon one another, their interest in one another, and their mutual helpfulness, constitute them a "body." The use of that word throws no light upon the nature of the particles of which the body is composed, either in its earthly or its heavenly, its pre-resurrection or its post-resurrection, state. These particles may be like those of our present frames, or they may be in striking contrast with them. The word "body" only says that there shall be an investiture or framework within which the vital force

shall dwell, and by which each possessor of a body shall be separated from his fellows.

(2) "Natural" ($\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\acute{o}s$). The translation is that of both the Authorized and Revised Versions, but few will be found to deny that it is not a happy one. For, in the first place, the word "natural" is in a high degree ambiguous; and in the second place, it conveys no conception of any internal force or power in man which expresses itself in the particular kind of body spoken of. Yet the term of the original is exceedingly difficult to translate. It is not of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. Except in the verses immediately before us, it is found only three times in the whole compass of that book: in 1 Corinthians ii. 14, James iii. 15, and Jude ver. 19. In the first of these passages it is again rendered, alike in the Authorized Version and the Revised Version, "natural," and in the second and third "sensual"; although the revisers sufficiently indicate their perplexity by attaching to it on these last occasions a double margin, "natural" or "animal."

There may be no complete remedy for this, as no word of the English language properly represents the Greek. Certainly the refuges of despair suggested by recent inquirers, "soulish" and "soulual," are still more objectionable. Yet, even allowing this, it is hardly possible not to feel that each of the three renderings found in the Revised Version and its margin leads us astray. The adjective, it will be admitted, must be understood in the sense of the substantive from which it comes, and $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ means neither what is "natural," nor what is "sensual," nor what is "animal" in human nature. $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is the life-principle, the principle of personality, in man regarded simply as a creature of this present world, and in contradistinction to the religious principle which connects him with another and a higher world. It is not necessarily sinful, although it is

capable of admitting a sinful as well as, in other circumstances, a Divine principle to rule in it. And it is not necessarily a degraded thing, for it may include our highest gifts of reason, intelligence, and emotion, so long as these are unconnected with a spiritual world. The essence, in short, of the biblical conception of *ψυχή* appears to be that it is that in man which adapts him to this world of sense in which he for the present moves; that which, along with the body, constitutes him a part of the visible and tangible creation.

These considerations at once suggest the true meaning to be assigned to the word *ψυχικός*, neither "natural," nor "sensual," nor "animal," but ruled by the senses, or by the material things around us as they are apprehended by the senses; and the English adjective which appears to come nearest to the expression of this thought is "sensuous." It will be found upon examination that this rendering is admirably adapted to the three passages above referred to. The last of the three indeed, Jude 19, demands it. To read "sensual, having not the Spirit," is to introduce a contrast of an unscriptural and most misleading kind. In the meantime therefore, contenting ourselves simply with translating the word, what we read of man's present state, and especially of his bodily organization during his present state is, "it is sown a sensuous body."

(3) "Spiritual." There can be little or no doubt as to the meaning of this word. It stands in a relation to spirit similar to that in which "sensuous" stands to sense; and the word "spirit," when spoken of man, points to that part of human nature which brings us into contact with God. "God is spirit" (John iv. 24), and there must therefore be something in man, come whence it may, and either at the first or later, which enables us to hold communion with spirit, and partakes of the nature of spirit. Such is the teaching of the New Testament. There is another side of

human nature than that which is alone appealed to by the things of sense. There is the spiritual side, that by which thought and aspiration pass from the material to the immaterial, from the visible to the invisible, from the earthly to the super-earthly, from man to God. And this spiritual principle, for the complete appropriation of which man is even originally fitted, may become the dominating principle of the man, and therefore of the body with which man works. That is the spiritual in man.

Thus then we are prepared to follow the contrast between man's present and future state, as, in the first place, the facts of that contrast are set before us in the words, "It is sown a sensuous body; it is raised a spiritual body." The body now possessed by man is, above all, distinguished by this, that it is linked to the objects of sense and governed by their influence. Not indeed that such a state is in itself necessarily low and degraded, one of which we can speak only with opprobrium or contempt. We may justly use far other language; for how striking and illustrative of Divine wisdom is the correspondence between each of our senses and the particular department of external nature to which it is adapted. How are our faculties called into exercise, strengthened, and delighted by; the appeals continually made to them through the objects of earth and sky! How are our affections nourished by the various relationships in which we stand to one another in the family, in society, in the nation, in the world at large!

What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!

And the body is scarcely less an instrument in all this than the mind and heart. Let us not condemn the "sensuous body." It is "fearfully and wonderfully made."

In one respect indeed such a body fails. It is not completely adapted to that spiritual and eternal world, relation to which is as truly a part of what God has designed for us as is relation to the world of sense. To the spiritual world it is not adapted, for how limited is the body when it comes to deal with the unseen! To the eternal it is not, for how brief is the span of its existence before it returns to the dust! Nay, the loftier the flight of the spirit in its religious life, the sooner does the body feel itself unable to bear it longer; and, though "the hoary head is a crown of glory when it is found in the way of righteousness," yet old age has already one foot in the grave, and the other may have to follow it at the very moment when the life seemed to be most full of instruction and most rich in promise. The "sensuous body" has at best its elements of "corruption" and "dishonour" and "weakness"; and, unless there be another principle stronger than they, they must prevail at last.

Such a principle, accordingly, the Apostle tells us that there is, as he points us forward to the time when what has been sown a sensuous body shall be "raised a spiritual body." As the "sensuous body" is the body ruled by sense, so the "spiritual body" is the body ruled by spirit. We have already seen that that time has not yet come: but it will come, when the limits of the sensuous world shall no longer hem us in; when the restraints of our earthly, material investiture shall be broken through; and when, under the all-pervading and dominating power of spirit, the body, in its strength, rapidity of movement, and ever-renewed youthfulness of vigour, shall be the meet companion of the soul in its loftiest flights. In the spiritual body the restrictions of the sensuous body shall wholly disappear. With it the believer shall rise superior to languor and weariness and death. Then shall be said of him literally what now can be said of him only ideally, that

he is fitted for serving God day and night in His temple, and for walking with Him in the land, the sun of which no more goes down, and the moon of which no more withdraws itself.

Of both the kinds of body thus referred to we have undoubted examples in the life of our Lord. While He tabernacled among men He had a "sensuous" body, like the other members of that family in which He was taking the place of elder brother. He hungered; He thirsted; He sat weary by Jacob's well; He fell asleep, probably worn out by toil, in the boat upon the Sea of Galilee; during His agony in the garden His sweat was like great drops of blood falling down to the ground. "Forasmuch as the children are sharers in blood and flesh, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same" (Heb. ii. 14). After His resurrection there was a great change. We read no longer of hunger, or thirst, or weariness, or pores of the body opened by pain and agony. We read of a body which was obviously altogether different from what it had been, but was in every respect obedient and subservient to the spirit. In that body in its two different stages we behold the type and model of our own, as it is and as it is destined to be. The experience of the Head shall also be the experience of the members. "It is sown a sensuous body; it is raised a spiritual body."

We have looked at the facts as stated by the Apostle, but the most remarkable part of this forty-fourth verse is—

2. The principle to which St. Paul refers in illustration and confirmation of his statement. According to the reading of the T.R. indeed—the reading followed in the Authorized Version—the Apostle simply goes on to say, "There is a sensuous body, and there is a spiritual body"; but the reading adopted by the most distinguished later editors of the New Testament, and resting upon what seems an overpowering weight of evidence, supplies

the translation adopted in the Revised Version : " If there is a sensuous (in Revised Version 'natural') body, there is also a spiritual body." The fact that the one exists leads to the conclusion that the other also exists, or that it will in due time do so. Upon what fundamental principle, or upon what process of reasoning, does this conclusion rest? Hardly upon the conviction only that the spiritual body is "the perfect development" of the sensuous body, and that the existence of the latter, with its great capabilities, "suggests and, to a mind that believes in the living and good God, demonstrates the future existence of the former. The resurrection of the dead is an instance of the universal law of progress."¹ This may be in part the explanation. St. Paul certainly seems, throughout this passage as a whole, to imply, that there is a great law of progress in the universe, and it may be that he found an instance of it in the fact that the sensuous body will at last pass into the spiritual body. But that is not his thought at the present moment; and, in so far as it involves the idea of a *gradual* development, it is rather opposed to his convictions than expressive of them. His reasoning appears rather to rest upon the principle that, when God gives the inward, He gives also its appropriate outward garb or frame; that He gives that, in short, without which we should only have an idea in the Divine Mind. Whatever be the human life-force, St. Paul believes that it will have a suitable vehicle for its energies.

Now two things he knew, and we may know. First, he knew, as a matter of daily experience, that the law upon the thought of which he was dwelling was exemplified in our sensuous life. The life-force ruling us in that life had a sensuous frame adapted to it. Secondly, he knew that there was such a thing as the spirit-life, both in Christ and in the members of His body. He had already written, and was to

¹ Edwards, *in loc.* : comp. Beet, *in loc.*

write more, to the Corinthian Church about that spirit-life. He and they knew it in Christ. They believed in the risen Lord as "Spirit" (1 Cor. vi. 17). They were yet again to be taught the same lesson, and, in addition, that they were to be "transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord, who was spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 18). Unless therefore they denied the higher spirit-life and the risen Lord, it followed that, as the sensuous life has now its appropriate earthly frame, so the spirit-life must some day receive its corresponding spiritual frame. St. Paul's mind had been already full of a similar thought at ver. 38, when he spoke of the manner in which the vital force of the seed, stirred into action by being committed to the soil, received from God a new body, as it pleased Him. The same thought, although in a more general form, occupies him now; and it is the sole thought upon which he dwells. He says nothing of any innate power possessed by the spirit to weave, as it were, for itself a corresponding covering; nor does he enter into the question whether the embodiment is produced by an instantaneous fiat of the Creator, or by a long and gradual process, in the course of which the nobler vital principle overcomes irregularities, smooths away roughnesses, and by imperceptible degrees establishes perfect harmony between the inner life and the outward form. He deals as yet simply with the fact that, as there is a spiritual principle in believers which will one day assert in them complete dominion, so we may be assured that to that principle there will yet be given its corresponding framework. It had been thus with Christ, whose heavenly life, led even now at the right hand of the Father, was acknowledged by all Christians at Corinth to have found expression in His heavenly body. Could it be otherwise with those who followed in His footsteps and were partakers of His spirit? No; for that heavenly or spiritual body had not been a mere gift to the risen Lord,

in return for all that He had done and suffered. It had been bestowed upon Him in fulfilment of a universal law; and, if that law took effect upon the Head, it would in due time, as the members shared the spirit of the Head, take effect also upon them.

W. MILLIGAN.

THE SIXTY-THIRD PSALM.

THE Feast of Tabernacles, important in the very earliest times, became still more endeared to the Jews by its connexion with the Maccabæan heroes. [It is in the later Maccabæan age that we first hear of that strange custom, implied in John vii. 37, of drawing water from the Pool of Siloam, and pouring it out as a drink-offering at the foot of the altar. The rejoicings of the multitude on the last day of the feast passed all bounds, and an ordinary teacher would perchance have despaired of winning the ear of the excited spectators. Jesus, however, with His keen eye for symbols, saw that this popular ceremony might furnish a text for one of His heart-searching appeals. Just as the priest had poured out the water from the golden pitcher at the foot of the altar (so at least we may suppose), Jesus stood forth and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink."

The words presuppose that the people were accustomed to symbolism like this. And certain it is that many of those who heard them at once began to question whether this might not be the prophet who was to come in the latter days, or even the Messiah himself. I should not wonder if the idea was suggested to them by a passage from a prophetic hymn in Isaiah which was inserted in the liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles: "*In that day*" (*i.e.* probably in the Messianic age) "*ye shall draw water with*