

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIII.—NO. 3.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLX.

ARTICLE I.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF FRANCE AND THE PASTORS OF THE DESERT.

*Histoire Des Églises Réformées de Pons, Gemozac et Mortagne
En Saintonge, Précédée d'une notice étendue sur L'établiss-
ment de la Réforme dans cette Province, L'Aunis, et L'An-
goumois.* Par A. CROTTET, de Genève, Pasteur à Pons.
A Bordeaux : 1841 ; pp. 263, 8vo.

*Histoire des Églises Du Désert chez les Protestants de France
depuis la Fin du Règne de Louis XIV., jusqu'à la Révolu-
tion Française.* Par CHARLES COQUEREL.

“ Plus á me frapper on s'amuse,
“ Tant plus de marteaux on y use.”

THEODORE DE BEZA.

Two vols. Paris : 1841 ; pp. 564, 616, 8vo.

*Histoire des Pasteurs du Désert depuis la Revocation de L'édit
de Nantes jusqu'à la Revolution Française, 1685–1789.* Par
NAP. PEYRAT.

“ Ils tenaient devant le trône, en présence de l'Agneau, vetus
de longues robes blanches ayant à la main des palmes.—D'ou
sont-ils venus ?—De la grande tribulation.—Ils ont lavé leur
robe dans le sang de l'Agneau ; voilà pourquoi ils sont devant
le trône de Dieu, et le servent dans son temple.”

Apocalypse, Chap. vii.

Two vols. Paris : 1842 ; pp. 516, 552, 8vo.

ARTICLE II.

THE RESURRECTION-BODY.

A little child receives its father's teachings with unquestioning faith. Its own love is a guarantee of the parent's; and the parent's love is the guarantee of truth. Nor is its trustful axiom, "Whatever my father says is true," in the least impaired, when, after a year or two of progressive knowledge, it begins to ask, "In what sense is it true? and with what limitations?" for, in process of time, it discovers that what was perfectly true to its infantile conception, is not all the truth to be discerned by its maturer reason.

The Church of God, which was once a little child in the knowledge of physics and psychology, though less so, perhaps, than our boastful moderns maintain, and which ought never to be otherwise in spirit, sustains very nearly such a relation to the precious doctrine of the body's final resurrection. Our Heavenly Father told us, long since, in the infancy of our faith, not to be afraid of death,—that it is not what, to the eye of flesh, it seems to be, the end of our bodily being,—that it is only a "sleep," and that after a certain period of repose passed in the grave, these same bodies shall awake to light and to immortal life. Or, if this is not taught in so many words, *it seems to be*; for this is the substance of this teaching, when interpreted according to its first and most obvious meaning. Now, we believe what he says; we believe every word of it; and the more earnest our love, the more firm our faith; but, remembering the rule of our opening childhood, and remembering, too, that language is to be rightly interpreted only by its evident intentions, we are inclined, after having made some little progress in knowledge, to pause and ask, In what

sense is his language true? and with what limitations? Shall we understand it as we did in the simplicity of the world's childhood? Or, conscious that, though children, yet we are, as a generation, "older than our fathers," and possessed of knowledge which they had not, shall we compare this truth with other truths given to us, and thus modify our former conceptions? *All truth* is of God.

We shall better understand the posture of the subject by taking a rapid survey of its history. The doctrine of the resurrection,—one of the sweetest to the pious in prospect of death, and one of the most comforting to those who lay their loved ones in the grave,—is peculiar to the Sacred Scriptures, and belongs almost exclusively to the New Testament. The earliest announcement of it, in such terms as to leave no doubt of its import, is to be found in the language of "the evangelical prophet," where he says (Is. 26 : 19): "The dead even shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." The next, and only other satisfactory passage, in the Old Testament, is in the Book of Daniel (12 : 2): "Many of them [or, the multitude of them] that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." It will no doubt be painful to many to learn that the celebrated passage in Job 19 : 25–27, beginning with "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and constituting a part of the impressive burial service of the Church of England, cannot be relied upon as a proof text on this subject, since it is given up by the great body of learned men (including Calvin, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Eichhorn, Jahn, and many others,) as not touching the doctrine of the resurrection at all. It is a remarkable fact, and worthy of note by the biblical student, that throughout the Pentateuch and the historical books, not the first allu-

sion to the general resurrection occurs.* What ideas may have been excited by the bodily translations of Enoch and Elijah, or whether any ideas whatever on the subject were entertained for the three thousand years preceding Isaiah's day, we have no means of judging.

Between the close of the Old Testament canon, however, and the opening of the New, the doctrine of a partial, if not a general, resurrection, seems to have become deeply rooted in the minds of the people. We find traces of this fact in a postscript to the Book of Job in the Septuagint, dating at least two hundred and fifty years before Christ: "But it is written that he shall rise again with those whom the Lord raises." Also, in 2d Maccabees, 7 : 14, (written about one hundred and fifty years before Christ, concerning current events,) where one of the seven brothers, martyred by Antiochus, is represented as saying to him, "It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by Him: as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life."

The Jews of our Saviour's day were divided in their opinions. The Sadducees, who professed to be guided in their faith by the plain letter of Scripture, without regard to traditional interpretations, and particularly to believe in the writings of Moses, who says nothing on this subject, rejected utterly, or at least disputed, the doctrine of the resurrection; while the Pharisees, who professed to believe in "the resurrection of *the just*," (to the exclusion, it would seem, of the resurrection of the wicked,) held at the same time such gross opinions about the continuance in another world of the relations existing in this, as to expose themselves to the just ridicule of their opponents.

In the teaching of our Saviour and his Apostles this doc-

* This does not consist with the declaration of our Lord, quoted by the author himself (see below, page 488), from Luke 20 : 37—"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush," etc., etc.—[Eds. S. P. R.]

trine occupies so prominent a place that it has constituted an article of faith in every Christian Church from that day to the present. Most of the Churches have contented themselves with using the language of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in * * * * the resurrection of the dead." Others, however, go farther. The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563, says, "*My body* [or, my flesh] also being raised by the power of Christ, shall be united with my soul, and be like the glorious body of Christ." The Synod of Dort, in 1618, representing the Churches of the United Provinces, and of England, Scotland, Switzerland, and other countries, expressed themselves thus: "For all the dead shall be raised out of the earth, and their souls joined and united with *their proper bodies*, in which they formerly lived." But by no Church has the doctrine been enunciated with greater fullness and precision than our own, both in the Confession of Faith and in the Larger Catechism. In the first of these (Chap. 32, Art. 2) it is said, "At the last day, such as are alive shall not die, but be changed; and all the dead shall be raised up *with the self-same bodies, and none other, although with different qualities*, which shall be united again with their souls for ever."

With these time-honored decisions of the Church, Christians generally have appeared to be content. Occasionally, however, men of restless minds, dissatisfied with the grounds on which these decisions have been based, and stimulated by new discoveries, real or supposed, in the physical sciences, have called in question the sense in which we are to understand the Bible doctrine of the resurrection. Among these, the most distinguished for ability, and at the same time for failure, is the late eminent Prof. Bush. In the years 1844 and 1845 he put forth two books ("Anastasis" and "The Soul"), in which he endeavored to prove, first by a "Rational Argument" and then from the Scriptures, that there is to be expected *no resurrection*, either general or particular, in the usually received accep-

tation of the term—that the body to be reunited with the soul, in the future state, is not, *in any sense*, the one committed to the grave, but that it is the psyche (*ψυχή*) or psychical body “which constitutes the inner essential vitality of our present bodies, and lives again in another world, *because it cannot die*,”—that this physical body *is not raised up* from the grave, but is “developed, by a natural law, from the material body at death,”—and that what we are to expect in the resurrection is, not a change to take place at the end of the world, but that at the instant of each person’s death the psyche, or vital principle, “which conjointly (with the intelligence) constitute the essence of the man,” goes forth from the body. The scheme of the unfortunate philosopher was, however, so gross a departure from the manifest teachings of that volume on which the pious rely more confidently than on any deductions of mere reason, that few persons, except himself, appear to have been led away by his error. The theory has in a great measure died with its author.

And yet the agreement among Christians upon this interesting point is more seeming than real. The main doctrine, that there is to be a final, general resurrection, is conceded by many as a plain teaching of Revelation, as well as of the Church catholic; while the question, “With what body shall we come?” involving largely the substance of the main doctrine, is still discussed with great diversity of opinion. Indeed, a close examination of the terms, quoted from the above cited Confessions, will reveal the fact that, admitting, with perfect sincerity, their authority, both theological and exegetical, their indefiniteness is such (perhaps intentionally) as to admit of widely different interpretations.

An ancient Pharisee, for instance, might have said, in the language of the Heidelberg Catechism, *I believe that our bodies being raised shall be united with our souls*; or, in the language of the Synod of Dort, “*The dead shall be raised*

out of the earth, and their souls joined and united with their proper bodies, in which they formerly lived," or, in the language of our own Confession, "*The dead shall be raised with the self-same bodies, and none other;*" and yet it is well known that they held some grave errors in connection, which our Saviour in part corrected, when he said to his disciples, "the children of the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God." The grosser forms of this error have long since disappeared from the Church; still its germ manifestly exists, and exhibits itself under many refined, though it may not be harmless, forms.

A second phase in popular opinion has been brought about by modern discoveries in physiology. A few generations back, no one conceived the possibility of a person's having more than one body during his earthly life. But the fact is now universally familiar, that we change our bodies as we do our garments, only not quite so suddenly or so perceptibly; and that in the course of the three-score and ten years allotted to man, the change may occur as many as ten times. The question, therefore, has arisen, *Which of these TEN complete bodies is to be THE body raised up at the last day?*

If it is replied, the last one worn, then there arise other difficulties. This "last body" is known in some instances to enter into the composition of other "last bodies." A ship's crew, for instance, are driven to the horrid necessity of cannibalism. In the course of a few days, one of the men, whose body is composed in part of the "last body" of his comrade, falls a second victim. The process is continued; and finally the remainder of the crew, whose bodies are composed of the compound and recompounded bodies of those devoured, are engulfed in the ocean. Who, by any conceivable mode of reasoning, can disentangle from this hopeless intricacy the "my body" of the Heidelberg Catechism,—the "proper body" of the Synod of Dort,—or

the "self-same body, and *none other*," of our own Confession? It is manifest that, if by these terms we are to understand the *entire last body of each*, the propositions involve an absurdity. Nor is this all. It were easy to show, on sound chemical principles, that the dissolved elements of our material structure escape from the grave, are borne by winds and waters in boundless diffusion over the earth's surface, and become incorporated into thousands of plants, the food of men and beasts, or are received by the lungs into the blood, and thence into the solid structure of other human beings; so that there is probably not an individual on earth whose body is not in part composed of elements that belonged in turn to the last bodies of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of the race. The thought bewilders.

For this last difficulty, it may be replied, that the resurrection-body will be composed of so much and no more of its former materials as may be necessary to a *consciousness of identity*. We will just take a peep into this part of the subject. The human frame, besides its organized (or, more correctly, its *organizing*) vitality—"the psychical body," or "essential vitality," of Prof. Bush—is composed of certain substances well known to chemistry, the principal of which are carbon, lime, potash, iron, sulphur, phosphorus, oxygen, hydrogen, etc. But can *lime* think? Can *potash* be conscious? Can any aggregation or combination of these inert substances be made to know any thing of identity? Of course not. Then the identification spoken of must be the act of the intelligent *soul*, and not the act of the material body. But what do we mean when we speak of the soul's identifying its former body? That it shall recognize certain long-scattered particles of carbon, lime, iron, etc., as being *the identical* lime and carbon which once composed its earthly house? Scarcely; for every atom of any one substance is so exact a counterpart of every other of the same substance, that, in the reconstruction of the future body, one particle would suit as well as another, and be as

much the subject of identification. It is not the mere matter, viewed in any form we will, that can constitute the body to be finally identified. The mind is not satisfied with any conception of "body," in this connection, that does not include the idea of *vital organism*. But are we to suppose that this essential endowment of the animal nature survives death and continues its existence through the lapse of ages, until evoked from the grave by the returning soul? Assuredly not—at least in the only aspect of the case acknowledged by science; for, if there is any thing in man which seems to come to an end, it is his animal vitality; and if there is any thing in him which is dissoluble, and actually dissolved in the grave, it is his animal organization. The whole structure, so far as the solid and gaseous substances, above mentioned, are concerned, becomes resolved into its chemical elements, and these elements having served one of their many purposes in constituting his material body, are called to serve other purposes, and probably to constitute other bodies, ere the day of the general resurrection. Then, *what* shall be the subject of the soul's identification? So far as we are able to see, it cannot be inert elementary matter. It cannot be the extinct animal organization. The question still is, What?

In thus pursuing the subject, under the guidance of human knowledge, we find ourselves getting into deep waters; but still able to touch bottom, and feeling that we have not forsaken "the Rock," let us for security return to where that Rock is more plainly manifest. *What say the Sacred Scriptures on the subject of the resurrection-body?*

The language of the Old Testament has been in part considered. The passage in Job, we are informed by those to whose judgment we bow, is inadmissible as a proof-text, and in referring to the others (Ps. 71 : 20; Ezek. 37; Is. 26 : 19, and Dan. 12 : 2) we ascertain that whatever they may tell us of a resurrection to be expected, they shed no light upon the particular point in question.

What may we glean from the language of Him, who, on all points of truth and duty, spake as never man spake? Selecting only such passages as may give us light, we come first to John 5 : 21-29 : "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, so the Son quickeneth whom he will. * * * The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. * * * All that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." In this doctrine of a universal resurrection, we are taught that in the resurrection-body we are to expect something which had been deposited in the grave—which had been regarded as dead—yet which had been so preserved in existence* that it was capable finally of being vitalized and of changing place. Again, John 11 : 11-26 : "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep. * * * Lazarus is dead. * * * Thy brother shall rise again. * * * I am the resurrection (i. e. of those already dead) and the life (i. e. of those who are yet to die); he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live (i. e. in the body), and he that believeth in me shall never die."† In these words of our Saviour we have an instance of that sweet thought (recorded first in Dan. 12 : 2), so often repeated by the early Christians, and even yet embalmed in our word *cemetery*, or sleeping place, that, "In the language of heaven, death is the sleep of the pious," (Bengel,) and we may gather from it the hint, elsewhere more fully expanded, that, as in sleep the vitality is not extinct, but only dormant, and capable of being reawakened, so in death, the resurrection-body, whatever it may be, is not wholly de-

* "The restoration of life to the body is one day to take place, in virtue of the *immanent* principle of the new life which proceeds from Christ." Tholuck in loco.

† Compare this passage with Rom. 8 : 11,—"If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken *your mortal bodies* by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."

prived of its existence as a body, but is only in a state of transitional repose between one period of activity and another. Again, Mat. 22 : 23-33, Mark 12 : 18-27, and Luke 20 : 27-38, on that occasion, when the Sadducees, who disputed the doctrine of the body's resurrection, came to the Saviour proposing that conjectural case of a woman with seven husbands, which the Pharisees, with their gross ideas on the subject, found so difficult to answer, he replied, "The children of this world (i. e. persons in the present life) marry and are given in marriage, but the children of the resurrection (or persons in the future state, after the reunion of soul and body,) neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are *as the angels* (*ὡς ἄγγελοι*, Mat. and Mark) of God in heaven; neither can they die any more, for they are *equal unto the angels* (*ἰσαγγελοι*, Luke 20 : 37). Now, that the dead are (i. e. to be) raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead but of the living: for *all live unto Him*." The following remark, made by the prince of commentators, quoted above, is worthy of notice here, although out of its appropriate place (Bengel's Gnomon, John 11 : 15): "It is beautifully in accordance with the divine decorum, that we never read of any one continuing dead in the presence of the *Lord of life*." Our Saviour teaches us that God is not the God of the dead but of the living, and that in a certain and important sense the Abraham, and the Isaac, and the Jacob, that are to be after the resurrection, even now live with Him. They are not dead. He also teaches that "the children of the resurrection" shall be "*like the angels*," in this respect, that the relation of sex shall no longer exist; and that they shall be "*equal to the angels*," in this other respect, that they shall not be subject to bodily death, which is equivalent to saying that they shall undergo radical changes in their bodily structure, appetites and liabilities.

Putting together, now, in one connected view the facts concerning the resurrection-body, given to us by our Great Master, we learn :

1. That, at that time, and in that event, known as the general resurrection, there shall emerge from "the grave" a something deposited there, and called "dead ;"

2. That, however, it is not dead, since it "lives unto God ;" but it is in that state which may properly be called "sleep," and from which it can be awakened ; and

3. That the future body shall be radically different from the present body in its structure, appetites and powers, being in these made "like the angels," or "equal to the angels."

And now, with these hints as to the character of the resurrection-body, gained from the lips of The Great Teacher, let us compare the teachings of those who, though infinitely inferior to Him in personal authority, were commissioned to speak in His name, and to unfold more fully His doctrines, under the guidance of the Divine Paraclete.

1. The central thought, imbedded in the language of our Lord to Martha, "I am the resurrection and the life," etc., (that the body laid in the grave is not wholly dead, but that there is an occult vitality kept up some where,) seems to be alluded to in other passages besides that already quoted from Rom. 8 : 11. It is glanced at by the Apostle in Col. 3 : 4, where he says, "When Christ, *who is our life* (both of soul and body), shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory ;" and also in 1 Thes. 5 : 16, "Christ died for us, that whether we wake or sleep (i. e. whether we are bodily alive or dead), we should live together with Him." The allusion, in these passages, to an extra-natural energy pervading the dead body is, however, so obscure that we only notice it and pass on.

2. The prophetic fact implied in the language of our Saviour to the Sadducees, that very great changes shall take place in the future body, is repeated by the Apostles,

Paul and John, with an important addition which was not possible in our Saviour's day. Christ "shall change our vile body," says Paul (Phil. 3 : 21), "that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." "Beloved," says the Apostle John (1 John 3 : 2), "it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." The glorious body of Christ is the type on which our glorified bodies shall be constructed. As he is, so, only in an inferior degree, shall we be. Some persons, in commenting upon this passage, seem to think that they are warranted from it to depict the future body as being one like that which was assumed by Christ in the Mount of Transfiguration, or like that which was seen by John in the Apocalyptic vision. But it is a significant fact, and worthy of being remembered by those who entertain this opinion, that *the same John*, who witnessed the transfiguration, and to whom the glorious vision in the Isle of Patmos was given, says, "Beloved, WE [i. e. you and I] KNOW NOT *what we shall be.*" It is not reasonable, therefore, to hold that the glorious body of Christ, seen in either of these cases, is to be the type of ours. What is to be its shape or appearance, John says, "We know not."

3. The richest mine, however, in which we may dig for thoughts upon this subject is in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians. In that is embodied all that is elsewhere implied, and with an eloquent fullness, that leaves upon every mind the sense of satisfaction. But even in this rich mine we must gather humbly and cautiously, for two reasons: First, because it is probably not within the power of human language to describe the things that belong to the unseen world; and secondly, because at the very outset of his remarks upon this subject, "the chiefest of the Apostles," in reply to a supposed trifler, who asks the question, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?"

says, "Thou fool." But, inquiring cautiously, we find some hints of a most valuable character.

(1.) Verse 36: "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." The figure here used, and kept up through most of what is said, is, that *the body is a seed. It possesses an innate vitality.* Its dissolution and alteration of parts, so far from being a real death, is only the prelude and prognostication of a glorious development. This, it will be perceived, is only the repetition, under another form, of the idea expressed by our Lord to Martha, "He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

(2.) Verse 37: "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." The body that shall emerge from the grave shall not be the same, except in part—in very small part—with that deposited there. The body placed in the grave is the germ; the resurrection-body is the development of that germ by the addition of elements not found in the seed itself.

(3.) Verse 38: "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." Each human body placed in the ground, like each seed, will be developed according to its distinguishing idiosyncracies. The two bodies (that buried and that raised) shall be the same, just as the seed put in the ground is the same with the stem, leaf, flower and fruit of the mature plant; but they shall differ in substance, configuration, adaptedness, and mode of existence.*

(4.) Verses 39, 40: "All flesh is not the same flesh. * *

* It is possible to find in this language the obscure hint of a future recognition. The idea has been expressed by a learned writer, that every angelic and other heavenly being is a *species* complete in itself, inasmuch as each is a distinct creative product, without parentage or posterity. If, therefore, in the isangelic condition of the resurrection-body we are to regard each individual as a species, complete in itself, it is not impossible to conceive that the specific development of the future body may be so far influenced by the known idiosyncracies of the earthly seed, that each person who knew another in this life should be able to recognize his development in the other.

There are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial." Not only may the same substance differ in texture, as do the different kinds of flesh, but also in impressiveness of appearance, as do the sun, moon, stars, and earth—which are all material, but as different in aspect as a stone on earth is from a star in the sky.

(5.) Verse 42: "So, also, is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." "Corruption," perishableness, dissolubility, is as true of what is mortal as of what is dead. "Incorruption," the antithesis of this, if construed as the attribute of a material structure, such as seems to be all along implied, is strictly predicable, so far as we can see, of that only which is uncompounded. This idea was no doubt familiar to the mind of Paul, being continually taught in the philosophy of that day. The teaching of the text, therefore, may be that the future body shall be marked with elementary simplicity, possibly constructed of some uncompounded, and therefore indissoluble, substance. It certainly teaches that the body to be shall be imperishable.

(6.) Verse 43: "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power."

"Sown in dishonor"—stripped of its majesty as the head of the animal creation; deprived of its glory as a wonderful machine, and rendered offensive to the eye; banished, like a felon, from society, fettered with grave clothes, and condemned to a cell. "It is raised in glory"—released from its prison; redeemed from its fetters; endowed with more beauty and majesty than was possible for it on earth; and become resplendent with the imparted glory of Christ. (Phil. 3 : 21.)

"Sown in weakness." It never was capable of fulfilling the higher behests of the spirit, and now it can fulfil none. "The weakness which belonged to it in life, is perfected in death." (Hodge.) "It is raised in power,"—"instinct

with energy,"—endowed, possibly, with "new senses," * or "with faculties of which we have now no conception," †—a thing of power, not liable to accidents of injury or dissolution, and capable of fulfilling to the utmost every demand made upon it by the immortal spirit.

(7.) Verse 44: "It is sown a natural (i. e. an *animal*) body," consisting of flesh, blood and bones,—a body that *must breathe*, and that without breath must die,—a body moulded by the organic life to suit the necessities of *food, repose, and reproduction*. "It is raised a spiritual body"—one that need not breathe, since it is breath of itself, ‡—a body that never hungers, nor thirsts; that is never weary, nor reproduces its kind; a body that is moulded by the organizing energy within it out of such materials, and wrought by it into such shape, as shall suit the spirit.

(8.) Verse 50: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." The words "flesh and blood" constitute a paraphasis of definite significancy; and in this passage they are evidently used to mean "the body as now constituted," (Hodge,) or "man, as far as the circulation of the blood quickens his flesh." (Bengel.) The earthly bodies of all, and even of those who are alive at the general resurrection, shall be changed, so that they shall be no longer "flesh and blood," but something *not unfit* for entering the glorious kingdom of God.

This concludes our enquiry into the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures on the subject of the resurrection-body. Let us now, as at a former point, gather into a synoptical view the substance of what we have gained. We learn,

1. That, at the general resurrection, there shall emerge

* Grotius.

† Hodge.

‡ Alluding to the meaning of the original word (*πνευματικον*), translated "spiritual."

from the grave something that had been placed there and regarded as dead.

2. That this dead thing, however, shall retain throughout its repose a vitality, extra-natural and occult, continued in it by Him who is "the resurrection and the life;" in consequence of which its seeming death is called "sleep."

3. That this *dead life* of the body, in its intermediate state, is analagous to that of germinating seed, which dies to live, and which lives in its death.

4. As to the *elements* of the future body; that it shall not consist of "flesh and blood," as our bodies do now; and yet that it shall sustain to its former body the relation which the developed plant sustains to the germ.

5. As to its *form* and *appearance*; that every human body shall be developed according to rules, not made known to us, ("God giveth a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body,") yet rules that exist, and in view of which we may conceive a mutual recognition as possible; but that the future body may be no more like the present than a star is like a stone, or than the grain of the harvest field, or the beauty of an opening flower, is like the seed from which it sprang.

6. As to its *qualities* and *capabilities*, that it shall be Negatively,

(1.) No longer corruptible, or liable to decay and dissolution;

(2.) Nor dishonored by wearing the badges of sin;

(3.) Nor inadequate to the desires of the spirit;

(4.) Nor dependent, by reason of its organization, on breath, food, and rest.

Positively, that it shall be,

(1.) Forever indissoluble; by which we may understand, constructed out of some pure, uncompounded substance;

(2.) Endowed with a majesty and beauty unknown on earth;

(3.) Instinct with power,—gifted, perhaps, with new

senses, and capable of fulfilling the utmost demands of the spirit; and

(4.) Moulded by the life-giving energy within to suit the then existing life, as the bodily organisms are now moulded to suit the animal necessities.

Furnished, now, with light, which in a case of this kind must be regarded as incomparably more reliable than any light of mere philosophy, let us revert to the question so abruptly terminated a few pages back, at the words, "What shall be the subject of the soul's identification? So far as we are able to see, it cannot be inert elementary matter; nor extinct animal organization. Then, What?"

Let us enquire *how far we can see*. What is matter? What is animal organization? To what extent is science able to pronounce upon them with such certainty as to demand a modification of the views usually held by intelligent Christians respecting the resurrection-body?

Look where we may through nature, we are impressed with the evidence of two physical coexistences—an object acted upon, and an agent that acts upon it. That object we call matter, and the agent, physical force. These two are ever found in union. We cannot separate them, even in our thoughts, for, when describing one, we are compelled to bring in the idea of the other. Force we define as "the cause of motion," that is, in matter; and matter, we define, (when reduced to its utmost possible simplicity, and its ultimate essential indication) by its "inertia," which means its relation to force. Yet that they are distinct,—perfectly, and even antipodally,—we gather from the very terms of the definition; matter is not and cannot be potential,—for this is the prerogative of force; and force is not and cannot be inert—this is the attribute of matter. Or, if they are to be regarded as being one and the same, it can be only by conceiving them, if such a conception is possible, as *opposite polarities* of the same physical existence. This is a point where our philosophy is perfectly, and, perhaps,

must be for ever, at fault. We cannot penetrate beneath the surface. We know nothing of matter, except by its relations to physical force; and nothing of force, except by its connection with matter. Familiar as they are to our experience, and patent as they may seem to be to our senses, the invariable confession of the profoundest students of physical being is, that, as to their nature, we are in ignorance, almost perfect, concerning both.

Above these, and connected with both, though separated by a nature more sharply defined than either, is a *third something*, in the shape of a high controlling energy, which, because it is not obvious to the senses, is by some regarded as shadowy and unreal. In every instance, however, even the lowest, and where the line of demarcation between it and the inferior kingdoms is faintest, it is marked by these two distinguishing peculiarities, sentiency, or the faculty, in some form, of perception; and a self-determining control, to greater or less extent, over physical force, and through that over matter. This third existence, (if we are warranted in calling it a third, when we know not but matter and force may be only antagonistical phases of each other,) we term spirit; and, in the examples more familiar to us, and at the same time more perfect, than that just described, it is marked by thought, feeling, and voluntary action. How far from being *shadowy*, may be conceived from these high prerogatives. Indeed, the time may arrive when spirit shall be regarded as the only thing substantial, and matter to be the shadow.

Now, by *animal organization* we usually mean that material structure, or that combination of material parts, by which a being endowed with sentiency (if no more) may come into active communication with the world of matter and of physical force. But, looking a little further, we see that "the organization" of a sentient and active being consists usually of a vast assemblage of organs—the eye, ear, heart, etc. Nay more, that the organs are themselves *organ-*

ized, or composed of cells and fibres, each one of which is a distinct organization. And, yet further, that every cell and fibre is constructed out of blood, every atom of which is in itself an organized substance. In view of these facts, how shall we define animal organization? What are we to understand by it? We are lost and overwhelmed, just as we were when peering into the mysteries of matter and force.

There is, however, one little clew still left us. We follow the leading of the fact that the term "animal organization" is as properly applicable to the ultimate atom of arterial blood, charged with its cell-making property, as it is to the whole structure of the animal, and it brings us to what is still more germane to our purpose, that it is as applicable to the *egg*, from which the future animal is developed, as to the future animal itself; and to the central, microscopic *cell* of the *egg*, as to the developing embryo; and as applicable to the embryotic *dot** (discovered by Prof. Agassiz) in the centre of that cell, as to the being developed from the dot.

And now, keeping the eye fixed on this significant "dot"—this incipient point of being—where the future bird, beast, or man lies condensed within bounds almost too narrow for the reach of the microscope, let us remember two or three facts: 1st. That the development, which is to be, takes place "under the influence of *the principle of life*, in connection with which alone any such phenomena are ever manifested;" 2d. That of the nature of this principle, and of the connection between it and the organized structure through which it acts, we are profoundly ignorant; "we know nothing of life, except by the phenomena it manifests in organized structures;" but, 3d. That these

* The writer of this article hopes he does no injustice to the teaching of the great embryologist. He quotes from the recollection of a lecture too eloquent to be easily forgotten.

phenomena "are so essentially different from the manifestations of any recognized physical force, that we are compelled to attribute them to a *special* SUPER-PHYSICAL principle." *

We learn, hence—what is, perhaps, denied by few—that there are forces in nature besides those usually recognized as the physical; and that the *vital* force, in being "super-physical," must be either spiritual or intermediate. But, since it cannot be spiritual, as is manifest from the fact that the vital energy is as much the property of the *tree* as of the animal, we are shut up to the conclusion that there are at least two kinds of force intervening between the thinking, feeling, self-acting spirit, and the dull, inert matter on which the spirit is known to act.

Nor is this all. When we come to scrutinize the framework of our familiar-looking world, we find—what it may be important for us to know in connection with our subject—that it consists, just as the animal body does, of a congeries of power within power, and principle within principle, "*whose foundation is in the dust,*" or, in plain language, which use matter as their basis and the theatre of their action. Matter, considered in its essentials, is so near to nothing, that we can only say of it that it is. Prof. Faraday, who studied it in the atom, (the only true place for learning its essential character)—the solitary atom—supposing one only to exist—and being, of course, without attraction, repulsion, or sensible motion, speaks of "inertia as, perhaps, its only true indication." † It is the super-induced operation of the various forces—gravitation, cohesive, chemical, vital, and others,—that give it its weight, solidity, variety, beauty, and that are to be seen encased one within another, in harmonious glory, like jewel casketed in jewel.

* Prof. Gray, of Harvard University.

† See his Address before the Royal Institution, 1857.

But it is time that this subject, increasing in interest and intricacy as it advances, were brought to its close. Let us, with such light as we have been able to gather from science and speculation, as well as from Scripture, revert once more to our question—"What shall be the subject of the soul's identification?"

We are still inclined to say, "it cannot be inert, elementary matter," but we dare not reject the idea of matter altogether, because we know not what it is, either as to its capabilities or its incapacities. For, so far as we know to the contrary, matter may be susceptible of other laws and other qualities than those revealed to the senses. It is not impossible for it, (and in this conjecture we may find our warrant in the language of our Master to the Sadducees on this very subject—"Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, *nor the power of God*"—Mat. 22 : 27)—it is not impossible for matter to be divested of its gravitation, chemical and other qualities, not essential to its existence, and to be endowed with others better suited to that condition needed by the returning spirit. In this state of ignorance, it is certainly the part of wisdom to leave the subject just where revelation places it.

As to the second point—"the animal organization"—we are compelled, of course, to surrender the idea of animality, but not necessarily that of organization. The very science (physiology) which starts the difficulty in one view of the case, brings, in another aspect, the answer. Organic life is a mystery. Just as, in the case of mineral crystallization, we know not where the formative power resides, whether in some *atom* which rules the rest, or whether in some *law of the mass*, compelling the aggregated atoms to unite in definite shape around a central point; and, also, as in the case, somewhat more complex, of the germinating seed, we know not where lies the vital principle, whether in the carbon, the potash, or the three essential gases, or whether in the organic combination; still, we

do know that the formative principle of the one, and the vital principle of the other, are *some where*; so we may conceive of the principle which is to evolve the future resurrection-body. It may reside in Prof. Agassiz's embryotic *dot*, which, having proved the germ of the animal body in one case, may continue indestructible, and prove the germ of the spiritual body (under a new constitution of matter) in another; and, in the stimulating energies of a higher life, it may rapidly gather round itself, in the great day of resurrection, all that is needful for its expansion, and in the light of Christ's presence, like plants in the sunshine, it may live in brightening beauty for evermore.

There is a third point necessary to the completeness of our subject—the future body as it shall stand related to our consciousness of identity. The universal heart of mankind demands that if there is to be a future body at all, it shall be such that those who knew one another on earth shall recognize one another in heaven. But, if neighbor shall know neighbor, shall not a man recognize himself?

Where there is no other proof, and especially no proof to the contrary, "the will of the people is" usually regarded as "the voice of God." On the subject of a future recognition the Sacred Scriptures say little—that little being all in favor of the common demand. The rich man and Lazarus are represented in the parable as knowing one another from a distance; and Peter, James and John, on the Mount of Transfiguration, seem, by *a sort of intuition*, to recognize Moses and Elias, whom they certainly never saw before.

Still, it is fairly questionable whether the future recognition of self and of each other, so plainly indicated, both by revelation and by natural desire, shall take place in consequence of any likeness such as we now conceive. Even the mother, who lays her babe beneath the clods of the valley, does not expect to meet her darling hereafter as a babe, but in the full maturity of its being; and the man in middle life, who deposits in the grave the body of a

revered parent, does not expect to see hereafter a figure bowed with the decrepitude of age, but one rejoicing in immortal vigor. Thus does popular opinion correct popular opinion, and teach us that the body to be is probably very unlike the body that is.

And this probability is still more confirmed when we combine the teachings of Scripture with the established facts of science. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—"it is sown an *animal* body, it is raised a spiritual body,"—"the children of the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as, like, equal to, the angels of God,"—"thou sowest grain, but (in its germination and maturity) God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." Now, admitting the natural, and almost necessary, interpretation of these passages, we are taught by daily experience that "every seed hath its own body," adapted to the natural functions necessary for it to perform; and that every animal has its own organization, adapted to its mode of life. So universal is this law of adaptation, that if you give a botanist a flower, he will tell you the kind of fruit its structure is fitted to develope; and if you give a zoölogist a bone from the fore-arm, or even the tooth, of any animal, living or extinct, he will tell you its mode of life. The organization of every known being is suited to its peculiar sphere of existence. Now, under the safe, (and, so far as human science has yet gone, the unerring,) guidance of this law, what figure shall we assign to a being whose corporeal structure is without "blood," and which, therefore, needs no heart to propel that blood, arterial ducts to convey it, or veins to carry it back?—a being whose life is independent of breath, and which, therefore, may be supposed to be without lungs, nostrils, and bronchial tubes?—a being which requires neither food, drink, nor repose, and in whom the wonderful apparatus suited to the functions of nutrition and recuperation are useless? Such an organization is

beyond the reach of our present conception. Vastly sooner might an intelligent caterpillar conceive the unseen glories it shall wear when, bursting its silken coffin and its shroud, it is to appear, no longer a crawling worm, feeding on gross herbage, but a thing of light and beauty, a fluttering gem, that adds brilliancy to the flowers which supply it with its dew.

Faith, hope, natural desire, unite to persuade us that there will be a ready, though it may be, at present, an unimaginable, mode of recognition hereafter. Still, the teachings of science, and the infinitely more reliable hints of revelation, warn us not to conceive grossly of that future state; and especially not to expect there the cumbrous, *earth-bound machines*, which now condemn us to crawl through the dust, and to feed upon its productions; but to picture to ourselves a body-suited to that "inheritance of the saints in light," which is described as "incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away."



ARTICLE III.

Letters of ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT to VARNHAGEN VON ENSE, from 1827 to 1858. With Extracts from VARNHAGEN'S Diaries, and Letters of VARNHAGEN and others to HUMBOLDT. Translated from the second German Edition. By FRIEDRICH KAPP. New York: Rudd & Carleton, 130 Grand Street. 1860; 1 vol. 8vo., pp. 407.

Few books have ever been more eagerly received by the reading public than this. Few, we will venture to add, have been read—if any one has read it besides ourselves—with a more grievous sense of disappointment. The world-wide fame of Humboldt, his vast attainments in natural science,