

THE
ADVENT SHIELD,
AND
REVIEW.

APRIL, 1845.
VOLUME I.—NUMBER 3.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
ART. XV.—The Doctrine of the Resurrection Vindicated—A Review of "Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body rationally and Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University."	239	ART. XVI.—The Conflagration of the Heavens and Earth—A Review of "The Millennium and New Jerusalem, by George Bush."	423

EDITED BY
J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS, & A. HALB.

Boston:
PUBLISHED BY J. V. HIMES,
No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.

345
d 97

H. F. Schwartz.

THE
ADVENT SHIELD
AND
REVIEW.

EDITED BY
J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS. & A. HALE.

VOL. I.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,
No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.
1844—5.

ADVENT SOURCE COLLECTION
General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists
WASHINGTON, D. C.

1945
AJ97

~~~~~  
DOW AND JACKSON....PRINTERS.

RECEIVED  
JAN 10 1945  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

ROSTON  
PUBLISHED BY JONAS Y. BROWN  
No. 11, Lawrence Street  
1914  
JAMES BROWN  
and  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

# CONTENTS.

|                                                                                                                                                                                              | PAGE. |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| ART. I.—THE MILLERITE'S CONFESSION AND ADVENTIST'S APOLOGY,                                                                                                                                  | 5     |
| Apology,                                                                                                                                                                                     | 9     |
| What is Written,                                                                                                                                                                             | 17    |
| Great Swelling Words of Vanity,                                                                                                                                                              | 25    |
| The Devil has his Counterfeit Millennium,                                                                                                                                                    | 33    |
| “ II.—THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ADVENTISM,                                                                                                                                                    | 46    |
| Of Adventism,                                                                                                                                                                                | 49    |
| Publication of Mr. Miller's Lectures,                                                                                                                                                        | 53    |
| Mr. Miller in Massachusetts—Publications, etc.,                                                                                                                                              | 57    |
| United Effort,                                                                                                                                                                               | 60    |
| Mr. Dowling's Book,                                                                                                                                                                          | 60    |
| Adventism established in New York city,                                                                                                                                                      | 67    |
| Camp-meeting Era,                                                                                                                                                                            | 68    |
| The Great Tent,                                                                                                                                                                              | 69    |
| The “Midnight Cry” Commenced,                                                                                                                                                                | 70    |
| The Crisis—Its Effect,                                                                                                                                                                       | 73    |
| Mr. Miller's Visit to Washington,                                                                                                                                                            | 79    |
| The Termination of the Prophetic Periods,                                                                                                                                                    | 79    |
| Fundamental Principles on which the Second Advent Cause is based,                                                                                                                            | 80    |
| Modes of Opposition,                                                                                                                                                                         | 83    |
| Advent Books,                                                                                                                                                                                | 87    |
| What Adventism has accomplished,                                                                                                                                                             | 89    |
| The Cause in Great Britain,                                                                                                                                                                  | 91    |
| “ III.—PROPHETIC CHRONOLOGY,                                                                                                                                                                 | 93    |
| The Two Thousand Three Hundred Days,                                                                                                                                                         | 100   |
| When did the Commandment go forth,                                                                                                                                                           | 103   |
| What Months of the Jewish Calendar fall within the seventh (or<br>any other year) of Artaxerxes,                                                                                             | 107   |
| “ IV.—THE DOWNFALL OF GREAT BABYLON,                                                                                                                                                         | 112   |
| What is Babylon,                                                                                                                                                                             | 112   |
| What is the Fall of Babylon,                                                                                                                                                                 | 116   |
| “ V.—OUR POSITION AS TO TIME—THE PROPHETIC PERIODS,                                                                                                                                          | 121   |
| “ VI.—THE REFORMATION OF LUTHER—ITS SIMILARITY TO THE<br>PRESENT TIMES,                                                                                                                      | 145   |
| “ VII.—SATAN'S LAST PAROCHIAL CALLS,                                                                                                                                                         | 163   |
| “ VIII.—VERSION OF DANIEL II., VII., VIII., IX.,                                                                                                                                             | 167   |
| “ IX.—PROPHETIC USE OF A DAY FOR A YEAR—THE NEW<br>THEORY OF INTERPRETATION,                                                                                                                 | 181   |
| “ X.—EXCLUSIVENESS,                                                                                                                                                                          | 189   |
| “ XI.—THE BEREAVED TO THE DEPARTED,                                                                                                                                                          | 202   |
| “ XII.—REPLY TO PROFESSOR BUSH'S “VALLEY OF VISION: Or the<br>Dry Bones of Israel Revived. An attempted proof<br>(from Eze. xxxvii. 1—14) of the Restoration and<br>Conversion of the Jews,” | 204   |
| The whole House of Israel,                                                                                                                                                                   | 207   |
| The Land of Israel,                                                                                                                                                                          | 210   |
| The Vision,                                                                                                                                                                                  | 212   |
| Explanation,                                                                                                                                                                                 | 213   |



|                                                                        |  |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| ART. XIII.—THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION—                |  |     |
| demonstrated from the Prophetic Destiny, Modern                        |  |     |
| History, Present Attitude, Resources and Intentions                    |  |     |
| of Popery,—continued to Volume 2, - - -                                |  | 223 |
| Popery a Subject of Prophecy, - - - - -                                |  | 223 |
| Character of Popery, - - - - -                                         |  | 226 |
| Its Fanaticism, - - - - -                                              |  | 230 |
| Its Avarice, - - - - -                                                 |  | 232 |
| Papal Ignorance, - - - - -                                             |  | 233 |
| Her Philosophers, - - - - -                                            |  | 242 |
| Portrait of Popery, - - - - -                                          |  | 246 |
| Prophetic Destiny of Popery, - - - - -                                 |  | 248 |
| The Papacy is Anti-Christ, - - - - -                                   |  | 252 |
| “ XIV.—THE SEVENTH MONTH MOVEMENT—ITS HISTORY—ITS                      |  |     |
| Results—Defects in the Argument—Our Position, - - -                    |  | 267 |
| Its Fruits, - - - - -                                                  |  | 271 |
| The Time in our year of the true Seventh Month, - - -                  |  | 272 |
| The Defects of the Chronological Argument, - - -                       |  | 280 |
| The True Chronological Argument which is contained in the Types, - - - |  | 281 |
| The Termination of the Prophetic Periods, - - -                        |  | 282 |
| “ XV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION VINDICATED. A                   |  |     |
| Review of “ Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the                          |  |     |
| Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scrip-                        |  |     |
| turally considered, by George Bush, Professor of                       |  |     |
| Hebrew, New York City University,” - - -                               |  | 289 |
| “ The Knowledge of Revelation is Progressive,” - - -                   |  | 290 |
| “ The Argument from Reason,” - - - - -                                 |  | 293 |
| New combination of particles, composing the dead body, between         |  |     |
| Death and the Resurrection, - - - - -                                  |  | 301 |
| Relation between the body that dies and the body that is raised, - - - |  | 305 |
| “ Distinction of Personal and Bodily Identity,” - - -                  |  | 314 |
| “ The true Body of the Resurrection, as inferred by Reason,” - - -     |  | 316 |
| “ The Scriptural Argument,” - - - - -                                  |  | 322 |
| “ The Old Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection,” - - -               |  | 324 |
| “ Examination of Particular Passages,” - - - - -                       |  | 325 |
| The New Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection, - - -                  |  | 334 |
| “ The Resurrection of Christ,” - - - - -                               |  | 336 |
| “ Examination of particular passages ” in the New Testament, - - -     |  | 342 |
| “ The Resurrection viewed in connection with the Judgment,” - - -      |  | 369 |
| “ The first Resurrection and the Judgment of the Dead,” - - -          |  | 377 |
| “ The Times of the Restitution of all things,” - - -                   |  | 387 |
| “ Christ's Delivering up the Kingdom,” - - - - -                       |  | 393 |
| The Second Advent, - - - - -                                           |  | 414 |
| “ XVI.—THE CONFLAGRATION OF THE HEAVENS AND EARTH.                     |  |     |
| A Review of “ The Millennium and New Jerusa-                           |  |     |
| lem, by George Bush,” - - - - -                                        |  | 423 |
| The Prophecy of Ezekiel, xl—xlviii. - - - - -                          |  | 430 |
| The Regeneration of the Earth by Fire, - - - - -                       |  | 432 |

---

NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

|                                                              |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Dr. Chase's "Remarks on the Book of Daniel," - - -           | 126 |
| "Questions on the Book of Daniel," - - -                     | 286 |
| "The Advent Message to the Daughters of Zion, No. 2," - - -  | 287 |
| "Supplement to the Advent Herald," - - -                     | 287 |
| "Anastasis, or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, |     |
| Rationally and Scripturally considered,—by George Bush,"     | 287 |
| "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Great Image," by G. Bush,     | 288 |

# THE ADVENT SHIELD.

## ARTICLE XV.

*The Doctrine of the Resurrection Vindicated.—A Review of "Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University."*

BY S. BLISS.

THE doctrine of the resurrection has ever, since the resurrection of Christ, been regarded as a most vital question in connection with the Christian's Faith. The death and resurrection of Christ are the foundation of the Christian's Hope. As Christ burst the bonds of death and rose triumphant from the tomb, so we are encouraged to hope, that through his resurrection, "death will be swallowed up in victory." The subject and nature of the resurrection cannot, therefore, be uninteresting to any lover of inspired truth.

Upon the nature of the resurrection depends, in a great measure, as we conceive, the nature of all the events which are to transpire at the commencement of the millennial age. If the resurrection of the dead is only a spiritual elimination from the body at death, as Prof. Bush teaches, it will necessarily follow that Christ's second advent, the end of the world, the New Heavens and New Earth, and the reign of Christ on earth, must all be of a nature to correspond. But on the other hand, if there is a "resurrection of the body," it must necessarily follow that these corresponding events will be *literally* fulfilled. The whole question is therefore decided by a decision of the question respecting the *nature* of the resurrection. And as the work under review has struck deep at the foundation,—at this "Corner Stone" of our hope, we



have regarded it as a question of sufficient interest and importance, to bestow upon it a candid and prayerful examination.

That we are in "the very crisis of this world's history," Prof. Bush, in a previous work, has admitted; and also that "if we take the ground of right reason, we must believe that the present age is one expressly foretold in prophecy, and that *it is just opening upon the crowning consummation of all prophetic declarations.*" The nature of the events to transpire at this "crowning consummation," is the only question here at issue: and on the nature of the resurrection all these turn. Says Prof. Bush:—

"The resurrection of the body, if my reasonings and expositions are well-founded, is not a doctrine of revelation."—*Preface.*

We therefore propose to examine the soundness of his "reasonings," and the correctness of his "expositions." The first proposition of the author, as laid down in his "introduction," is that

"THE KNOWLEDGE OF REVELATION IS PROGRESSIVE."

In support of this, he argues, that as a knowledge of the "volume of *Nature*" is only acquired by slow and toilsome steps, and gradual developments are continually being made; so in "the volume of *Revelation*," there may be continually new discoveries, and new and unexpected views of truth, which may lead to the most momentous results. He gives, as the views entertained by the mass of Christians, that as our knowledge is continually being extended respecting the minute details of any country after we are familiar with its great outline, so they admit there is "the possibility of a greater amount of information as to the *particulars* of revealed truth—the clearing up of certain verbal difficulties and obscurities in the sacred text—and the happier illustration of certain passages from the manners and usages of Oriental life—while at the same time we no more look for any farther grand and momentous disclosures, than we do for the discovery of a third continent of equal dimensions with the eastern or western." p. 15. While he admits there is "a substantial truth involved in this view," he claims there are many things in the scriptures which will "receive a vastly fuller and clearer exposi-

tion, than has yet been afforded to the world ;" and that this progress will "modify, and in some cases, perhaps, supersede established ideas."

In proof of this, he adduces the intricacies and obscurities of some portions of scripture for which we sigh "for some Daniel, some dissolver of doubts and shower of hard sentences to unriddle," which are more particularly applicable to the "prophetical writings," but not confined to them, although he says, "all matters of *vital* importance are distinguished by a sun-like lucidness." He refers to "the drapery of a foreign and dead language," in which "the volume of revelation comes to us clothed," "the means of understanding" which "are constantly multiplying upon us ;" and also to "the signal advances which have been made in later times in the principles of biblical interpretation." These obscurities, he claims are "to be understood ;" and that while "there exists a deep-rooted impression" that we "have to do" only "with the *plainer* parts of revelation," and "the epithets of *fanciful, chimerical, visionary*," are associated "with any attempt, however sober, to pierce the veil of futurity," so that "hundreds of inquiring spirits have been frowned and frightened away from this field of inquiry by the force of prejudices wholly baseless and unreasonable," yet God is saying to us, "Come, and let us reason together."

We would not particularly dissent from the foregoing view of the question within certain limitations. We believe that light is being continually diffused over the sacred page, and that such light will shine with more and more distinctness unto the "perfect day." But we contend that such light will *always* be in accordance with the literal and grammatical reading of the inspired word, in the sense in which its language was used and understood in the times in which it was written:—always excepting such figurative and symbolical portions as the Bible itself explains. We can therefore not subscribe to a principle like the following. Says the Prof. :—

"If, for instance, the obvious, literal, and grammatical sense of the sacred record leads me to believe that the material globe, with the various orders of its inhabitants, was first spoken into existence six thousand years ago ; and geology at the same time brings to my mind absolute demonstrations, which I cannot possibly resist without doing violence to the fundamental laws of belief, that it has existed thousands and myriads of years before that time, what am I to think ? I am brought to a stand at once. I must pause and ponder on the discrepancy. I must cast about for some adequate mode of harmonizing these various views."—p. 26.



It is true that such discordant views need to be harmonized. But we could be at no "stand" *how* that should be done. If the "*obvious literal and grammatical* sense of the *sacred record*," should give 6000 years for this world's age, we must abide by it, whatever *inferences* from *geological facts* might be presented to the *contrary*. A "thus saith the Lord," is better to us than the most scientific results from mere *human reasoning*. But does the Prof. inquire what we would do with these "geological facts?" We reply that we would admit fully the *facts*, but we would question the soundness of any *inferences* from those facts, which should deny a positive revelation. We remember that while God is infinite and knoweth all things, and therefore cannot be mistaken respecting any physical or moral truth, that man, in his best estate, in his most *scientific* and *philosophic*, is ever liable to the grossest errors.

We are uninformed what mighty and stupendous agencies were at work, actuated by the word of God, during the six days of creation, to change this earth from a chaotic to its Eden state, and which could have so stamped its entire geological structure, that finite beings might reason therefrom, that the book of nature contradicts the book of revelation. Nor are we acquainted with the extent of the changes which were wrought on the surface, or in the internal structure of the earth during the deluge, when the fountains (foundations) of the great deep were broken up. Therefore, when we find a "geological fact" which we cannot harmonize with a duration of only 6000 years for this world's existence, however demonstrative such fact may *seem* to be, we must ascribe our inability, not to any want of definiteness in the grammatical, obvious and literal sense of God's word, but to our own want of knowledge respecting the *cause* of these geological facts; and which, from the nature of the case, man has no means of penetrating.

We remember that *some inferences* from geological facts have been afterwards entirely disproved. Thus when Brydone discovered seven different strata of lava with two feet of soil between, in digging at the foot of Mt. Etna, and therefore concluded that, as no soil had accumulated on a bed of lava which he supposed was thrown out by an eruption of Etna mentioned by Polybius nearly 1700 years previously, it proved that more than 6000 years would be necessary to form layers of earth between those seven strata. This was thought

by many to be a conclusive argument ; and not being able to reconcile it with revelation, such "were brought to a stand at once," and in "casting about them" for a mode to harmonize the "discrepancy," they rejected the revelation as being disproved by geology. But it was afterwards ascertained that there have been discovered *six* different strata of lava at Herculaneum and Pompeii, with two feet of soil between each, when the first eruption which overwhelmed those cities was only 1700 years ago ; and if two feet of soil could accumulate between *six* layers of lava in 1700 years, it might *possibly* between *seven* in 6000. Thus the *inference* drawn from the first "*fact*" was shown to be fallacious, as *all* such *inferences* might be, if we could ascertain the cause of,—the manner of producing—and the length of time requisite for existing geological formations to be produced.

"THE ARGUMENT FROM REASON."

Under this head, are presented his first arguments against the resurrection of the body. He claims that "we must *understand* a proposition in order to *believe* it,"—not "the *mode* in which the asserted fact exists, but the *verbal proposition* affirming it ;" and that we "must be able to affix an intelligible sense to the language employed for that purpose." He says:—

"The simple assertion that the dead body is to be raised, does not constitute an intelligible proposition, for the reason that it leaves it utterly uncertain *what body is meant*. A resurrection is indeed predicated of *a* body, but this is a very different thing from the resurrection of *the* body, and our inquiry cannot possibly be satisfied, without a more minute specification." —p. 36.

He then argues, as the "constituent particles" of the body are continually varying, that no man has the same body now, he had seven years ago ; and that the man, who dies at seventy, has had ten different bodies ; and, "which of these is to be the body of the resurrection ?"

This philosophical consideration cannot militate against an understanding of "the simple assertion that the dead body is to be raised : " for if "*the dead body*" is to be raised, it must be "*the body*" that is "dead." There is no more necessity for supposing the *previous* bodies a man may have inhabited, were included, than there is for supposing, when a man's tenth



child dies, and it is said the child is dead, that the nine elder children died with it! And it would be just as *philosophical* to inquire which of the man's ten bodies *died*, or which of the ten was enclosed in the coffin, as it would to inquire which of the ten would be resurrected.

Again he asks :—

“ Or is it the aggregate of all these ? ” and adds, “ If we go back to the days of the Antediluvians, and apportion the number of the bodies of Methusaleh, for instance, to the length of his life, and then suppose the whole to be collected into one vast corporeity, we should indeed be reminded that as ‘ there were giants in those days, ’ so there will be giants in the resurrection ! ”—p. 37.

This objection is only founded upon the *supposition*, that in the resurrection all those bodies, if collected, must be of the same *density* as in this life ; or that it would be inconsistent for there to be giants in the resurrection. But as it may be seen, that the question of which body will be raised, is only an imaginary difficulty, the other difficulties vanish with it.

Again he says :—

“ The resurrection body is to be a *spiritual*, and not a material body. The re-assembly of material particles can result only in the reconstruction of a material body, and a material body cannot be at the same time spiritual ; at least we may confidently affirm that the *same material* body cannot be at the same time *spiritual*, although we are aware that Paul's expression ‘ a spiritual body, ’ is understood by some to denote a body *adapted to spiritual uses*, instead of implying one that is metaphysically *spiritual* in contradistinction from *material*. But, taken in either sense, the assertion above quoted involves contradictory ideas. A material body is a body of flesh and blood ; but flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. ”  
p. 40.

Here is presented the supposed scriptural evidence of the *immateriality* of the resurrected body : it is to be a “ *spiritual* body, ” and “ flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. ” Now if this last quotation proves that those who “ inherit the kingdom of God ” will possess immaterial bodies, it must certainly prove that this “ kingdom ” cannot be set up while men inhabit bodies of flesh and blood ; and Prof. Bush acknowledges we are in the age of the world when this kingdom is to be consummated. It can, therefore, be inherited by none save those who have passed their last change. Will the Professor explain how a kingdom which flesh and blood cannot inherit, can be set up in a world inhabited only by flesh and blood ?

Now we do not believe that “ flesh and blood ” will inherit this kingdom : and this text is one proof that this kingdom will

not be set up till Christ shall "judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing and kingdom." The objection to the materiality of the resurrected body, consists in supposing that a "*spiritual* body" cannot be a *material* body; and also, that if that which is committed to the tomb is raised, it must necessarily be a body of "*flesh and blood.*"

1. That a *spiritual* body cannot be a *material* body. This objection is founded upon the supposition that a *spiritual* body must be an *ethereal* body, or, no body at all. That which is not material, can fill no space. A pure spirit, aside from all materiality, can have no body of any kind. A body must be composed of *matter*, however rarified, spiritualized, or *etherealized* it may be, and must occupy a certain space. If a spirit possess a *spiritual* body, it must possess something in addition to the spirit itself; but if the body is *spirit*, it is no addition to the spirit; so that the spirit is still destitute of a body. A *spiritual* body must therefore be something besides spirit, in which the spirit is "clothed upon;" and consequently must be a *material*, and not an *ethereal* body. There is no more necessity for supposing a *spiritual* body is nothing but spirit, than there is in supposing an intellectual man is nothing but intellect. Now, as the Prof. says he "must *understand* a proposition in order to *believe* it," we would ask him to explain to our "understanding" how a spirit can possess a "*spiritual* body," which is itself *spirit*?

But Paul informs us, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a *spiritual* body." What is raised a *spiritual* body? Why, evidently, that which is sown; i. e., that which is planted must be "raised." If nothing which is committed to the tomb is to form a part of the *spiritual* body, then there is no connection between what is "sown," and what is "raised," as our text assures us there is. And if that which is sown is raised, this "*spiritual* body" is also a *material* body, but "*adapted to spiritual uses.*" The text also shows, that the body is spoken of as "*spiritual*" only as the converse of "*natural*," and not of *material*—the same as *it* is sown in *dishonor* and raised in *glory*. Again we would inquire, if it is an "*intelligible* idea," that what is sown is raised, and yet that there is no possible relation between the two bodies?

Paul however informs us, that *it*, that which is sown, is "*raised*" a *spiritual* body. To *resurrect* a body, it must have fallen from an *erect* attitude; it is the rising again of what has fallen, to its original and previous position. If all



which is laid aside at death, is forever to remain disconnected with the spiritual body, there can be no *resurrection*; for there is no rising again of that which is laid down. The "spiritual body," as Prof. Bush understands it, has never fallen, has no connection with what was deposited in the tomb: such would be a mere change of existence,—not a resurrection, but a new creation; and we would inquire how the "idea" of *such* a resurrection can be made "intelligible?" But as there is to be a resurrection, that which is fallen must be raised. Consequently the spiritual body must be the resurrection of the material body which was "sown," raised in "glory" and "power," "incorruptible" and "immortal."

2. But again we are told, that if the body that is sown, is raised, it will be a body of "flesh and blood," which "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." And even Prof. Bush asks:—

"Why shall preference be given to these particular bodies, when, as is well known, they are often withered and wasted by consumptions, swollen by dropsies, mangled by wounds, made hideous by deformities, curtailed of limbs, or become partially putrid by gangrenes? If the material particles are to be re-assembled at all, why not rather suppose that it will be those which composed it in the period of its prime, in its utmost vigor and beauty?"—p. 40.

Now the answer to all this is very simple; and we cannot but fancy those questions were asked without noticing the scriptural assurance, that "we shall all be *changed*." "Ye do greatly err," said our Savior in answering objections to the resurrection state, "not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God." If there was not to be this *change*, the bodies of the risen saints would be just as "wasted," "withered," "swollen," "mangled," "wounded," "hideous," "deformed," "curtailed," or "putrid," as when deposited in the earth. But all this is the result of the curse; and when there is "no more curse," men will have recovered what was lost by the "fall." "So," Paul assures us, "is also the resurrection of the dead. *It* is sown in corruption, *it* is raised in incorruption. *It* is sown in dishonor; *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. There is a natural *body*, and there is a spiritual *body*." Such is Paul's testimony and explanation of this supposed objection. That it is a *mystery*, he admits, but he does not on that account reject it; and he adds that "at the last trump," "the dead," not a spiritual body which *never died*, but "the *dead* SHALL be raised, incorruptible, and we shall be changed: for this *corruptible*

must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal must put on immortality." Consequently when this change shall have taken place in accordance with "the scriptures" and "the power of God," that which was "putrid," "deformed," or "hideous," will have become "glorious," "incorruptible," and beautiful; and the body which was buried, "the flesh and blood," will be raised immortal and spiritual, but, nevertheless, to every intelligence, it will be "its own body."

Now it is a well established fact that all material creation is reducible to a few simple elements or different substances; and from these are constructed all the infinite variety of created matter, found in air, earth, or ocean. The atmosphere we breathe, with all its vapors and gases, the water we drink, and that which forms the mighty ocean, the earth itself with all its varieties of soils, rocks and minerals, all its varied productions, from the moss of Greenland, to the noble Banian tree of India, all the varieties of grass, herbs, shrubs and trees, with their varieties of fruits and flowers, their various and beautiful colors, the wondrous contrivances by which they are sustained and nourished, the infinite variety of animal life, from the smallest animalcule, to the leviathan of the deep, from the smallest moving thing that creepeth on the earth, to the mighty behemoth of the forest, from the smallest insect that floats on the breeze, to the noble eagle that soars in mid heaven, with all their constituent parts, their blood and bone and muscle, flesh and sinews, veins and arteries, their feathers, hair or scales, every organ of sense, and every property discoverable by feeling, sight or taste, with every medicinal or poisonous quality of matter; are all the results of the different combinations of these few simple elements. A slight variation or change in the proportions of their elements, or arrangement of the particles of which any substance is composed, often produces the most surprising results, forming new and different substances. In this way, that which is poisonous is often made wholesome and nutritious, and that which is harmless is by a like change rendered poisonous. Even the air we breathe, and on which we depend for the preservation of our animal existence, by a slight variation of the relative proportion of its constituent gases, becomes the most deadly enemy of life.

A perfect arrangement of all the material elements would present the perfection of beauty, health and utility in all created beings and things. Such was earth in its Eden state,



when God pronounced all things "very good," and the morning stars sang together for joy over a new made world. All this is now under the "curse," and all creation is *marred*: instead of beauty and perfection and health, we behold sickness and pain, disease, and death, and decay. But when another change shall have been effected, and the constituent elements of all creation are re-arranged and proportioned anew, then the wilderness will be again as Eden, and the desert as the garden of the Lord. Then, instead of corruption will be incorruption, and instead of mortality will be immortality: for all things will be made, or re-arranged anew. Then the "wasted," "withered," "swollen," "mangled," "wounded," "hideous," "deformed," "mutilated," or "putrid" corpses, which may have been cast aside by dying humanity, with such a change, would be no longer hideous or loathsome, but would be as lovely and angelic, as pure and inviting, as they were loathsome and repulsive.

But this change, Paul assures us, is a "mystery; and Professor Bush is bound by his own rule to reject it, because it is not "an intelligible idea." And he is also by the same rule obliged to reject every chemical or physiological change or result, because, although the result is evident, yet the why and wherefore such result is produced, can be only a "mystery." He must even deny the growth of vegetables, because we cannot understand *how* their growth is effected, and Professor Bush says, "we must *understand* a proposition before we can believe it." But is it replied that this is not analogous? that we have seen these results produced and therefore can believe them? We answer, that the philosophy of these results is none the less incomprehensible; and that is the objection urged against the resurrection of the body. The great question which Paul predicted "some man will say," is "How are the *dead* raised up," not a spiritual body which emerged from the dead body at death and which was never dead, but "How are the *dead* raised up? and with what *body* do they come?" And he assures us that that which is "quickened" must previously "die." But when it is quickened, then the result will be as evident, as if the change was not a "mystery." "Flesh and blood" are the result of a certain combination, and the arrangement of a few of these elements. Re-arrange or change the arrangement of these particles, and while the body is the same, it is no longer "flesh and blood." The "flesh" is the result of one combination,

and the "blood," of another ; add to the flesh, and mingle with its elements some of the properties of the "blood," and it would be no longer flesh, but a new substance ; or mingle with the "blood" some of the properties of the "flesh," and it would be no longer blood. And thus the whole man, when quickened, will not be "flesh and blood," but a glorified body.

Dr. Nelson thus illustrates this.

"God can make very durable and very glorious things, out of materials the very opposite of firmness, or of brilliancy. He has done this. Of all the substances with which we are acquainted, we esteem the *diamond* the hardest, and the most glittering. Charcoal is as black and as crumbling as any other body known to us ; yet these two bodies are the *same!* The learned know, the plough-boy does not, that the difference between charcoal and diamond is, that the Creator has ordered a *different arrangement of particles!* The same materials are differently placed, that is all. If any are wishing for a body more beautiful than they now have, they may be assured that God can, if he chooses, take a part of our present fragile, corruptible forms of clay, and make of it something exceedingly glorious. 'It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory.'"—(*Cause and Cure of Infidelity*, p.71.)

The *change* in the arrangement of the particles in the *charcoal* to produce a *diamond*, is no less wonderful, or mysterious, or "unintelligible," than will be the change in our material bodies ; and if Professor Bush is constrained to reject the one as an "unintelligible proposition," to be consistent with himself and his own rule, he must reject the other.

We thus learn that the body of "flesh and blood," which is laid aside at death, when it shall be quickened in the resurrection, will not then be necessarily a body of flesh and blood. We have also seen that a spiritual body is not necessarily an immaterial body. But to ascertain the true nature of the future spiritual bodies of the saints, we can only have recourse to the Scriptures, to the positive declarations of God's word. A question of this nature depends in a great measure upon the definition of terms. And as we have no dictionary of these, or any umpire to whom we can refer for their definition, we can only refer to the Scriptures themselves. It is however fortunate that the Bible is its own *glossary* : it contains within itself the definition of its own terms. And we find that the term *spiritual* is, in some instan-



ces, there applied by the Holy Spirit to *material* substances. Thus God, speaking by Hosea, vii. 7, says, that "the spiritual *man* is mad." That cannot surely refer to an *ethereal* man. Paul, Rom. vii. 14, uses spiritual in opposition to carnal; and in 1 Cor. ii. 13, he makes the same use of it. In several places he speaks of "spiritual things," &c., and he speaks of those who are spiritual.

We are, however, not entirely dependent upon the scriptural use of this term, for an understanding of what our spiritual bodies will be: God has in his Word revealed even this unto us. We are aware that Professor Bush has entered into an examination of the texts which are adduced in support of a material resurrection; but we will, nevertheless, in this connection refer to a few, which positively assert that the *bodies* which are dead will again be raised. In Ezek. xxxvii. 12, we read, "I will open your *graves*, and cause *you* to come up *out of your graves*." A spiritual body, as Professor Bush explains it, was never in the grave; but here the resurrection body is something to be taken out of the grave when it is opened. This cannot be figurative language, for it is God's explanation of a symbolic representation; and he never explains symbols, or figures, or parables, by language which needs another explanation to be understood. Again we read, Dan. xii. 2, "Them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." This must be a literal prediction, for the context is literal; but the material body is that alone which "sleeps in the dust of the earth." Consequently the material body will be raised." In Matt. xxvii. 52, we read, "And the graves were opened, and many *bodies of the saints which slept*, arose." Here it is positively asserted that the "*bodies of the saints which slept*," arose. This, according to any use of language, can express nothing but a *material* resurrection. Again, John v. 28, "*all that are in the graves shall come forth*," &c. This must imply something besides a body which was never dead. Paul, Acts xxiv. 15, had hope that there would be "a resurrection of the *dead*." The material body alone *dies*.

Again we read, Rom. viii. 11, "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your *mortal bodies*." Here the assertion is *positive* that our mortal bodies, those we now inhabit, are the ones which will be quickened. We also read Phil. iii. 21, that God will "change our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." And Isaiah,

xxvi. 19, assures us that the "dead men" of Zion, will arise with his "dead body," that those that "dwell in the dust," will "arise and sing," and that the "earth shall cast out the dead." All these and kindred passages assert the resurrection of the body, as positively as language can assert any doctrine; and we cannot conceive how the "idea" can be made "intelligible," that such language can be made applicable to a body which we receive at death, which never dies, and can never be raised from the dead. And that it cannot refer to such a body, is rendered evident, aside from all other considerations, from the fact that the wicked will not live till 1000 years after the resurrection of the righteous; whereas, if the resurrection of each body takes place at its death, as Professor Bush contends, no period of 1000 years could transpire, during which "the rest of the dead live not again."

NEW COMBINATIONS OF THE PARTICLES COMPOSING THE  
DEAD BODY BETWEEN DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.

This is the next great objection founded in "reason" against the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. "Waving all objection" respecting *spiritual* bodies, Professor Bush says:—

"The doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, *in any sense whatever*, encounters difficulties in our view absolutely insuperable, arising from the changes and new combinations which the particles of the dead body undergo in the interval between death and the resurrection. Who does not know that the luxuriant vigor and verdure of the wheat crops, waving over the field of Waterloo, are owing to a source of fertility which the Belgic husbandman never conveyed to the soil!

Rich harvests wave, where mighty Troy once stood,  
Birth of a soil made fat with Phrygian blood.

The putrescent relics of the goodly structure which once enshrined a human soul, are resolved into the dust of the earth. The dust springs up in the varied forms of vegetable life. The beasts of the field crop the grasses and the herbs, which derive their succulence from the constituent material of the bodies of buried men. Out of these eaters comes forth sweetness, and the flesh which was fed by the flesh of the fathers, goes to the sustenance of the flesh of the sons. To whom shall these particles belong in the day of their final recall from these varied compositions? Will it not require the whole vegetable and animal world to be decomposed, in order to extricate the assimilated portions and give to each his due? And how can the matter ever be adjusted? The particles that now belong to one body have previously belonged to some other; whose shall they be in the resurrection?—as the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands. And what shall we say of the case of those who have fallen victims to the barbarous rage and horrid hankerings of cannibals? Who



shall be the rightful claimants in the day of adjudication, when specific particles have been incorporated into two different bodies?"—p. 41.

This objection is pursued at greater length, but the foregoing is "the sum of the matter." We are very much surprised that the Professor should inquire "whose" these supposed particles shall "be in the resurrection," and compare the question to the one "the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands!" for to us it appears *just about as pertinent*. Both are the results of not knowing,—to say nothing of the Scriptures—the mighty power of God. This reasoning at first view is very plausible, and many, by this objection alone, have been made to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. It will, however, we trust, be seen that it is only a *supposition*—merely a supposed difficulty, and that nothing is *proved* by it.

That the particles of matter composing our corporeal structures do at death enter into new and varied combinations, no intelligent person will deny; and that particles of matter which have entered into the structure of the father's body, *may* subsequently perform the same office in that of the son, will also be admitted. But, can it be *proved* that the *same particles of matter* have ever borne a relation to *two* human beings, so as the *second time* to compose a part of a human body at *death*—for this is an objection to the supposition that the body inhabited at death will be raised—so as to be liable to be claimed in the resurrection by two different persons? No. It will not for one moment be asserted that such a case *can* be made out. All the force, then, there is in the argument is that such *might* be the fact! That it *might* be, we admit, unless God has decreed otherwise. But if he has so decreed, he has the wisdom, skill and power to prevent it. We should not therefore, permit any such *supposition*, founded on "the oppositions of science, falsely so called,"—for all science is *false*, which contradicts the *true* meaning of the Scriptures—to militate against the express declarations of God's word.

But, is it asked, can it be *demonstrated* that such results will *not* be obstacles in the way of the resurrection of the body? We answer, No. We *cannot demonstrate* this, only as we show that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of such a resurrection: nor is it necessary that we should *prove a negative*. Before it can be a valid objection, the affirmative must be *proved*.



But, is it again asked, how can such results be *avoided*, in the production of the countless millions of beings, who have appeared and passed away from the stage of life? We answer, it can only be avoided by HIM who constructs and nourishes all the workmanship of his hands, and who arranges, according to his own wisdom and pleasure, all the various particles which enter into the combination of animate or inanimate objects. If God has purposed to raise again the identical bodies which are laid aside when the man is "unclothed" at death, he has the power, while arranging his "handy-work," so to order the disposition of the various constituent particles in all the various combinations of matter, that, whatever changes these particles may pass through, or offices they may subsequently perform, they shall, at the death of any person, have respectively composed a part of only *one* dead body; and so every body at death, may be composed of particles which were never the component parts of any previous dead body.

Thus, if the succulent properties of man's "putrescent relics" add "luxuriant vigor" to grasses, herbs, or waving crops; or even if these are eaten by the beasts of the field, however varied and changeful their combinations may be, if they never again enter the human structure, this objection falls powerless to the ground. Or if they again become "the constituent material of the bodies" of men, if the body only is to be raised which is put off at death, and having there performed their office, shall pass away into new combinations before death overtakes the subsequent body of which they were constituents, the objection is equally powerless. And that such *may* be the case, no one will deny, who limits not the power of the Almighty.

That there is a *necessity* that the same particles should fulfill the same office in the bodies of two persons, no philosophical mind will claim. If 6000 years are the prescribed limits of this world's career, and the 800,000,000 of persons who are now estimated to pass out of existence once in thirty years, should have passed off the stage every thirty years from the fall to the close of time, there would be but 200 times 800,000,000, or 160,000,000,000 of beings in all who could ever have existed on the earth. If this immense number had all existed on the earth at any one time, and were scattered equally over the land on this earth's surface, there would have been more than *fifty* square rods of land for each person. But



100,000,000,000 of inhabitants—considering that all descended from two first parents, and that the inhabitants on the globe at the end of 1656 years from creation were reduced to eight persons—is a fair estimate of the number of all the generations of men; and if they were all equally diffused over this earth's surface irrespective of land or water, there would be 200 square rods, or of land alone, 80 square rods to each human being. Then would not these several districts of eighty square rods respectively furnish a sufficiency of material for a single human body? This no one will deny, who reflects for a moment that the greater part of this earth's surface, not covered by water, has been covered over with forests of majestic trees, not eighty rods apart, nor of man's pigmy size, but towering towards heaven, and in close proximity with each other. And therefore it is no more impossible with God to keep the material of the bodies of one hundred thousand million—the number of all who have lived on the earth, and which is only a little more than one hundred times the number now alive—separate and distinct, than it is to sustain 800,000,000 now on the earth, distinct each from the other. If, therefore, God has willed to raise the dead bodies of his saints, he is not, on the dissolution of each human body, so destitute of materials with which to perform a similar office, or so destitute of creative energy, that he may not lay these particular particles aside to be no longer used till the resurrection; or he may at his pleasure arrange them as constituents of other combinations, and still *preserve* them for their own appointed place in that “auspicious morn.” We therefore find that we cannot rely with confidence upon this objection, and are again driven “to the law and the testimony:” if they speak not according to this word, there is no light in them.

An objection that Professor Bush urges to this, is the difficulty of finding the first proprietor. He conceives that

“A portion of matter, which once entered into the body of Goliath of Gath, may have found its way into the flesh of Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, from which it might be traced till lodged in the person of some dancing dervish of an eastern city, whirling about in as many angry gyrations as ever did Bucephalus himself, when attempted to be mounted by any one but his royal rider.”—p. 42.

We have not followed our author through all the “gyrations” he conceives these same particles may pass, which he carries on indefinitely; but we have shown the nature of the



objection. We however "conceive" that the "difficulty of finding the first proprietor" of these particles, *can* be solved by Him who numbers not only the hairs of our head, but the atoms in the universe; and who might, if he saw fit, call each individual atom by its own appropriate name, watch over each in all their multiform combinations and "gyrations," and at last restore each to its destined office. It is in vain for man to attempt to limit infinity.

RELATION BETWEEN THE BODY THAT DIES AND THE BODY THAT IS RAISED.

"The objection," says Professor Bush, "which constitutes the burden of our present argument, obviously resolves itself into the difficulty of conceiving of any fixed *relation* between the body that dies, and the body that is raised."—p. 42.

"If a man retained precisely the same body unchanged from his natal to his dying day, the difficulty would not be so glaringly insurmountable; but even in that case, as the resurrection body is to be a spiritual body, it confounds our faculties to attempt to imagine of what use the former materials and fleshly particles are to be, in the formation of a purely spiritual body."—p. 43.

"Even admitting, as of course we must, that the power of God is competent to form bodies of the same external configuration, but of more glorious texture, and to unite disembodied souls with them, still the question forces itself upon us—What *relation* exists between the original, putrified, decomposed, and dissipated body, and the sublimated, glorious, incorruptible fabric, which is to succeed;—what the relation in virtue of which I can call such a body *mine*, and say, 'Behold *my* body raised from the tomb and animated anew?'"—pp. 43, 44.

"Guided by the mere *letter* of Scripture, it is common to hear mention made of the body's being raised from the grave at the sound of the last trumpet, and of its coming out of the tomb or the sepulchre in which it was interred. This we concede is Scripture language, and the simple use of the *ipsissima verba* of the Holy Spirit can never be a ground of censure towards any man who uses it with pure motives. Still we are at full liberty to inquire into its meaning, and to institute the most rigid comparison between the literal averments of holy writ, and the inevitable deductions of our reason founded upon the ascertained results of science. The sense, however, which we are constrained to put upon the *letter* of the sacred record may be different from that which is most natively obvious, and such as would never have occurred to us, but from an apparent conflict between the literal interpretation and the known facts, or irresistible inferences derived from other sources."—p. 45.

Does the Professor mean that the use of the letter of Scripture is with "pure motives" when its *letter* is disbelieved, and that to use it believing it, is to use it with impure motives?

But, if we have read aright, here is an assumption of the superiority of *reason* over the express declarations of revelation. Perhaps Professor Bush would have his own language inter-



preted by the same rule he interprets the language of inspiration, and have us reject the *letter* of *his* reasoning! And certainly no one has cause of complaint, when the same liberties are taken with his own language, that he takes with the language of the Scriptures. Should we take these liberties, we should argue that Professor Bush does not mean what he says. This, it would seem from the above quotation, is the liberty he takes with God's word: he *rejects it*, if it conflicts with "known facts or irresistible inferences derived from other sources." We are therefore constrained to believe he does not mean this. For when "reason" is so often defective, when what are supposed to be well "established facts" are so often disproved, and when "irresistible inferences" are so often irresistibly proved to be baseless conjectures, when new discoveries are continually reversing the deductions from previous researches, and the whole history of the race proves how liable the wisest men are to be mistaken, we cannot conceive how one who "yields to none in reverence for the Scriptures," should reject the *letter* of a "thus saith the Lord," for any *supposed* difficulty in reconciling it with "the oppositions of science." If we may so depart from the letter of these Scriptures, we may by the same rule reject the letter of any portion of the Bible, and in this way anything, or nothing, may be proved from the word of God as the fancies, or the "reason" of men may dictate. Even the Professor's evidence for "*spiritual* bodies" might thus be set aside. We have noticed that in the presentation of any new view, its advocates are the strictest adherents to the letter of Scripture, when it is supposed to favor them; but if it denies their assumptions, they are ready to put constructions upon it, which otherwise "would never have occurred" to them! Is not such an admission presumptive evidence of the unsoundness of any theory? The word of God is to us the last appeal. We may not at first arrive at the true meaning of a passage. But where it is admitted that the language of the Scriptures is simple and positive, and can only be set aside by rejecting the letter of the word, we consider our case is made out. That such is the fact respecting the resurrection of the body, the above quotation, unless we reject its literal sense, admits. We will, however, examine some of his arguments for rejecting the letter of these Scriptures. He says:

"Thousands and millions of human bodies, that were once deposited in graves, are not there now, and never will be again. Their tombs are cen-



*otaphs* or *empty monuments*, in every sense of the word. Where now are the tenants of hundreds of the cemeteries of Egypt, whose mummy-remains have been removed? &c, "and it is affirmed that these bodies are to be raised out of their graves at the last day; how is it to be reconciled with the fact now adverted to?"—p. 45.

In answer to his question whether this is "a *valid* objection," we reply, that it is no where said in the Bible, that *every man* must be raised from a *grave* or tomb; and although the ashes of many have been thus scattered, yet the graves of millions of others have never been disturbed; and therefore it is none the less true,—because the sea will give up the dead which are therein, and the remains of others must be gathered from the places whither they are scattered,—that the graves will be opened, and the dead will come up out of their graves. Our Savior says, "all that are *in* their graves will come forth." Others will be gathered from their respective receptacles, which will apply to *all* who have never been *in* a grave. But again he asks:—

"What is meant by the resurrection of the body, and what the *relation* which the body that dies bears to the body that is raised?"

But we shall perhaps be referred to the analogies of the vegetable world, and be reminded of Paul's striking illustration drawn from the sown seed, and the up-springing plant, in which we are to recognize the most fitting emblem of the resurrection."—p. 50.

He admits the general force of this analogy, but thinks the subject is thus illustrated "*in a different way*" than is generally imagined. He argues that the new plant "arises from some inwrapped and latent germ or stamen, to which the vital principle of the plant adheres, and under the plastic and organic power of which the new plant is developed;" but that there is here "the uninterrupted continuance of *life*," with "no *break* in the chain of vital operation," so that "the *relation*" is obvious "which the new plant bears to the old," and "so long as we can keep our eye on the unbroken thread of life," "there is a consistent sense in which it is the same plant." But if a seed was *decomposed*, and a plant of the same nature should spring up in a distant place fifty years afterwards, we could conceive of no relation between the two. He then adds:—

"Now this presents very fairly the difficulty in regard to the resurrection of the body. The difficulty arises from the break in the continuity of the vital operations. While the body is *alive*, the vital functions are indissolubly connected with the presence and functions of the *soul*. When death takes place, the principle to which the *animation* of the body was owing, departs and leaves the body a mere mass of inert lifeless matter, subject, like all other matter, to the action of chemical agencies, by which



it is gradually resolved into its primitive elements. Where then do we, or can we, detect anything like a germ or staminal principle, by the action of which a new body can ever be developed out of the remains of the former!"—p. 51.

He then argues that a seed thrown into the fire, loses its reproductive power; and that the same effect would be produced on the vital principle of a human body if it were submitted to the action of the flames; so that "the same natural causes which forbid the re-quickening of the one, forbid that of the other also.

This is said on the hypothesis that there remains a vital principle in the human body. But as we have no belief in any such "vital principle," we have no disposition to meet that part of the objection. We believe with Professor Bush, that "If the body is again to be animated, it must be by the re-infusion of the soul." If there was a something remaining in the dead body by which it might germinate, as plants do, the demonstration of such a *break* would be a *valid* argument. But as we acknowledge no such principle, and look for no resurrection of the body by "*natural causes*," all the foregoing objections weigh nothing. The resurrection can only be produced by the miraculous power of Him who first made man,—not causing him to germinate by "*natural causes*" like a "plant," but by forming him out of "the dust of the earth," and breathing into him "the breath of life." Thus we behold Adam first formed out of the dust, before this life is breathed into him. There is no vital principle there; and the question might be asked, What "*relation*" can there be between this inanimate body, and the body of the future Adam after the breath of life shall be breathed into him? Upon the same principle may we inquire what relation there is between the body before it is raised, and the body after it is raised, when the life has been suspended? If the same spirit is again infused into the same body, no one will deny but that the body that died is raised, whether there is any "*relation*" or not between its two states of existence. The man is "unclothed," and he is again "clothed:" this tabernacle is put off and it is again put on: we are in this tabernacle, we leave it for a season, and then we enter it again: it is dissolved for a season, and it is refitted again. The relation which did exist is restored,—like the plant which grows for a season in a certain soil, is taken up and protected during the inclement winter, and is again set out in the same

place. The break in the relation between the soul and body, and that between the plant and garden, we conceive to be alike. So much for the *break* in the thread of life. But against this re-animation of the body, Professor Bush arrays two objections:—

1. "How is the body to be forthcoming at the appointed time, when it has become blended with an infinity of other organization, and when different human bodies have an equal claim to the particles composing it?"—p. 52.

This we have already answered in a previous part of the argument.

2. "Supposing that Omnipotence should adjust this difficulty, will the re-construction of the original materials of the fleshly body form the spiritual body which we conceive to be that of the resurrection? And if a change take place virtually equivalent to a new creation, how can this be termed the resurrection of the *same* body?"—p. 52.

The first question has been answered by showing that a spiritual body is not necessarily *im*-material. And the second question obviously should be answered in the affirmative. We take a house and separate every board, shingle and timber. It is no longer a house. We again bring them all together, each in the very place it previously occupied, and all so nicely adjusted that the house is perfect in every part. Would this be a new creation or a restoration? It would evidently be a restoration, a "resurrection" of the house; and yet the change may have been virtually equivalent to a new creation. Just so it is with the human body. If the *same* particles which once constituted any single body, have been scattered to the four winds, and are again all collected and adjusted with their same relative position to each other, there being no addition or subtraction of particles, would it not be the *same* body that previously existed? There would certainly be present *everything* in which the identity consisted, and therefore it must be the same body. Or if there was a change made in some of these particles, some being replaced by others,—for we do not know that in the resurrection the body must be limited to just so few, or so many particles—it would be the same body;—as a pile of apples would be the same pile if some of them should be replaced by others. A new creation is the formation of something which had not previously existed. A restoration, or resurrection, is the bringing again of that which has once existed to its original state. The change may be equivalent to that of a new crea-



tion, or it may be less,—as that which is restored had been more or less resolved into its original elements. The only necessary distinction, is in its previous existence.

Professor Bush then turns to the animal kingdom, and instances the “caterpillar.” It casts off its “exuvia,” and becomes a butterfly. Here he says:—

“Though it has not the *same body*, yet we have no hesitation in saying it is the *same creature* which we beheld creeping in peristaltic movement along the ground. And we say it is the same, because we perceive here also the unbroken continuity of the vital principle, the true seat and subject of animal identity.”—p. 52.

He then supposes the caterpillar should moulder to dust, and 100 years afterwards,

“An insect should appear flapping its gilded wings over the very spot where the preceding structure was decomposed:” “all the relation we could discern between the one and the other would be that of priority and posteriority of time.” “Now this, we contend, is precisely the difficulty that weighs upon the common theory of the resurrection of the body.” “There is just that break” “in the continuous agency of the vital principle which makes it so impossible to discover or define the *relation* between the buried and the beautified body.”—p. 53.

With regard to the first supposition of the caterpillar, we cannot conceive how it can be said not to be the same body. It certainly has not a new body; for it has nothing but what was contained within the old body. And though it may have laid aside its outer covering, yet to all intents and purposes, it is the same body.

The objection of “a break in the link,” is answered by the same arguments adduced in the illustrations from the vegetable kingdom. The supposition, however, respecting the caterpillar, is not analogous. We will suppose a case. The caterpillar dies and is decomposed.—A Being so intelligent as to identify each individual particle amid all their varied changes, restores each to its place.—We again behold the caterpillar. Who will not say it is the same, although it does not yet live? Life is then infused into it, and it moves along the ground. Here is its resurrection. Man cannot see the relation between the two; and yet that Being who controls all things, has watched those particles in their dispersed and restored condition, and knows the relation they sustain to each other. If, then, that caterpillar should become a butterfly, there would still be the same relation between it in all its several conditions. Man is not enabled to understand all about it: it is not necessary he should. Yet He who has



promised, is able to perform all his pleasure. But if "these dispersed materials are to be re-collected again," how and when is it to be done? Says Professor Bush:—

"How this is to be effected without taking to pieces and unraveling as it were, the whole frame-work of Nature, surpasses conception. And if this is to be the case, when? Is it at the period denominated the last day, when it is for the most part held that the conflagration of the heavens and the earth is to take place? If such be unequivocally the divine testimony, we must of course receive it. But it would surely seem, to human view, *a priori*, a strange and incomprehensible procedure, that the re-gathering of these scattered particles, the re-building of these dilapidated human temples, should be going on in the midst of this scene of 'telluric combustion!'"—p. 54.

We have already seen that from God's ability, if he has designed to raise the dead, he is able, even upon *philosophical principles*, so to arrange and dispose of the individual particles which may have been severally connected with any human remains, so that in all their future combinations they shall be respectively protected from any subsequent disposition that shall in any wise conflict with their ultimate destined restoration, in the resurrection of the same body of which they formed a part at death. And with such an arrangement and disposition, if it is necessary, they can be forthcoming at the desired moment without "a taking to pieces and unraveling the whole frame work of Nature." We however learn, by the volume of inspiration, that all nature *is* to be "unraveled," that "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," that "all these things shall be dissolved." It is not, however, in the midst of this "telluric combustion," that the re-organization of these bodies is to be effected; nor is this "melting" to be for the purpose of effecting this re-organization. It is to be for the purpose of purifying the earth, from all the effects of sin, and the "fall," that it may be a fit territory for the kingdom of God. But before this is accomplished, "the dead in Christ will" be raised, and "we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air:" so those who are raised will thus be beyond the reach of "this scene of 'telluric combustion.'" "

After presenting these objections, Professor Bush adds:—

"It is obvious beyond question, that the popular theory reduces us to great extremities of solution. Indeed, we see not but that the difficulties which cluster about it are absolutely insuperable; and if Faith has only this view of the resurrection to present to Philosophy, we cannot perceive any ground for wonder that Philosophy should be slow to receive it; and



yet Philosophy and Faith, like Righteousness and Peace, in the economy of God, are and must be wedded together. True philosophy—and we are here speaking of no other—can never—never—be in conflict with true faith.”—p. 54.

We have endeavored to do justice to Professor Bush's arguments from reason, by presenting them fairly, though not in full. And we flatter ourselves that they have been, so far, “*fairly met*,” as our author justly demanded they should be. We have taken up his various objections, one by one, and endeavored to show,—how successfully others must judge—that there is nothing in right reason which militates against the resurrection of the body; and that these “great extremities of solution,” these “absolutely insuperable” “difficulties which cluster about it,” are all resolved into mere *suppositions*, into bare *possibilities* which *might* stand in the way, if *chance*, and not an Omniscient, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent Being controlled the elements of the Universe. If the resurrection depended upon some germinating power within the body upon which the laws of nature must act to re-produce life, as the *potato* is made to germinate, we would admit the validity of his objections.

But as One, who sees the end from the beginning, controls every minute particular in view of any desired result which He may wish to produce, we have no cause to fear that any obstacles will *chance* to arise to thwart his purposes. There will, therefore, be no natural, physical, or philosophical reasons to oppose what inspiration has affirmed. Consequently, if the Scriptures assure us that the man who dies will live again, it will be even so—true Philosophy and true Faith will alike receive it.

Before we leave the argument from reason, we trust we shall be pardoned in making a few observations on the nature of Faith. It is believing what the Scriptures assert, *because* they assert it. It is not hope; nor is it knowledge. That which can be demonstrated and seen, is no longer a subject of faith. Therefore, “*faith* is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” Our faith is *tested* when a plain scriptural statement is presented for our belief. If we can believe it *because* it is *there recorded*, we exercise true faith in God's word. But if we believe it because it is in accordance with the deductions of science, then we do not believe it because the Bible asserts it. How do we believe “that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do ap-



pear?" It must be by faith in God's word, or by the deductions of philosophy. Is there any thing in the whole circle of the sciences to teach the creation of the world? No, nothing. Then it is by *faith* alone that we understand it. We believe it because the Bible teaches it. The same is true of the flood.—There is nothing in philosophy to explain how the waters could cover the tops of the highest mountains. Looking to philosophy alone, the most profound philosopher would decide to the contrary. How then can we believe it? By *faith* in the word of God. But if Professor Bush should subject those and kindred events to the same rule by which he judges of the resurrection of the dead, he would reject them as "unintelligible ideas." Now if we could not believe what the Bible asserts because the Bible asserts it, and must first submit our faith to the test of philosophy, and then if philosophy indicated that obstacles *might* arise, be obliged to modify our faith to square with our philosophy, we should accuse no one of doing us injustice who should intimate that we had more confidence in the deductions of science than in the word of God. We cannot therefore refrain from asking whether Noah would have "prepared an ark for the saving of his house," whether Abraham would have "hoped against hope," or whether Moses would have ventured across the Red Sea at the parting of the waters, if they had been schooled in Professor Bush's philosophy? And we would most respectfully inquire of Professor Bush, whether, with his views, had he been called as either of those were, he would not have seen "difficulties" "absolutely insuperable" against the fulfillment of those predictions, so that his "Philosophy" would "be slow to receive them?"

All the miracles recorded in the Scriptures might be disproved by such rules of interpretation. And those who have carried them out have argued, that Abraham only *dreamed* he must offer up Isaac; that when Jacob's sinew shrank, it was the result of rheumatism; that the thunderings and lightnings on Mount Sinai at the giving of the "law," were only the result of an accidental thunder-storm; that when Christ walked on the water, he *waded* as far as he could, and then *swam*; that the out-pouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was an accidental gust of wind that struck the house and electrified the disciples; that on Peter's reproof, Ananias only fell down by fright, and was carried out and buried alive, or as Heinrichs says, that Peter stabbed him, &c.



&c. Now these are not merely suppositions, but they are the actual interpretations given of those texts, by such men as Eichhorn, Ammon, Thiess, and other German advocates of scriptural "*Accommodation*," and who would be astonished at the bigotry of any who should question their Christianity, or reverence for the Scriptures. Now if we can believe nothing but what is intelligible, we shall be constrained to believe that those who reject what *they* cannot reconcile with philosophy, have *more regard* for philosophy than for the declarations of inspiration. And yet such may honestly believe that they "yield to no man living in sentiments of profound reverence for the oracles of Scripture."

"DISTINCTION OF PERSONAL AND BODILY IDENTITY."

Under this head, Professor Bush says:—

"The position that the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection necessitates the belief of the resurrection of the same body, enforces upon us the consideration of the subject of identity. We are at once arrested by the inquiry, whether the *identity of the person* implies the *identity of the body*. In strictness of speech, a body which is undergoing a constant change in its constituent particles cannot be said to be the same in any two successive moments of its duration. This of course applies to the human body, the component atoms of which are in a state of ceaseless fluctuation. A precise use of language will not warrant the assertion, that our bodies are the same this hour that they were the last. The paring of a nail, the clipping of a hair, leaves the body a different body from what it was before this subduction from its integrity took place. It is true indeed that for all the purposes of ordinary and popular discourse, it is perhaps an unexceptionable mode of diction to say that we have in mature life the same bodies that we had in childhood. But when we subject the phraseology to a rigid test, it is obvious that it cannot be true. That cannot be the same through a given lapse of time, which is constantly changing its constituent parts during that time. How then is it possible to affirm with philosophical accuracy, that I have the same body to-day that I had twenty years ago? And it would certainly be hard to show that that which is philosophically false is theologically true." pp. 58, 59.

This reasoning is extended to considerable length, in which we will not follow him, because we find that as far as *fact* is concerned, we should not vary materially from him respecting this question; although we might in the use of terms and in defining our understanding respecting it. We believe in no "immortal bone in the extremity of the *os coccygis*,"\* nor in any "immovable matter" to perpetuate the identity of the body. Nor do we deny these continued progressive

\* "The Jews have an opinion that the *os coxendicis*, the lower joint of the backbone, survives the corruption of the body; and that it is out of this bone that the resurrection body is formed."—*Clark's Com.* Vol. 7. p. 229.



changes, by which the material of the body may be repeatedly entirely displaced by other particles, and in which sense it is not the same body. There is, however, another sense in which the body is the same, independent of the spirit which animates it. Thus in the case of a tree.—It is subject to the same philosophical changes that man is. It has no properties of thought, reason, or sensation; and yet it preserves its *identity*, not of particles, but the tree is the same. All its peculiarities are the same; and however long it may continue, all recognize it as the same old tree; and none mistake it for any other tree. As this is true of a tree, so it is also true of the human body. We recognize the child in the man. There is the same general expression, the same natural marks or scars, and peculiarities of the body, by which we recognize that it is the same body. Even after death, and every particle in it may have been changed since we previously saw it, we are sensible it is the same body.

The body grows in size and vigor for a certain time, and then becomes old and decrepid; whereas, were there no bodily identity, we could not conceive why, as there is a continual addition of fresh particles, it should ever cease to be vigorous. Contagious diseases of certain kinds, if experienced at the earliest age, ever after protect the body from subsequent attacks of the same disease, although not a particle that was previously infected, may remain in the system. In the case of a beast, which Professor Bush claims has no personality, we are conscious that it is the same animal, from the calf to the ox, from the colt to the horse, &c. There must therefore be an identity of the body independent of the identity of the spirit which animates it. And yet as far as the philosophical fact is concerned, we would not dissent particularly from Professor Bush respecting it. He however asks:—

“If a man rises in the morning with a different body from that with which he lay down—though he still remains the same person, with what propriety can he be said to rise from his grave with the same body with which he entered it?”—p. 63.

If Professor Bush wishes to be understood that in the resurrection there will be the *same relation* between the body that is raised from the grave, and that which entered it, as there is between the body with which a man rises, and the body with which he retired, we will admit to any extent he pleases the want of identity. For such a relation is all we claim. But if he does not admit the *same relation* in the



*two cases*, the comparison is not analogous. And especially it cannot be, if, as we understand him, he denies a material body at the resurrection. But whatever may be said with regard to bodily identity while living, we cannot see that that will affect the question of a resurrection of the body. As a man rises in the morning, may he not arise in the resurrection, with the same relation to the body he put off at death, as the body with which he rises in the morning bears to the one with which he lay down at night? It certainly does not prevent his being restored to the last body he inhabited. We will therefore proceed to the consideration of his next proposition :—

“THE TRUE BODY OF THE RESURRECTION AS INFERRED BY REASON.”

He says :—

“The succession of particles in the human body may be compared to the successive members of a corporate society formed under a charter.” “Let us suppose that this company, after being in existence for a number of years, should at length, and long before the term of the charter expires, become virtually extinct by the death of all but one or two of its members, who become remiss in acting any longer in their corporate capacity. We will imagine again, that after the lapse of a considerable interval, it is proposed to resuscitate the company. What are the leading ideas involved in the supposition? Would it be at all inferred that the former members were to be restored to life and organized anew? Does the renovated life of the company imply the reviviscence of the individual members who have previously formed it?” “The vitality, so to speak, is in the charter, and there its identity is seated.” “So far, then, as we can perceive, the revival of the corporate society is not the revival in any sense of the original members, but merely the revival of the inherent formative or organic power of the charter. The charter is the living nucleus—the germ—the ground-element—to which the new social fabric owes its existence.”—p. 69.

This figure expresses very fairly our views of the resurrection; but we see a more striking analogy. The charter is the soul, the society is the body, the members of the company are the constituent particles of the body,—these may be continually changed, increased, or lessened, and it is still the same society, or body, even if none of the original members are left. Those which remain cease to act in a corporate capacity; and the society dies. Now how can this society be revived? Must all the original members be restored? Answer, No. It must be done and can be done only by the members which remained, the body put off at death, again acting in a

corporate capacity. While the charter alone existed, it would be as ineffective as the souls under the altar, crying, "How long, O Lord?" \* and the society could not be resuscitated by merely new members, for that would be another society; and the terms of all charters make them available only to those to whom they are granted, and such others as may by their consent become united with them. A company of entirely new members could not be formed under an old charter, but by a special legislative act; and then it would be a new society with the same name and powers. The resuscitation of a corporate society must therefore be like the resurrection of the body, a restoration of the charter, the soul, to those members, particles, which relinquished it at death. After its resuscitation these members might add to their number or not, as circumstances should render necessary. As Professor Bush has selected this figure, we most fully subscribe to its appropriateness as an illustration. The conclusion that he arrives at, is, that

"The resurrection body is that part of our present being to which the essential life of the man pertains. We may not be able to see it, to handle it, or to analyze it, or to describe it. But we know that it exists, because we know that we ourselves exist. It constitutes the inner essential vitality of our present bodies, and it lives again in another state, *because it never dies*. It is immortal in its own nature, and it is called a *body*—a spiritual body—because the poverty of human language, or perhaps the weakness of the human mind, forbids the adoption of any more fitting term by which to express it."—p. 70.

That which cannot be seen, handled, analyzed, or described, must be a strange body! nor can we see how Professor Bush can have an "intelligible idea" respecting such a body, so as to receive it. We are also at a loss to understand by what rules of philosophy such a body can be demonstrated to exist. It can therefore only be believed by faith, or by supposition.

Professor Bush has not, however, carried out the analogy of his own illustration. After showing the death and resuscitation of a corporate body to illustrate the resurrection, instead of using the resuscitated society, as he must to carry out the figure, he takes the charter, at the death of the old society, for the symbol of his resurrection body! Who cannot see a want of harmony in his illustration? And yet he ventures to affirm in view of such reasoning, that

---

\* Rev. vi. 10.



“If it be sound, we not only calmly repose in the conclusion, but are unshaken also in the conviction, that revelation, *rightly interpreted*, must harmonize with it.”—p. 71.

It is true, that if it were “*sound*” reasoning, “revelation must harmonize with it.” But it is none the less true, that if it were sound reasoning, it would *harmonize with* “*revelation*.” If, however, revelation seemed to harmonize with *such* reasoning, we should fear we did not read revelation aright. Again he says:—

“While our reason assures us that the power of thought does not pertain to the gross physical fabric which remains when the inhabiting spirit has taken its flight, we are still unable to resist the impression, that it does inhere in something which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle.”—p. 72.

This “something” he speaks of in another place, as composed of “subtle elements mixed up in the grosser materials of our bodies, with which our mental operations are connected, and upon which they are dependent;” and adds, “and we cannot know but that they may exist separate from our bodies and form, in fact, in the strictest propriety of speech, a spiritual body.”—p. 77.

Again he says:—

“It would seem then on the whole, from a collation of all the grounds on which an opinion is to be formed, that the judgment of reason would be, *that a spiritual body is developed at death*. By *spiritual*, in this connection, we mean refined, subtle, ethereal, sublimated. By the development of a spiritual body, we mean the disengagement—the extrication—of that psychical part of our nature with which vital and animal functions are, in the present life, intimately connected, and which differs from the pure spirit, the intellectual principle, as the “*sensitive principle* differs from” “*the self-conscious intelligence*. It is a *tertium quid*—an intermediate something between the cogitative faculty and the gross body. It is indeed invisible; but so are many of the mightiest agents in nature, and so are many of the noblest entities in the ranks of created beings.”—p. 78.

That “the power of thought” does “inhere in something which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle,” and that this “may exist separate from our bodies,” we are not disposed to question. The point here at issue, is, whether this is the spiritual body which Paul speaks of, that was sown a natural body; or whether it is merely that part of man which constitutes the *spirit* that returns to God that gave it, when the dust shall return to the earth as it was; \* and which waits to be re-united to its dust again. A body eliminated from another body cannot, in any use of terms, be called a resurrection body. Nothing had previously fallen

\* Eccl. xii. 7.



which is here raised up: it is rather a casting off, a change of condition, a disengagement from a previous state. So that if that were the true view, the illustrations and use of terms explanatory of the resurrection, in the Scriptures, even if they were only figurative and metaphorical, would be most unhappily chosen. Neither would such be analogous to insect transformations: for there it is the old body with new capacities that is eliminated from a mere exuvie or outward covering in which it was previously incased, which constituted but a small, and no essential part of the body; but according to this supposition, *all* of the entire body which is apparent to any of our senses remains, eliminating a mere invisible agency. And even if this agency were to receive a spiritual body at death, in exchange for the material body, it could not be a resurrection; it would be a mere transition, a passing from one body to another, a transmigration; and instead of a resurrection it would be a new creation.

Again, if this were the true view of the resurrection, Hymeneus and Philetus would not have been in error in saying, "That the resurrection is past already;"\* nor would such "words" have "eat as a canker," or "overthrown the faith of any." For if the resurrection is at death, it would in that age have been "past" to all who had died, and they should rather have been commended than censured for such teachings. The Bible also speaks of those who died in the faith, as not having received the promises, but as still to receive them, as having seen them afar off,—not nigh at death,—and as expecting to be satisfied, not when they should fall asleep, but when they should awake in His likeness. The Bible teaches a space between death and the resurrection; but this theory makes it an instantaneous change. Those who have departed, are everywhere spoken of as having fallen asleep; and we are told that we shall not all sleep, but we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall be changed. Now if the change that Professor Bush speaks of, was all the resurrection the dead will, or do experience, it would not be true that we who may be alive at Christ's coming, shall any the less sleep than those who have gone before us; for our change would be the same as theirs. Nor would any sleep.

The church in its apostolic age received no such understanding of the doctrine of the resurrection from any of the teachings which they received. Dr. Pearson says, that the

---

\* 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.



souls of none enter heaven until the resurrection, "is the opinion generally received in the schools and delivered as the sense of the church of God in all ages."—*Creed* p. 363. Again he says, "The most ancient of the fathers whose writings are extant, were so far from believing" that the saints are translated to heaven, "that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ's death, until the general resurrection." Among these he enumerates Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hilary, Gregory Nissen, Novation, &c. And to this belief he says there were very few, if any exceptions, "for above five hundred years after Christ."—*Ib.* p. 371.

We thus learn that the faith once delivered to the saints, was received by them in its literal acceptation. Those who sat under the teachings of the apostles, looked forward to a resurrection of the body, as they would not, had they been otherwise indoctrinated. And a view of any doctrine, of which no trace can be found in the primitive church, can have but little support from their understanding of the Scriptures. Professor Bush admits, that

"We cannot say, indeed, that the evidence of this induction is *demonstrative*; it is at *best* perhaps but *presumptive*; yet the presumption is extremely strong."—p. 78.

If it is at best but *presumptive*, we feel that in support even of the resurrection of the body, "we have a more sure word of prophecy;" and that it becomes us more to take heed to *it*, than to any merely presumptive argument.

But, says Professor Bush,

We may "justly propose the question of the *cui bono* in relation to the resurrection of our former bodies. What purpose can they be supposed to answer, provided we have, as all reasoning and analogy tends to establish, spiritual bodies that have emanated from the material bodies wisely adapted to a spiritual world?"—p. 80.

We may not be able to comprehend the precise good that will be accomplished by the resurrection of the body; and we may not be able to say what good has been accomplished even by its creation. If its restoration is useless, it will not be done: if it is to be done, it will be for wise purposes. We however conceive, that it is because we do not at death, as Professor Bush supposes we do, receive a spiritual body that is adapted to our destined state, and that the resurrection is to supply that deficiency. But as the clay has no right to say to the potter, Why hast thou made me thus? nei-



ther do we suppose we have any right to demand the "why," for any future change God may see fit to make in our physical structure. Again he says:—

"We are well aware that in view of all this, the two-fold question will be at once proposed—What *proof* is there of its truth, and if true, how is it to be reconciled with what are regarded as the express averments of Holy Writ? We have already admitted that *the solution propounded cannot be demonstrated to be true*, although we doubt not there is constantly accumulating evidence that it is true; and if it be, it follows of course that the Scriptures must be interpreted so as to agree with it." And, "If the letter of revelation holds forth a view of the doctrine which arrays itself against the clearest evidence of facts, and the soundest process of reasoning, is there no demand, on the other side, for the reconciliation of Scripture with science?"—p. 81.

It will be time enough to ask this question, when "the letter of revelation *does* array itself" against "*the clearest evidence of facts* and the *soundest process of reasoning*." But while it is admitted that "the solution propounded CANNOT be demonstrated to be true," there will be no "war" of "acknowledged truths," if it does not "harmonize" with the Scriptures. But we can hardly conceive how such a question should be propounded respecting a proposition, which, it is admitted, cannot be demonstrated to be true, by one who says,

"For ourselves, we yield to no man living in sentiments of profound reverence for the oracles of Scripture."—p. 82.

Had he said for the oracles of *presumptive evidence*, it would harmonize more with some of his reasoning. He however supposes that evidence will accumulate to prove his theory, and that

"It will be at length everywhere conceded, that the destinies of our being are to be evolved according to established laws, and not in violation of them. These laws will be developed by the progress of scientific research, the conclusions of which will carry with them a force of authority as irresistible as the *literal* announcements of the sacred text; and nothing can be gained for the interests of revelation, by lifting up a standard against them."—p. 84.

Here is an exhibition of the reverence he has for the Scriptures. He is willing to place them upon an *equal* footing with his presumptive evidence; but, look out, nothing will be gained by setting up revelation above it! This, in our view, is asking too much for man's presumptive conclusions, and is derogatory to the Word of God. It is placing God and man too nearly upon a level; or rather, it is permitting man to dictate terms to the Almighty! We would not, however, be understood as intimating that our Author would not himself give



the preponderance to revelation. It is of the *tendency* of his views we speak. He says:—

“If the teachings of that divine volume array themselves so unequivocally and inexorably against the conclusions to which we are brought by the argument from reason, that we can by no process of conciliation harmonize the two, undoubtedly we are required to abide by the Scriptural decision, whatever violence it may seem to do to our rational deductions. But this deference to Scripture, in opposition to the demands of a seemingly incontrovertible logic, can never be claimed but upon the ground of an *absolute assurance* of having obtained the true sense of the inspired oracles on this subject.”—p. 85.

It would seem, however, from the above, that *if* the Scriptures can by any process of ratiocination be twisted, moulded, explained, or accommodated, so as to avoid its literal sense, that it is to be thus disposed of. And this is the process, in disproof of the resurrection of the body, that we are next to consider. We therefore come to

#### “THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.”

This forms the second part of his work. He commences with a few “preliminary remarks,” in illustration of the *principle* which is applicable to the interpretation of these Scriptures. He argues that

“The Bible “deals in two distinct classes of subjects—those which are originally *within* the limits of man’s rational powers, and those which are *without*. Truths that are purely scientific, fall into the former class.”—p. 86.

He then contends that “The results to which reason is brought in its researches, in many of the departments of science, may be regarded as certain,”—as “*demonstrated truths* ;” and refers to the sciences of astronomy and geology, and the discoveries therein, as evidence. We are not disposed to controvert the proposition thus laid down. But the question is, whether this is a subject purely scientific. It was long since asked, “If a man die, shall he live again ?” and all the philosophy in the world could furnish no answer. It was acknowledged that there is “hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again ;” but man’s resurrection could only be known by faith in the word of God. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is unaffected by this proposition, unless an event, dependent *only* upon the fiat of the Almighty, is to be determined by the deductions of science. He further argues, that



"Instead of finding the earth at the centre of the system, he finds the sun there. But the Scriptures, speaking according to appearance, represent the earth as the central body, and the sun and the stars as revolving around. What shall he do? shall he give up his conclusions because the *letter* of revelation is in conflict with them, when at the same time he is just as well assured of their truth, as he is that there is any sun or earth at all?"—p. 87.

Again he asks:—

"Are we not left as free by the Creator to abide by the ascertained results of physiology, as by those of astronomy or geology? Is not certainly a conclusion as attainable in the one case as in the other? And is it not just as probable that the Scriptures should speak according to *appearance*, and in conformity with the then state of knowledge?" "Are not the Scriptures constructed on this point, as on all others having respect to physical subjects, in reference to the then state of knowledge—to the popular impression and belief—among those for whom they were originally designed?"—p. 90.

In the above we are brought to the consideration of an important question, viz., How far do the Scriptures speak in accordance with men's opinions? It is true that so far as language is concerned, this is often done. Thus we read of the "four corners of the earth," when it is round and without corners; of an "understanding heart," when the head is the seat of knowledge; of "the rising of the sun," and "the going down thereof," when it is stationary as respects the earth, &c. But let us bear in mind that it is nowhere said, that the earth *is not* round, or that it *is* a plain with four corners; that the heart *is* the seat of understanding; that the earth *is* in the centre of this system, or that the sun revolves around it. Nor is there a single direct and positive statement in the Bible that the researches of science have in any way disproved: consequently, it does not follow, because language is sometimes used in accordance with the understanding of the men of that age, when nothing *positively* is asserted, that plain and positive and absolute statements are made to accommodate men's understanding. Such a conclusion would drive us to a denial that *anything* could be learned from the Scriptures corrective of men's ideas; as they would be only an index of what *men thought* in that age: for if such a rule was applicable to the resurrection, it is to the entire teachings of the Bible.

I know it is claimed that geology is in opposition to the letter of the Scriptures. The Bible teaches that we are only about six thousand years from the time of Adam, while geologists contend that the world is much older. Now if this was



all true, there would not necessarily be a contradiction ; for the Scriptures only give us a chronology from the creation of Adam, whereas geologists themselves contend, that the marks of age on the earth were anterior to his time. So that if their deductions were correct, it must have respect to an interval, between the beginning when God created the heavens and earth, and the commencement of its being re-modelled, when the earth was without form. Between those two periods, there might have been room for all the changes, producing all the results for which geologists contend. It has not, therefore, been shown that a single positive declaration of God's word has been ever modified by scientific discoveries. And as those texts upon which the doctrine of the resurrection is based are *positive* declarations, the accomodated use of language referred to is not analogous, and cannot affect the doctrine. Or, if it might be thus affected, Professor Bush does not contend *he* has arrived at that certainty in physiological researches, as we have in astronomical : so that again the two cases are not parallel. But, believing that the positive declarations of God's word may be thus *stretched*, he says, that

“ In nothing is the divine wisdom more conspicuous than in what we may term the *elasticity of import* in the language of the sacred volume.”—p. 91.

How *elastic* the Scriptures will be found, we shall see as we progress in our review. The next point upon which he dwells, is

“ THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.”

He argues that the intimations in the Old Testament

“ Do not distinguish very precisely between the doctrine of the *resurrection*, technically so termed, and that of a *future existence* or *immortality*. So far at least as the tenet of the resurrection is supposed necessarily to include the idea of the living again of the physical body, we shall probably look in vain for a single passage that unequivocally asserts it.”—p.93.

When we find such texts as the following, it does not seem that we thus “ look in vain : ” viz., Job, xix. 26,—“ And though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God ; ” Psa. xvii. 15—“ I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness ; ” Isa. xxvi. 19, “ Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise ; ” Ezek. xxxvii. 12, “ I will open your graves and bring you up

out of your graves ;" Dan. xii. 2,—“ And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” &c. If any language is unequivocal, the above most surely is ; so that the question, “ Why, if it be taught in the New Testament, it is not taught in the Old, and *vice versa* ? ” “ may ” not “ be pronounced a question of very difficult solution,” from the simple fact that the resurrection *is* plainly taught in both. He, however, admits that this doctrine

“ Enters into the articles of the Jewish creed, and as their creed professedly rests upon the Old Testament alone, it would seem a problem difficult to be solved, whence their faith on this subject was derived, if not from the writings of Moses and the prophets.”—p. 93.

In speaking of the “ *Definition of Terms*,” he shows the various words in the Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek, used to denote the resurrection,—the principal one in the Greek being *Anastasis*, which he adopts as the title of his work ; and he admits the usage of these words “ is founded upon ideas drawn from visible objects and phenomena, and such as were appropriate to a general belief of the resurrection, the standing up again of the defunct body.”—p. 96. But he argues that that usage is of little importance—that “ the truth of the doctrine is one thing, and the Jewish construction of it another.” He then proceeds to the

#### “ EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR PASSAGES.”

The first texts to which reference is made are in Gen. xvii. 7, 8, where God promises to give to Abraham *and* his seed, “ all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession.” He quotes “ Menasseh Ben Israel (De Resurrec. Mort. L. i. c. 1, § 4,)” as saying, “ It is plain that Abraham and the rest of the Patriarchs did not possess that land ; it follows therefore, that they must be raised in order to enjoy the promised good, as otherwise the promises of God would be vain and false. Hence, therefore, is proved not only the immortality of the soul, but also the essential *foundation of the law*, to wit : the resurrection of the dead.” He also says, “ Mede also puts the same construction upon the words, and it is generally adopted by the Millenarian writers.”—p. 97. Thus we have the sense of the Jewish and the early Christian writers,—Mede being of their faith. To this Professor Bush objects that “ *if* ” his previous “ reasoning be sound,” disproving the resurrec-



tion of the same body, the body of Abraham can no more be raised than those of the rest of the race. But, we reply, if his reasoning is *unsound*, as we think we have shown, it militates nothing.

His second objection is, that the word "*and*, is *very often* synonymous with *even*," so that the promise is to Abraham, *even* to his seed; and he thinks this sense here is proved by Gen. xv. 18, where God says, "Unto thy seed have I given this land,"—"his posterity" being "his representative." But as he has not shown that "*and*" is *always* synonymous with "*even*," it *may* not be in the case before us. Nor can the promise of the land to his seed in another place preclude its being given to Abraham; for both him and his seed are included in the promise in the text. We, however, have positive scriptural testimony in opposition to Professor Bush's reasoning. In Ex. vi. 3, 4, God assures Moses that he appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and had established his "covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." And our Savior assures us, Luke xx. 37, that Moses showed at the bush, that the dead are raised when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Stephen assures us, Acts vii. 5, that God gave Abraham none inheritance in the land of Canaan; "no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." While Paul assures us, Gal. iii. 16—29, that the "promises" "to Abraham and his seed," were made to "Christ;" and that "if ye are Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise." He also testifies, Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40, that Abraham and the other faithful worthies, "all died in faith, not having received the promises," [They had been fulfilled to none even in Paul's day,] "but having seen them afar off,"—not nigh at death—and "that they without us should not be made perfect." We are therefore satisfied, that resting upon these texts alone, sustained as they are by God's own expositions, the resurrection of the body is fully made out. Their language is not "elastic" enough to destroy their literal import.

He next refers to

Job xix. 25—27. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and that though after my skin, worms destroy my body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." &c.



In disposing of this, he argues that the book of Job was not written by a Jew, or one who had any knowledge of a promised Messiah; that this passage has various renderings; that Job is not "cited in the New Testament as an example of *faith*," but only of "*patience*;" that Job is not therein referred to as a *prophet*; that the word there translated Redeemer, "is variously rendered by interpreters, *vindicator*, *avenger*, *deliverer*," and had reference to Job's being healed, and God's vindicating his innocence from the false charges of his friends; and that his seeing God was fulfilled when he exclaimed, xlii. 5, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but *now mine eye seeth thee*;" also that it was not supposed by the Jews to refer to the resurrection, nor is thus quoted by many who are the strongest in that belief.

Notwithstanding these objections, the letter of the text, with the Professor's modifications, seems still to favor a literal resurrection; but as there are other texts sufficient to prove the doctrine, we are willing he should have the full benefit of all these objections.

He next quotes Psal. xvi. 9, 10, where we read, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." He says:—

"The fact of a resurrection is undoubtedly taught in these words, and yet from the inspired comment of Peter, Acts ii. 29—31, it is clear that it is a resurrection predicated of the body of Christ, and not of the bodies of men in general." And as the body here spoken of was *not* to see corruption, and the bodies of men *do*, "How then can this passage be adduced in proof of the general doctrine of the resurrection of the body?"—pp. 104, 105.

The answer to this question, we find in the language of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 12—20, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." &c. Now as Professor Bush admits that Christ's resurrection is undoubtedly here taught, and as Paul, speaking by inspiration, assures us, that if Christ be raised, there will be a resurrection of the dead, it follows that the doctrine of the resurrection must be contained in this text.

He next quotes Psal. xvii. 15, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." He translates it—"I shall be satisfied in the awaking, with thy likeness,—understanding it of the beatific vision to be enjoyed," "when the righteous dead



are to be gloriously manifested as risen from the dead, but not in a sense to include *a resurrection of their bodies.*" He thinks it may describe the "transition of the disembodied spirit from earth to heaven at the moment of dissolution."—pp. 105, 106.

It, however, cannot have such a reference; for Peter assures us that "David is not ascended into the heavens;" and Paul testifies, Heb. xi. 32, 39, that David had not received the promise.

He then refers to Ps. xlix. 14, 15, the import of which he supposes to be, that while the wicked has no hope, the righteous hath hope in his death. But as we cannot dwell on these more collateral passages, we proceed.

He next quotes Isa. xxv. 7, 8, "He will swallow up death in victory;" and assumes that the "death" is not used "in its natural and ordinary acceptation, but as another term," for "everything which causes grief, mourning and tribulation," and which he claims is its use in Rev. xxi. 4, "There shall be no more *death.*" Paul, however, assures us, 1 Cor. xv. 54, that "the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory,' " will be brought to pass "at the last trump," when "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality"—at the resurrection.

To this Professor Bush replies, "that such cannot be the meaning of Paul, *provided* it be not the meaning of Isaiah." And he argues, that Isaiah "is merely setting before us one of the links in the great chain of events which are to distinguish the latter days of Zion's welfare;" and that the last trump is merely "the *commencement*" of the "ultimate bliss and glory" of this world. But he has offered no proof of a long duration of the present world, that the "death" referred to is not physical death, or that the meaning of Isaiah is not of the resurrection. If there were any *obscurity* respecting Isaiah's meaning, the comments of Paul should decide its true meaning: for upon the principle that God reveals his truth, "here a little and there a little," more obscurely at first, and afterwards more clearly; we can only regard the New Testament as an illustration and explication of the Old; so that the New settles the meaning of the Old, and not the Old, of the New.

His next text in order, is

Isa. xxvi. 19,—“Thy dead men 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 her dead."

Professor Bush argues, that "together with," is not in the original ; and

"As the general scope of the chapter is to celebrate the national deliverance from exile and bondage, and the destruction of the enemies who had tyrannized over them, so the drift of this paragraph is to draw a graphic contrast between the lot of their former lordly oppressors, and the favored and felicitous condition of the chosen people themselves." He also argues, that the "dead" are "civilly dead ;" and that "my dead body," "is merely a collective term for the restored mass of the Jewish nation." —pp. 114—121.

The *defect* in this argument, is, that it is only an *assumption* that the "scope of the chapter" is to celebrate a "national deliverance." The subject is commenced in the 24th chapter, where it is said, "The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage." "In that day," we read, "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients, gloriously." That this is Christ's personal reign in the New Jerusalem, is evident from the context in the 25th chapter. Here we are told, that "He will swallow up death in victory," which Paul assures us is at the "last trump ;" and the prophet adds, "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God ; we have waited for him, and he will save us : this is the Lord ; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Then the same subject is continued through the next chapter, with no allusion to a national deliverance ; but closes with, "For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity : the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." So that if the meaning of the text is to be decided by the general scope of the context, it must have respect to the time of Christ's Second Advent, and not to a mere Jewish national restoration. And the resurrection which is brought to view, must be, not a mere restoration to civil rights, but the resurrection of the dead.

His next reference is to Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14, where is recorded the vision of the valley of dry bones, with God's interpretation of it. He says :—

"The vision" "goes on to state that the bones came together, were clothed with flesh and skin, were animated with a reviving breath, and



finally, that 'they lived and stood up on their feet, an exceeding great army.' If the reader were to proceed no farther, he might conclude that the grand scope of the vision was to teach the doctrine of the *literal resurrection of the body*; but the Spirit of inspiration immediately furnishes the true clew to the oracle, by expressly assuring us that the bones were symbols, not of actually deceased men, but of the Israelites in their long-continued state of extreme affliction and depression, while remaining captive in the country of their enemies, as dead bones from the grave; and that the revivification of the dry bones is a symbol of the certain revival of the Jewish state, by the restoration of the people to their own land."—p. 122.

It follows from the above, that whether we are to understand this as teaching a literal resurrection, or the restoration of the Jews, depends entirely upon the explanation of this vision, which God gives in verses 11—14. And the point in that explanation is the declaration, "Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel." But it does not consequently follow, that "the whole house of Israel," is Israel in bondage. If we take the inspired definition which Paul gives of "all Israel," it can only respect the host of the redeemed. He assures us, Rom. ii. 25—29, that those are not Jews who are so outwardly; "but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." And ix. 6—8, that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel"—that "the children of the flesh" are not "the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." And we learn in Rom. xi., that all who believe are grafted into the olive tree, and all who disbelieve are broken off; and that the full number of the Jews who will come in, and the full number of the Gentiles, will complete the number of God's elect, and constitute "all Israel" who will be saved, as it is written in Isa. lix. 20, when "the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them *that turn from transgression* in Jacob." "The whole house of Israel" must consequently be all of God's children; and none else. And that these are the ones to be resurrected, is also proved by God's explanation referred to,—i. e. if Professor Bush will permit us to take it all as literally as he would understand the word "Israel."—For, "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel,"—i. e. the renewed earth promised to Abraham and his seed, not "through the law, but through the righteousness of faith,"—Rom. iv. 13; and who must come up out of their graves to inherit it. We therefore unite most fully with Professor Bush in the following conclusion:—



"So far as the letter is concerned, it would be difficult to find any other passage in the Scriptures, where so much is said respecting the opening of graves, and the bringing up out of graves; and yet nothing can be more expressive, and consequently more imperative, than the interpretation which the Spirit of God himself puts upon the prophetic scenery, and to which the commentator *must* adhere, whatever inferential additions he may see fit to graft upon it."—p. 123.

He next refers to Hosea vi. 2, and xiii. 14, but we shall pass over these more collateral evidences, and proceed to his examination of

Dau. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

"This brief passage," says Professor Bush, "contains more emphatically, perhaps, than any other in the Old Testament, the germ of the resurrection doctrine. It is incessantly referred to by the Rabbinical writers, who have treated of the subject, and has exercised a controlling influence on the literal statements of Christ and the apostles!"—p. 131.

He gives as the correct explication of it, —

"And many of the sleepers of the dust shall awake; these (the awakened) (shall be) to everlasting life; and those (the unawakened) (shall be) to shame and everlasting contempt,"—the same that "is suggested, as he says, by some of the Jewish school, and is undoubtedly very ancient." Aben Ezra renders it, "'Those who awake shall be (appointed) to everlasting life, and those who awake not, shall be (doomed) to shame and everlasting contempt.' The words of Gaon himself, are, that 'this is the resurrection of the dead of Israel, whose lot is to eternal life, and those who shall not awake, are the forsakers of Jehovah.'" &c.—p. 134.

This, then, clearly establishes the fact, that whatever the nature of this resurrection may be, it is only the righteous that are to be raised when Michael shall stand up; so that the difficulty it has presented, and the evidence that has been attempted to be deduced therefrom, in support of the resurrection of the righteous and wicked at the same time, are entirely destroyed. It will also be seen, that the explication admitted to be the most correct and literal, if taken in its most literal sense, is even more favorable to our views of the resurrection, than the letter of the common version. How then can this text be disposed of? Says Professor Bush,

"Still the question recurs, What kind of a resurrection is that here announced, and to what time is it to be referred?" He then argues, that the context indicates

"An extended order of events stretching onwards, through a long lapse of centuries, to the time, whatever that may be, when Daniel himself is to 'stand up in his lot at the end of the days.'" And as it is connected with "a period of distinguished trouble, when Michael the Great Prince is to stand up for Daniel's people, and as the same language occurs in the de-



scription of this trouble with that which is applied to the calamities experienced at the destruction of Jerusalem—viz., that there never had been and never would be a scene of equal distress—it seems fair to infer that the woes of that period are at least *included* in the present prediction.”

He conceives this prediction ushers in “that new dispensation which was to be offered by the Messiah at his death and resurrection,” and recognizes

“An incipient fulfillment of this oracle, not only in the several individual instances of resuscitation of the dead recorded in the gospels, but more especially in that remarkable display of resurrection power which was put forth upon the many bodies of the saints that slept, which arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection;” but “still having a more special reference to events that should distinguish the *commencing period* of that grand era to which they pertained.” And he adds, “So far then, the words of the prophet may be construed as having respect to a literal resurrection. But this we regard as, in the main, a mere outward and sensible adumbration of a far more glorious work of moral quickening.”—pp. 134—136.

To this we reply, that the *context* does indicate an extended order of events extending to Daniel’s standing in his lot. But it does not therefore follow that the *text* will cover the same extended period. It is rather the consummation of that period. We also admit that there is a connection between the time of trouble here spoken of, and the one in Matt. xxiv.—that, the commencement, and this, the close, of a long period of trouble, extending from the time of Jerusalem’s overthrow to the end of the world. But if it had its incipient fulfillment in the individual instances of restoration to life recorded in the Gospel, and in the resurrection when Christ arose, of the bodies of the saints who slept; then its incipient fulfillment was a literal and material one. And if it has “a more special reference” to the “commencing period” of the universal establishment of God’s kingdom, it follows that then there must also be a literal resurrection, unless Professor Bush would have us reason “from *unlike* to *unlike*.” But as he admits “so far as the *words* of the prophet may be construed,” that this is a prediction of a “*literal resurrection*,” we will proceed to the examination of his reasons for regarding it as only the “*adumbration*” of a “moral quickening.”

In proof of this, he first adduces “testimonies from the Rabbinical school,” who believed, according to Sohar, that “In the world to come,” God would “vivify the dead, and raise them from the dust, so that they shall be no more of an



earthly structure," but "subsist as structures firm and durable."

But what have the traditions of the Rabbies to do in the decision of the question whether the Scriptures are to be received, or not, in their literal acceptation? For we are expressly assured by our Savior, that they made the word of God of none effect by their traditions.—Mark vii. 13. But even here this tradition can have only respect to the resurrection of the body, for that alone can be raised from the dust. And so with the opinion he quotes of R. Saadiah, that the "dead Israelites" are to be "brought out of their sepulchres," "in this world" (or age) it is none the less literal, than if it were in the *future* age. Even we contend that the resurrection of the righteous is to be in this age, but at its very close. Nor does the "prevalent impression of the Jews" referred to, "that the resurrection there spoken of pertains more especially to their own nation," make it any the less a *literal* resurrection. But he says:—

"From the teachings of our Lord and his apostles, we learn that all men are *dead* in trespasses and in sins; and that the effect of the Gospel, attended by the energetic influence of the Holy Spirit, is to *quicken* its recipients into a new and divine life, which, as it is a virtual resurrection while they are yet in the body, issues by necessary consequence in that consummated resurrection which accrues to them upon their leaving the body."

Let it here be remembered, that when merely moral death is presented, the quickening from it is in *no place* spoken of in the Scriptures as a resurrection. But if recovery from moral death is a moral resurrection, must not, — unless we reason "from unlike to unlike," — the recovery from physical death be a physical resurrection?

He then quotes a number of passages where he argues it is literally a resurrection "*from* the dead," "from out the dead," &c., showing that *all* the dead are not raised in the resurrection there referred to, and which he argues gives us "a *usus loquendi*," referring directly to this text in Daniel; "and if so," he says:—

"The proof, we believe, must be regarded as conclusive, that that passage, in its more legitimate and primary import, does not convey the idea of the *resurrection of the body*."

This is a most strange conclusion. It seems then that the "sum" of his argument amounts to about this. The words of the text, taken literally, predict the resurrection of the body; but the Jews looked to a literal resurrection of their



own nation, and many of them believed they would rise out of the dust; and the resurrection is often spoken of as being only a part of the dead; and therefore *none* of the dead are to be raised! Q. E. D?

This is all the force we can see in his argument. But let us examine for a moment the great objection, that it refers to only a part of the dead raised from among the dead. The force of this seems to be contained in a note he quotes from "Noble's Appeal," viz., that when Paul speaks of "attaining unto the resurrection of the dead," "he evidently speaks of something as attainable in this life,—otherwise his modest notice 'not as though I had already attained,' would be nonsense;" and if by "striving to attain unto the resurrection of the dead," he meant "the resurrection of dead bodies, which all are to experience, whether they strive for it or not," it would be strange "talk."—p. 140.

Now all the force of this objection arises from the error which the spiritualists have run into, in supposing the resurrection of the righteous and wicked is all to transpire at the same time; when the letter of inspiration is positive, that those who attain unto the resurrection of the righteous "from among the dead," will be raised one thousand years before the rest of the dead will be raised, who rise not at the first resurrection. This harmonizes all those texts which speak of "out from the dead," &c., and strengthens the doctrine of two resurrections. Paul, in striving to attain unto this resurrection, was looking to something in the future. And it could not be a moral resurrection for which he was looking; for he had passed that change; and consequently he was striving to attain unto the resurrection of the righteous which no man will attain unto without thus striving.

Thus, in view of all the admissions of Professor Bush respecting the letter of the various texts favoring a literal resurrection, and the arguments he has used to prove their figurative use, we are more than ever convinced that the resurrection of the body is not only not disproved by the argument from reason, but that it is most emphatically a doctrine of the Old Testament.

#### THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

After endeavoring to establish that the literal predictions of the Old Testament were only an "adumbration" of a "moral



quickening," and making the whole subject as *shadowy* as possible, he comes to the conclusion that this doctrine is only "darkly intimated" there; and then proceeds to test the "*elasticity*" of the "import" of the language of the New Testament. As he has made the question so "obscure," he argues, that Christ's great mission would be to "bring *life* and *immortality* to light;" and proceeds to the question, "in what manner the Divine Teacher would *be apt* to promulgate to the Jews," the "doctrine of man's future existence." And as he presumes the Jews knew very little of the doctrine, although our Savior *might* have taught differently, yet he argues that

"The revelations of his word have mainly a moral bearing, and the presumption would doubtless be, in the present case, that the doctrine would be conveyed not so much in the terms of scientific verity—in the technical phrase of a strict and accurate physiology—as in a popular diction that would declare the main fact in an intelligible way, and clothe it with the highest practical efficiency, while at the same time it fell short of scientific exactness."—p. 143.

Now, instead of having "recourse to *a priori* considerations," how Christ "would *be apt*" to communicate instructions, in deciding the import of the instructions he did communicate; we should examine his actual teachings, and judge therefrom how he *did inculcate* truths. But if *we* should reason "*a priori*," we should conclude that he would speak the *truth*. And if he taught "in an *intelligible* way," we should expect he would use language according to its usual acceptation at the time he taught: for otherwise they could have had no "intelligible" ideas of its true import. Again, if his mission was to "bring life and immortality to light," we should expect his teachings would be enveloped in no shadowy and obscure diction: for that would be darkening counsel by words without knowledge. *We* should therefore conclude that as a Divine Teacher, he would speak to men in the language of men, so that those who sat on the green grass, the sea-shore, or on the mountain top listening to his instructions, would not be necessitated to carry symbolical dictionaries under their arms, to enable them to understand the import of his teachings;—but that his teachings would be so plain and simple that none need misunderstand him.

Professor Bush next argues, that the "import of the word resurrection, as used in the New Testament," is "simply that of a future existence. He then proceeds to a consideration of



## "THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST."

As the doctrine of the resurrection of the saints is based upon the resurrection of Christ, it becomes necessary, in disproving a material resurrection, to prove that Christ did not arise "in his material body:"—as Professor Bush says, "As he in his risen body; stands at the head of his saints, so the fact of his resurrection occupies a like relation to the fact of theirs." He admits "the *fact*" "of his emergence from the sepulchre on the third day;" and also that "if he actually rose in his *material* body—in the self same body in which he was crucified—it doubtless affords some countenance to the idea that his people are also to rise in like manner in the bodies which they laid down at death." Yet even then he thinks "his resurrection is to be regarded as a pledge," and not "as a *pattern* of their resurrection;" because "his body did not see corruption, while theirs do."

The bodies of all will not see corruption. Those who may die three days before their resurrection, will not. But it is their bodies that are not to be in *death* like his, and which in the resurrection are to be made like his glorious body. But to his argument. And

1st, he argues, that it is nowhere explicitly affirmed, "that the identical material body of Christ arose." And

2d, "that the same body which arose, ascended;" but "that it was not a material body that ascended."

As he has offered no particular proof on this point, we proceed to the next consideration.

3d. That the manner of his appearing to his disciples indicates a spiritual body.—He entered and stood in their midst when the *doors were shut*; and they were terrified and affrighted, thinking they saw a *spirit*, &c.

Now although Christ *convinced* the disciples that he was *not a spirit*, saying, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not *flesh* and *bones* as *ye see me have*;"—showed them the "print of the nails" and his wounded "side," and "eat" with them "broiled fish" and a "honey comb;" yet Professor Bush recognizes in it only, "*a miraculous adaptation of the visible phenomena to the outward senses of the disciples.*" His eating, he thinks "was doubtless an *optical act*"—"appearing to eat," to convince the disciples of his "identity." The Scriptures, however, affirm that he "*did eat* before them."



Now our Savior either "did eat," or he intentionally *deceived* his disciples by *calling* for "meat," and *appearing* to eat, which, when they were watching him with such intense interest, would have been a *trick* of the veriest *jugglery*, a feat of legerdemain. But he could have had no possible object in thus deceiving them: for if they do not eat in the resurrection he could as easily have stated that fact, as that they do not marry in the resurrection. And they were already convinced of his "identity." Therefore, to *dupe* them by *pretending* to eat, would be derogatory to his character.

By the same process of reasoning, we might conclude that all the circumstances of Christ's birth and life were only "a miraculous adaptation of the visible phenomena to the outward senses" of the Jews. Thus, we might deny his incarnation, as well as his resurrection. His fasting forty days, his walking on the sea, his being transported from the temple to the mountain, and his transfiguration, would as soon demonstrate that he never possessed a material body, as do the arguments which are adduced to prove that he did not rise with such. All his miracles might also be explained away as "optical acts;" and even his crucifixion might be regarded as an "appearance." Such, however, was not the faith of the early Christians. Says Ignatius, a disciple of John the Evangelist, and a martyr, Christ "was condemned, was crucified, truly, not seemingly, nor in appearance, nor by deception, he died truly, and was buried, and was raised from the dead."

If Professor Bush lays so little stress upon a positive declaration here, we wonder that he should lay any stress upon his objection, that it is no where positively said his body was raised!!! Doubting Thomas rendered himself proverbial for his unbelief. Yet no one will question that he was finally *fully satisfied* that he beheld and handled the identical body that was nailed to the cross. But it would seem, from the reasoning of Professor Bush, that had *he* been one of the twelve, the unbelief of Thomas would have been entirely eclipsed. We will suppose the Professor had been present; would the Savior have convinced him as he did Thomas? Certainly not. He would have required some more "philosophical" evidence, than merely handling the Savior, beholding the identical wounds by which he died, or the positive declaration, that "*a spirit hath not flesh and bones AS YE SEE ME HAVE.*" Nor would his *eating* have been any evidence; it would be only an *optical* delusion! How then



could he be convinced, while rejecting the evidence of all his senses? Alas! can he regard all this as only an *appearance*?

But shall we regard the difficulty of his entering the room, when the door was shut, as counterbalancing all these evidences? We have no evidence that the same body may not be raised, and yet be so changed in its capacities, as not to be deterred by obstacles which would have prevented ingress, while in the mortal state. And, also, it is evident that the fact of the doors being shut, is recorded, not that it is so wonderful that he entered while they were closed, as that they were in great fear of the Jews, and therefore met with closed doors. It is therefore possible he made his ingress in the usual way. But *if* his eating was only an *appearance* of eating, might not his entrance with closed doors have been only an *appearance*? That "rule" ought surely to work both ways. Or might not the disciples have been so engaged as not to observe the manner of his entrance, beholding him first in their midst? But, says the Professor, our "Lord did not ascend in a material body," and therefore it was not raised or "he must have put it off, either at the ascension itself, or at some time previous, during the forty days of his sojourning on earth, of the proof of which we have not the slightest trace, except what is involved in the hypothesis itself." But we might add, that "we have not the slightest trace" of evidence, that his material body did not ascend. He has as yet presented none.

Another objection he adduces is, that Mary mistook Christ for a gardener, so that he must have had on the garments of one, while his own clothes had been divided among the soldiers, and his grave clothes lay wrapped together. "Whence then, did he obtain his garments?"

We may not know how he obtained them; and yet they might have been obtained in a thousand ways, without the resort to a miracle; or they might have been miraculously furnished. But as God has not seen fit to reveal this to us, it can be no ground of objection, unless it can be *proved* that there could have been no possible way of obtaining them. But there is no evidence that Mary supposed he was a gardener from his dress. She was overwhelmed with sorrow and grief, supposing that her Lord had been taken away, she knew not where; and seeing a man in the garden, she concluded at once he was the gardener. And while weeping,



on hearing the word Mary fall from the Savior's lips, "she turned herself" and at once recognized the Lord. But, says Professor Bush,

"We are still firm in the belief, that the impression is far more spontaneous, that the whole was miraculous, the *apparent* body as well as the *apparent* garb."—p.156.

Such is his confidence in the *elasticity* of the import of language! He then argues that he appeared in different forms, ascended several times to heaven during the forty days, &c. &c., as proof of his spiritualism. But if his material body could ascend *once*, it *might* many times; and therefore, even if he could establish those propositions, which are *far* from being *demonstrated*, we cannot see that it would affect the materiality of his body.

He thinks "the body which hung upon the cross was miraculously dissolved or resolved into its primitive elements, like that of Elijah when he was translated. But this is only an assumption respecting Elijah. We nowhere read of Elijah's body falling down from mid-heaven upon the head of Elisha, as it must have done had it been dissipated only by "natural causes," by which Professor Bush argues God usually labors. It was only his mantle that Elisha saw fall. If his body was parted from him in his ascent, there would have been some propriety in the request of the sons of the prophets to go and seek for it, "lest, peradventure, the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up, and cast him upon some mountain or into some valley."—2 Kings ii. 16.

The translation of Elijah must have been of the same character as was that of Enoch; and we are expressly told, Heb. xi. 5, that he "was translated that he should not *see death*; and was not found, *because* God had translated him." Now if in being translated his spiritual body was eliminated from his corporeal system, and its material dissipated into invisibility, he must as much have tasted of death, although in a different manner, as any do who die: for, according to Professor Bush's hypothesis, on the death of each person there is a like spiritual body eliminated and disconnected from the grosser material. The reason that Enoch "was not found" was, "because God had translated him." Now if the ascent to heaven of his material body was not necessary, his translation would have been no reason for the absence of his body; that might have still remained. But that reason being given, proves its ascension also. He says:—



“ We may admit indeed that the disciples supposed that the body which they saw and handled, was the veritable body of their crucified Lord, and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea than that of the re-animation of his body of flesh.”—p. 165.

This is admitting that the resurrection of the body was a part of the faith once delivered to the saints, and for which we are commanded earnestly to contend.

But if there was no necessary connection between the disappearing of his body from the tomb, and his resurrection, why should it have been removed from the sepulchre? why not suffered to moulder away by the effect of “*natural causes?*”

Ah, they might have “*worshipped his body!*” Why then did they not worship it during the “*three days?*” But, he asks:—

“ How could they have been adequately convinced of his being actually alive, of his ascension and glorification, while they could, at any time, by going there, have seen him with the eye of sense, dead in the tomb? How much, moreover, would the ministry of the first preachers of the Gospel have been embarrassed in the proclamation of the great fact of the resurrection, if his body had remained visible, or the mode of its removal been commonly known? Could the Jewish or Gentile gainsayer be expected to yield credence to the declaration, that Jesus had risen from the dead, and was still alive, when both his tomb and his body could at any time be pointed out, as yet remaining with them?”—p. 167.

We agree with the Professor, that had his body remained, the disciples could not have been convinced, nor could they have convinced others of his resurrection; and this is conclusive proof that in teaching the resurrection, they taught the *resurrection of the body*. If the resurrection is only the elimination of the inner from the outer man at death,—if it is barely a *future existence*, the presence of the body would have been no hindrance in the way of convincing men of its truth: the Jews believed in that already; but they were grieved because they taught the resurrection of the dead. Even the refined Athenians, to whom Paul preached in “*the midst of Mars-hill,*” did not reject the doctrine of a future state; but “*when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked;*” and all thought it a “*strange thing*” he brought to their ears. We read in Luke xxiv. 3—6, when they went to the sepulchre “*and found not the body of the Lord Jesus,*” they “*were much perplexed thereabout;*” and the angels relieved their perplexity about the *body*, by assuring them, “*he is not here, but is risen.*” If the body was not risen, there was no pertinency in the answer the angels gave.



It, therefore, is evident, that the angels also believed in the resurrection of the body. Again we read, that the only answer the Jews could make to the fact of Christ's resurrection, was, that "his disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept."—Matt. xxviii. 13. They argued that the disciples, to make them believe in Christ's resurrection, stole away his body. Professor Bush argues, that God stole away his body, to induce the disciples to believe it!! But Christ died to bring life and immortality to light.—All but the Sadducees were already satisfied of a future existence.—The result was, that those who received this light, embraced fully the belief of the resurrection of the body. But if the body is not raised, he shrouded the whole question in still grosser darkness. Consequently the death and resurrection of Christ fully establishes the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

The question of the resurrection of Christ's body seems to be fully settled by Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 1—8. He affirms that the "faith" which they "received," and by which they were to be saved, was, that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Now the spiritual body, in which Professor Bush supposes Christ was eliminated from his crucified body, could not have been buried; for, upon his hypothesis, it emerges from the physical structure at death. Consequently, when it is said, "Christ died and was buried," it can only have reference to his flesh which was not to see corruption; and, therefore, when it is said he rose again, it must include the flesh that was buried. It is this which must have arisen the third day; for if his resurrection pertained only to what was eliminated at death, he would have risen the first day, even before his burial! But Paul affirms, that "he was buried," and "he"—i. e., what was buried, "rose again the third day." His promise to the thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise"—the world of spirits—proves that his Divinity, the uncreated Word, "whose goings forth have been from everlasting," (Micah v. 2,) was not laid in the grave: but "his soul was not left in *Hades*, neither did his flesh see corruption:" both were raised again on the third day.

The evidence of the elimination of a spiritual body from his material body at death, would not have depended upon its subsequent visibility. And yet Paul here rests the evi-



dence of it entirely upon the fact, that "he," who was buried, "was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve," and after that "of above five hundred brethren at once," after that of "James," then "of all the apostles," and "last of all," Paul says, "he was seen of me also." Now if his body was not raised, and they saw nothing but an *apparition*, all this testimony of his being *seen*, is entirely irrelevant, and no proof at all of his resurrection; so that he may still not be raised, upon Professor Bush's hypothesis, as we have no evidence but this to the contrary.

"EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR PASSAGES" IN THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

Having satisfactorily disposed of the resurrection of Christ, Professor Bush proceeds to dispose of the resurrection of the saints. The first portion of Scripture he *adumbrates*, is that in 1 Cor. xv. 12—53. He first premises,—to which we agree,—that the resurrection here spoken of "*pertains exclusively to the righteous.*" Respecting verses 12 and 13, he argues, that if they refer to a *future* resurrection, Paul reasons "in a circle." He cannot see how "the future resurrection of the saints is proved by the *past* resurrection of Christ," or how "the *past* resurrection of Christ, is proved by the *future* resurrection of his people." But if it "takes place with every individual believer as soon as he leaves the body," "this logical inconsistency is avoided."

Is it not very evident that the Professor has here misapprehended Paul's argument? The argument seems to be this: If *none* of the dead are raised, Christ cannot be raised. If *one* is raised, it cannot be true that there is *no* resurrection of the dead. Therefore, "if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of the dead? But if there be *no* resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen:" for *no* resurrection would preclude *all*, so that even Christ could not be raised. If the question in dispute was a future existence, there would be *no logic* about it. For Professor Bush admits that Christ's *actual* spiritual body was *invisible*, and that all the disciples saw was only an *appearance*. If so, they did not have a particle of proof that Christ was risen; and, therefore, it would not prove the dead would rise. But as a future existence was not disputed by the Jews, the resurrection of the body alone could be the subject of controversy.



Verses 16—18. The Professor comments upon the 18th verse, "Then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" and asks how that follows, "provided there was no resurrection of the body? Their *souls*, the true constituent of *themselves*, were certainly in being, and what should prevent their *souls* being saved, even if their bodies did not rise?"—p. 170.

Professor Bush would not have asked these questions, had he attended closely to Paul's *logic*. We read in Rom. iv. 25, that Christ "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." If, therefore, Christ was not raised, no flesh could be justified in the sight of God, and all must perish. The wicked will perish; and if no flesh could be justified, all would be left to experience their fate: for they would still be in their sins. So Paul argues in the 17th verse of the chapter under consideration, which Professor Bush passed over without comment. Says Paul, "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." "Then"—that is, consequently,—arriving at a conclusion predicated upon the proposition, that if Christ is not raised, "ye are yet in your sins,"—"they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. Why? *Ans.*—They would still be in their sins.

On verses 20—23, he contends, that the idea is not that Christ rose first in point of *time*; but the first in *rank*. And that every man's rising "in his own order," is, "as he dies,"—all along through time. But Paul has himself shown us what he means by "every man in his own order,"—the last part of that text being exegetical of the former. He explains it as, "Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Professor Bush argues, as the harvest comes immediately after the first fruits, that a long time could not elapse between the resurrection of Christ and that of his redeemed. But we reply, the harvest is not continued all through the year: it is reaped at the appropriate time. And as the antitype is greater than the type, so may the time between be proportionally greater. We are told that the harvest is at the end of the world; but Professor Bush would extend the harvest, even from the beginning!

Verses 35—37. "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain; it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain."



When St. Paul wrote the prediction of the above questions which would be asked respecting the resurrection of the body, it is to be presumed that he little suspected questions so similar would be asked by a learned Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in the New York city University !! Says St. Paul, some man will say, "How are the dead raised up?" Says Professor Bush, "How—in what sense—are these bodies to be raised?"—p. 49.—"How is the body to be forthcoming at the appointed time?"—p. 52. Says St. Paul, some man will say, "With what body do they come?" Says Professor Bush, "What body is to be raised?"—p. 37. "It leaves us under the irresistible prompting to inquire, what body?" "What body is intended?"—p. 55. These, and similar questions which we find frequently propounded throughout the work, have so striking a resemblance to the questions Paul predicted would be asked, that one given to *fanciful* interpretations of Scripture, might suppose them a fulfillment of that prediction. But we only set it down as a "striking coincidence." St. Paul may be considered by some to be rather indecorous in the answer he gives to Professor Bush and others who ask questions of this nature. But Paul was not probably aware of the extent to which "science" would disprove the "letter" of the Scriptures, or how "elastic" their "import" might be found; and as he could not have had Professor Bush within the scope of his prophetic vision, he must be excused for any seeming disrespect. And, we can assure the Professor, that according to his own rule it is only "*apparent.*" But should any contend that the legitimate construction of the text necessitates us to such an application, we would remind them that the Professor has already shown that when the body of Christ was dissipated in the sepulchre and resolved into its original elements, the apostles were actually so *fool-ish*, they really "*supposed* that the body which they saw and handled, was the veritable body of their crucified Lord, and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea than that of the re-animation of his body of flesh,"—p. 165, and actually supposed they saw him eat. And, also, that sometimes Paul's "reasoning, so to speak, does not rise above the surface of the ground.—p. 176, and "is little more than mere reasoning in a circle."—p. 170. He also says, in reference to the selection of the germinating of a grain of wheat, as illustrative of the resurrection, that

"In the *present state* of our scientific knowledge, it might perhaps appear that an analogy drawn from insect transmutations would have been still more striking; but *it may be questioned* whether the facts in this province of nature *were known* to the *apostle*, and at any rate, the law of vegetable re-production to which he refers, is sufficiently apropos to his main design."—p. 175.

Paul being thus shown to be *deficient* in knowledge himself, the Professor might retort the same epithet upon the apostle.

The inference which Professor Bush draws from these texts is, that

"Nothing is more certain, than that the apostle intended distinctly to teach, that as the grain of wheat obtains a new body only by previously dying, so man, by undergoing a similar process, becomes possessed in like manner of a new investment." "In regard to the grain, he affirms, 'Thou sowest not the body that shall be.' What is the correlative to this, unless it be, that the body that dies is not the same body that shall be at, or after the resurrection?"—p. 179.

To this we reply, that in a certain sense, the body is not the same: it is changed—is remodeled. And that this is all he means by its not being the same, is evident from the next verse, where he says, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and *to every seed HIS OWN BODY.*" Professor Bush presents a long argument respecting the germination of seeds, and shows that the body cannot thus *sprout*,—having no "*Luz—ossiculum Luz*"\* by which to germinate, no unbroken "link of connection between it and the resurrection body," &c.; therefore,

"As the plant emerges from the seed by the expansion of the germ, by the uninterrupted action of the vital principle, so the spiritual body must develop itself immediately, by the continuous operation of a like agency?"—p. 180.

All this is upon the supposition that the resurrection, if the body is raised, depends upon some germinating principle in the buried dust. But this has been fully answered in the review of that part of the argument which is derived from reason. We will here only observe, that if he would thus closely press the comparison, he would be obliged to admit that the body raised is a material body, and of the same nature as the one deposited in the ground.

Verses 38—41. "A moment's reflection," says Professor Bush, "will convince us that by 'giving to every seed his own body,' is meant nothing

---

\* "The Jewish name for a bone which they supposed was in every human body, immortal and indestructible."



more than his *giving to every seed a body peculiar to that kind of seed.* A seed of wheat does not produce a stalk of barley, nor a seed of barley a stalk of wheat. The species are kept distinct by a mysterious arrangement of Providence." And, therefore, as there are different kinds of bodies, "man may have a different body fitted to the different state in which he enters at death,"—and "though the natural body should rise no more, yet provision has been made for his being furnished with a better in its stead; for as there is an earthly body adapted to an earthly life, so there is a heavenly body adapted to a heavenly life."—p. 183.

But if a seed of barley cannot produce a stalk of wheat, how can a material body produce an ethereal one? It must certainly be like the one sown, but adapted to its future condition.

Verses 42—44. Professor Bush argues that the *sowing* referred to, is not "by being deposited in the grave;" but that "it is sown at its *birth*, and not at its *death*." Also, that this is not a "resurrection of *the* body, although it is doubtless of *a* body." He further adds:—

"But to our mind it is clear, that the fact of its being *incorruptible*, proves that it cannot be the same with that which is *corruptible*, and that nothing now is meant than that the corruptible shall be *exchanged* for the incorruptible, the mortal for the immortal."—p. 187.

Upon this principle, the seed is *planted* when it is formed in the head of the stalk, and not when it is deposited in the ground! The language of the text is to us very positive, that IT which is sown will be raised. But may not that which is corruptible become incorruptible? The apostle assures us, that we shall all be *changed*,—not "*ex*-changed;" and when this change has passed upon us, we shall no more be the corruptible body we now are, than is the diamond the easily pulverized body it would be, if in the form of charcoal, although it would be the same material.

Verses 50—53. "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Says Professor Bush:—

"We here encounter a great difficulty in view of our previous position, that the true resurrection takes place at the death of every individual believer, when he emerges from a material into a spiritual body. Is it not clearly implied, not to say expressly asserted, in this passage, that the resurrection of all the righteous is simultaneous, and that this event is still future, to occur at the epoch of the second advent, and in conjunction with the translation of the living saints?"

We can of course have no object in denying or disguising the fact, that these words have very much the air of directly contravening the general tenor of our interpretation of the preceding portions of this chapter. Still, if our previous train of reasoning be sound—if our conclusions be fairly sustained by the evidence adduced—it is certain that these words, *rightly understood*, cannot be in conflict with them."—pp. 190, 191.

Would it not have been more logical to have remarked, that if our previous reasoning *had been* sound, these words would not have been in conflict with it? For one rule which we have adopted, is, that if any theory is contradicted by the literal rendering of a single text, it must be fallacious; and that a scriptural view of any subject will harmonize with the entire word of God. Professor Bush is, however, "so strongly persuaded of the truth of" his "previous conclusions," that his "confidence in them is no wise shaken by the literal reading of a passage, which seems at first view to enforce entirely another theory."—p. 191.

He then endeavors to justify his position, by showing that the Jews were looking to the period "called 'the last day'—'the world to come'—'the reign of the Messiah,' when a new order of things was to be ushered in, among which was to be the event, denominated *the resurrection of the dead*," when there would be "an indefinite period of peace, prosperity, and happiness, from the rising to the going down of the sun,"—that this forms "the burden of a multitude of the Old Testament prophecies," which the Jews "applied to his first advent," but which we know "belong to his second." He then proceeds:—

"Now it is unquestionable that our Lord, in predicting his second coming, Matt. 24 and 25, does in reality announce, in accordance with Dan. vii. 15—28, the same great era, though it is essentially interwoven with the tissue of his predictions respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, and that *appearing* which was to take place during the life time of the men of that generation."—p. 192.

He farther argues that our Lord's predictions are "but the application of numerous Old Testament prophecies," and "were the foundation of all the knowledge which the apostles possessed respecting the Lord's second coming;" and adds:—

"Thus the remarkable passage, 1 Thess. iv. 15—17, is but a paraphrase of Christ's prediction, Matt. xxiv. 29—34, whence he introduces it by stating, 'This we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*.' Consequently, if the true meaning of the symbolic language in which our Lord delivered his predictions, was not made known to the apostles, of which their writings afford no evidence, they would naturally interpret them according to the letter, and suppose a speedy fulfillment." "What then more nat-



ural, nay, unless expressly informed to the contrary, what more inevitable, than that they should have cherished the expectation, that they should themselves behold the Lord appear in the clouds of heaven, and be themselves caught up to meet him in the air."—p. 193.

He then quotes Gibbon as saying, that the "primitive church" were "in their day," expecting the "literal fulfillment" of these prophecies. He also quotes from Dr. Watts an argument to show from the writings of the apostles, that "they imagined the day of resurrection and judgment was very near;" and therefore, "labored under a mistake on that point,"—not understanding the full import of all the Holy Spirit spake by them. But, says Professor Bush:—

"We contend," "that it does not truly detract from Paul's claims to inspiration, that he should not have understood what was not revealed, or that he should have so stated what was revealed, as to evince that he had, in some respects, mistaken its true purport—that he should have put upon it a sense which we now know to be erroneous."—p. 197.

In the above quotations it is admitted that the apostles understood the advent of Christ to be literal and personal, and that such a coming was the faith delivered to the saints. But we find no evidence presented that the language in which those predictions are clothed, is otherwise than strictly *literal*. Or that the apostles were *mistaken* in the nature of the advent, or as he claims, that that was at the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor do we find evidence that the apostles were looking for his second coming in their day. All the various texts spoken by our Lord or his apostles, that refer to that event as being then near, it will be seen by an examination of their context, were spoken in reference to other events which were previously to transpire; and when they should have been fulfilled, the advent would *then* be "quickly," in "a little while," &c., &c. The over-looking of this simple fact, has led many into the error of supposing that the apostles believed the second advent would be in their day—although some of these very persons believe the apostles taught one thousand years must transpire before the Lord could come! But Peter assures us that the Lord had showed him how he must put off this tabernacle; and Paul affirms that that day will not come, except the Man of sin be revealed—the Papacy. While, therefore, we admit the primitive church believed in the event as near, there is no evidence that the apostles were of the same opinion.

The Professor then argues that

"The apostle in the present instance, discloses the grand fundamental fact, that at the time to which the Holy Spirit refers, there should be a

translation of the living saints." "But we have no evidence that the precise time of this event was any where made known, and therefore it was to be expected that Paul should assign it to that epoch which he supposed to be intended when our Savior said, that 'this generation shall not pass away till all these things shall be fulfilled.'"—p. 199.

Now there is as much evidence that the connection of this change with Christ's appearing is the teaching of inspiration, as that the change itself is. The phrase, "this generation," by which it is assumed that Christ's coming was during the generation then living, we are satisfied affords no proof of the kind. In the 24th of Matt. where this famous text is found, the context shows us that our Savior had given to his disciples a prediction extending to his advent. He then gives them the signs which were to precede his coming, and which were to be after the long tribulation of those days of persecution which commenced at the destruction of Jerusalem, and extended through the Papal persecutions. Thus having taken the disciples in prophetic vision, down to the very signs which were to indicate his coming and the end of the world, he assures them that "this generation"—the generation of which he was last speaking—"will not pass away" until all is fulfilled. This is the only exposition we have seen that would harmonize that chapter with itself; and this view of it harmonizes with St Paul's connection of the Advent with the translation of the living saints. But says the Professor:—

"We well know by what criticisms upon the word 'generation,' it is attempted to rebut the force of the natural construction, and make it harmonize with an accomplishment that should first ensue hundreds or thousands of years after the life-time of the disciples. But after all, it is impossible to explain away the native and genuine import of the phrase."—p. 199.

It is really amusing, to see how *suddenly* the Professor has become a great stickler for "*the native and genuine import of the phrase.*" He entirely rejects what he himself admits to be the "native and genuine import" of Paul's assertion, that this change is to be at Christ's appearing; and also the letter of the Scriptures whenever they speak of the resurrection; but lo, here we must abide by the *native import*—because his construction of it makes Christ's advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But if, as Professor Bush says, the word "fulfilled" should rather be, "begin to occur," why, upon his own reasoning, may not Christ's advent—one of the last events in that prediction—be "after a long tract of



centuries," as well as the termination of the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, which the Professor thus locates in the future, and which in the prediction precedes that of the Advent? It may most certainly. And consequently, we must abide by Paul's construction.

Again, speaking of this change, he says:—

"It is to come to pass at the period so frequently alluded to in the prophets, as to be distinguished by something that is here termed the 'sounding of the last trumpet;' and as this is doubtless identical with the last in the series of the seven Apocalyptic trumpets, Rev. xi. 17, which announces the downfall of earthly dominion, and the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, it is clear that it cannot refer to what is technically termed 'the end of the world,' so far as that phrase is to imply the physical destruction of the globe. For the sounding of the seventh trumpet is not a signal of the *close*, but rather of the *commencement* of that last grand phasis of the kingdom of Christ, which is the theme of the most enrapturing strains of all the prophets.—p. 201.

He then contends that this "change" will be going on forever, and not be a "*simultaneous translation*;" but acting on all, as they are individually affected, "in the twinkling of an eye."

We need not inform Professor Bush that the "end of the world" in the Scriptures, is literally "the end of the age;" and that it is in this sense we use it. We, therefore, no more look for the end of the *globe* at the last trump, than does the Professor; and with him we admit, that it is the *commencement* of the "last phasis" of the "kingdom of Christ." But there are several difficulties in the way of understanding his conclusion that this change is not to be "*simultaneous*," but continuing indefinitely, which he sustains by no *evidence*. 1. The text positively asserts that "we shall all be changed" "at the last trump," which John explains to be, "when it shall begin to sound." 2. We are assured, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." And as this is the last phasis of this kingdom, no one can enter it until they have passed this change. Consequently there will, during its continuance, be no subjects for this change, so that they must all be changed at its commencement. 3. The apostle, in another place, makes a distinction between those "who sleep," and "we who are alive and remain," who will "not sleep." Upon the Professor's hypothesis of the spiritual body, there can be no distinction made between the living and the dead: for all finally sleep, and all are alike changed, and the commencement of this change, according to his own theory, would be fulfilling as much in all time before the last

trump, as afterwards. We must, therefore, notwithstanding all Paul's *fool*-ishness, abide by the exposition of the Apostle, in preference to that of the Professor. We, however, excepting the nature of the events, agree with the Professor in the following:—

"Nothing in our view is clearer than the events commonly assigned to what is termed, by one of the grossest philological errors, 'the end of the world,' i. e., as implying the physical conflagration of the globe, do, in fact, occur at the commencement, and not at the close of the grand Sabbathism of the world—for it has no close, i. e., none revealed."—p. 201.

On this point we cannot find room for a question, or a doubt. The whole scope of the Scriptures testify that the "resurrection," the "advent," the "conflagration," &c., are at the commencement of a new and more sublime *age*—"the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." We therefore argue that those who *spiritualize* the reign of Christ on earth, must, from the necessity of the case, deny any personal advent, *resurrection* of the dead, burning of the world, or final judgment. These are all intimately connected, and must be alike literal, or alike spiritual. Consequently the church, to be consistent, must embrace Professor Bush's views of the resurrection, or admit the Scriptural doctrine of the literal and personal pre-millennial advent of Christ and his reign on earth. We can see no escape from one of these conclusions, only by refusing to examine the question, or by refusing to admit the evidence.

Matt. v. 29, 30. He endeavors to escape the conclusion, that the body will be raised and cast into hell, by the argument that hell is only the emblem of hell, and not hell itself; and that if a part is emblematical, all is.

But if it was only an emblem, it must have been an emblem of a *reality*, and consequently the body must be raised to suffer there.

Matt. x. 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

He evades this *positive* declaration, by the assumption that

"Neither this, nor any other text, bearing upon the life after death, can be explained in disregard of the results which we have previously reached. If these results address themselves, upon their own evidence, with irresistible force to our convictions, it is impossible that the mind, constituted as it is, can receive a declaration in conflict with them. We admit, indeed, the possibility that our conclusions on this head may not be true. We would simply affirm, that *if they are true*, of which every one must judge for him-



self, they will imperatively govern our construction of particular passages which carry a contrary import in their letter."—p. 205.

This is very cavalierly disposing of the difficulty in this passage of Scripture. Upon this principle, the whole Bible might be set aside! and it is upon this principle that the infidel not only rejects the *letter*, but the *spirit* of the entire word—assuming that the declarations of reason are valid, and consequently set aside all opposing declarations of the word of God. We, however, trust we have shown that his argument from reason is inconclusive; and consequently it cannot affect the letter of this text.

Matt. xxii. 31, 32. "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

This he argues proves only that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were alive when God declared himself their God. And that as our Savior uses the resurrection as denoting a future state, it is in the other instances to be used in that sense. He also claims that a future state was the great truth the Sadducees denied, and that unless our Savior's answer had respect to that, it would be irrelevant.

It is true the Sadducees disbelieved in angel, spirit, a resurrection, or a future state. But as the Jews believed the saints did not enter heaven until the resurrection, but were until then in an intermediate state, the question which the Sadducees asked respecting the woman, whose wife of seven husbands she would be, could only have respect to the resurrection. And as they denied either "angel or *spirit*," the great difficulty to them in the way of the resurrection of the dead, was their disbelief in any existence after death, so that if the fathers were to be raised at all, it would be a new creation, and not a resurrection. But when God assured Moses that he was *then* the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, showing that they still lived,—as he is not the God of the dead but of the living—it set aside their great argument against the resurrection of the dead. There is, however, still farther evidence that the resurrection of their bodies is brought to view in this declaration. For God also assured Moses that he had established his "covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers."—Ex. vi. 4. And for them to inherit this land, they must be raised from the dead.

Matt. xxvii. 50—53. He argues that the bodies of the saints which here arose,

"Disappeared immediately upon what is termed their 'rising,' and were seen no more; for the supposition is to us utterly incredible that these material bodies were the objects beheld by those to whom the subsequent appearance was made."—p. 215.

"It was, in the main, an invisible resurrection of the saints."—p. 218.

"We do not suppose that, strictly speaking, they did now first arise."—*Ib.*

"The design was to put forth to the senses of men, a visible effect" of what "was going on in the spiritual world."—*Ib.*

The above are a strange mass of contradictions. They remind us of the "*oppositions* of science!" "Their bodies were raised to show what was going on in the invisible world; and yet their bodies vanished as soon as raised, and were not seen, and of course afforded no evidence of the act then transpiring; but there were *apparitions* which were taken for those bodies, and were an outward evidence of the spiritual resurrection; yet it was an *invisible* resurrection; and finally, 'strictly speaking,' there was no resurrection of any kind then taking place!" This, as near as we can analyze it, is the sum of the argument. And, "if it is sound reasoning," it is proof conclusive. Truly the Professor is reduced to great "extremities of solution!"

In answer to the question, Why, if the bodies did not *appear*, are they said to be raised? he replies that "the language of the Scriptures is constructed very much" "in reference to the impressions made on the senses." Therefore, as they appeared to be raised, it is so written! But we ask, why should there be such an appearance? He answers that the souls of departed saints enter heaven by the merits of Christ; and,—

"Was it not as important to bring their resurrection and glorification into connection with his, as it is to bring ours into that connection? And how could this be externally evidenced to living men, but by some visible effect produced upon their visible bodies? The simple *appearing* of spiritual bodies might indeed have tended to this result, but it would not carry with it that conviction which would arise from some obvious connection of the spiritual bodies with the material."—p. 219.

Now if their resurrection could only be evidenced to living men, by an *appearance* of the resurrection of the body, it proves that the body must be raised to produce a resurrection. For if the body is not raised, to produce an *appearance* to induce men to believe that it is raised in order to convince them of a spiritual resurrection, is a *deception*.



We therefore must dissent from the conclusion of our author, that this "affords no adequate proof of the general theory of the *resurrection of the body*, but rather the reverse." He farther remarks:—

"We are not without strong impressions that Peter's allusion to Christ's going and 'preaching to the spirits in prison' after he was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, will yet receive its solution from the very passage which we are now considering."—p. 219.

"The suggestion has occurred to us, that as the true sense of 'preaching' is simply 'proclaiming,' the idea might be, that the Savior's spirit went into the world of spirits, the common receptacle of the departed, and there simply *proclaimed* or *announced* the fact of his having conquered death in dying, and of his being about to accomplish a glorious resurrection, which should be available to consummate the hopes of the patriarchs and saints, who had died in the faith of a blessed immortality, which as it depended upon Christ's redemption-work, it could not be *fully* enjoyed until he had lived, died, risen, and ascended."—p. 220.

The first difficulty that suggests itself to the above is, How could the Savior proclaim that he had conquered death before his resurrection? His dying was certainly no proof of death's being conquered! Death was then the conqueror, and gained the victory over him. But when he arose from the dead and could not be holden by the "grim monster," then he could exclaim, "O death where is thy victory?"

We are, however, constrained to give an entirely different application of the words of Peter. He assures us that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit:" "by which also he went and preached unto the spirits [now] in prison;" i. e., he preached to them by the spirit. The question then is, When did he preach to them? Ans. Not while they were in prison, where they are bound in "chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment;"—but he preached to them by his Spirit when they were "disobedient" during their probation, "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing," and Noah, a preacher of righteousness was warning them of the approaching deluge.

But even if Professor Bush's explication of Peter was correct, it would not disprove the resurrection of the body.

John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which 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."

He says:—

"This is undoubtedly the strongest passage in the New Testament in favor of the common resurrection;" and "we cannot fail to perceive that



it is marked by a certain directness of enunciation, in respect to the general subject, which must be considered as strongly countenancing the construction which the Christian world has ever for the most part been led to put upon it."—p. 234.

His arguments against its literal acceptance, are

1. That our Lord "for the most part, speaks of" the resurrection "as the distinguishing privilege and prerogative of the righteous. Thus, Luke xx. 35, 36, 'But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children (sons) of God, *being the children (sons) of the resurrection.*' Here it is clear that the 'children of God,' are identified as the same with the 'children of the resurrection.' Again, Luke xiv. 12—14, when commanding his disciples to call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, to their feasts, he adds, 'And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just;*' as if the resurrection belonged emphatically to the just. In strict accordance with this, the apostle expresses himself, Phil. iii. 11, 'I by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection of the dead.*'"—p. 235.

Now all the force there is in the above objection, is in the *supposition* in accordance with the *modern* belief that the resurrection of the righteous and wicked are co-etaneous. And if the resurrection which all will attain unto is alluded to in these passages, they would be meaningless. The Bible, however, teaches no such co-etaneous resurrection of both classes.—It is everywhere in accordance with the faith of the primitive church, that "the dead in Christ will rise first"—that they will be raised, "Christ the first fruits, afterwards they which are his at his coming," &c. Even some of the very texts which have been examined, are rendered by Professor Bush as referring to the resurrection of the righteous only. So that there is a resurrection unto which the wicked cannot attain. Now if all are raised, how is this explained? It is by the fact that there are two resurrections,—that of the righteous, being distinguished as *The Resurrection*, which is the resurrection referred to in all such and kindred texts. In Rev. xx. 4—6, John says the martyrs, &c., "lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the *First Resurrection*. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *First Resurrection*: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." It is the rejection of this positive prediction, by which the true doctrine of the resurrection is here presented, that has given place to the idea that it is a simultaneous event with both classes. And



because there are so many passages which cannot be reconciled with its being a co-etaneous event, it is adduced as an argument for entirely rejecting the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. But with this view, those same texts become the strong bulwark of this doctrine.

2. His second consideration against the literal interpretation of this text, is "the cumulative mass of evidence, built upon rational and philosophical grounds" against *any* resurrection of the *body*; but which he dare not "by any means affirm" is conclusive. As we have seen its inconclusiveness, it ceases to "have weight."

He again brings forth the old objection that *all* the dead cannot issue from their graves, when "the clearest induction of reason" assures us that "millions of bodies," "once deposited in those graves are no longer there;" to believe which, he declares "is a downright crucifixion of reason." This objection, however, is not valid; for the text only asserts that "*all that are in the graves shall come forth.*" It is not "all shall come forth from graves," nor "all who were once in," but "all who are in." Instead of following the simple letter of the text, he adds to it what it does not assert, and then because this addition would "crucify reason to believe it," he rejects the text itself!

But he finds a new dilemma, that this "is not so much now a conflict between Revelation and Reason, as it is *an apparent conflict between one part of Revelation and another.*"—p. 237. He has, however, presented no portion of Revelation which conflicts with the text, so that we proceed to his

3d argument. This is the "*accommodation*" principle of interpretation, which accommodates the Bible to every absurdity imaginable. Upon this principle, he supposes the Savior is only quoting Dan. xii. 2; and he asks:—

"Why is it not sufficient to understand him as saying in effect, 'Marvel not at what I have just said, for the time is coming when the event predicted by the prophet Daniel, whatever or whenever it shall be, shall be accomplished, and that too through my agency, to whom the Father hath given a quickening power, however lightly my claims may now be regarded.'"—p. 240.

To us, that understanding is not sufficient, because we have seen no valid reasons given for it; and the plain letter of the text teaches something more positive and explicit.

John vi. 3, 9, 40. In these texts our Savior promises of

every one who believes in him, that "*I will raise him up at the last day.*" Says Professor Bush:—

"The same declaration in substance or in form, occurs v. 44, 54. It certainly denotes the resurrection of those who believed in him, and, according to the letter, a resurrection within the limits of a certain period, denominated here 'the last day.' An equivalent allusion to this day occurs, xii. 48, 'The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him *at the last day.*' That the expression is conformed to the usual mode in which the resurrection of the righteous was spoken of among the Jews, is also unquestionable. Still we cannot deem ourselves precluded from referring again to the principle, \* somewhat fully developed on a previous page, on which many things in our Lord's addresses to the Jews are to be interpreted. It cannot be denied that without sacrificing or compromising any substantial truth, he did still, on many occasions, adopt the style of his discourse to the notions then prevalent, and which were grounded in the main upon the *literal* record of their Scriptures. Although the traditional interpretations put upon these Scriptures were in many instances wrong, yet it obviously did not enter his purposes invariably to set his hearers right in respect to them. Nor can we conceive of his having done so without thereby shocking their prejudices to a degree that would have prevented their reception of his doctrines, not to remark that he could scarcely otherwise have made himself intelligible to them."—pp. 241, 242.

"When our Savior, for instance, says, Matt. xii. 27, 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?' are we to suppose that he intended to sanction the common belief, that such exorcisms were actually performed at that time by others than his own disciples? The conceit was rife among the people that such *was* indeed the case, and our Lord simply adopted the argument *ex concessis*, without intimating whether the popular belief had a ground of truth or not."—p. 244.

"So also in regard to the phrases 'world'—'world to come'—'end of the world'—there is no evidence that he did not employ them as they were generally understood. So in the present case we rest in the conclusion, that our Lord spake on the subject of the resurrection in accordance with the sentiments and the diction then prevalent, and that his words are not to be regarded as a criterion of the *absolute truth* of the current doctrine."—p. 245.

The Professor is certainly reduced to "great extremities of solution," in being necessitated to resort to such an expedient to obviate the literal import of this passage. He admits that here is literally predicted a resurrection of the body; that the Jews at that time understood by such a use of language a literal resurrection; that they believed in such a resurrection, and that this belief was founded upon the literal record of their Scriptures! And what more could be wished to prove the common view from this text? Oh, our Savior's words are not to be regarded as "*absolute truth*," because he could scarcely make "himself intelligible," and it would have been "shocking their prejudices" had he expressed himself

\* "The principle of accommodation."



otherwise than in accordance with what the Jews then believed!

But if Professor Bush can make himself "intelligible" in teaching the "resurrection," and make use of language in a manner so that no one would suspect that he believed or taught the resurrection of the body; might not Christ, who "spake as never man spake," have made himself equally "intelligible," in presenting the view that is presented in the volume under consideration, had it been the truth? No one certainly will claim that our Savior was not as able to express himself intelligibly as Professor Bush!

But he was fearful of shocking the prejudices of the people, and therefore did not correct their errors! We were not before aware that our Savior ever hesitated to proclaim the truth, however unwelcome it might be to them. He was no fawning sycophant, or flatterer of the Jew. Witness his fearful denunciations of their shameless hypocrisy!—Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! He denounced them as whited sepulchres, as the descendants of those who killed the prophets, as drawing nigh with their lips, while their hearts were far from God, as blind leaders of the blind, as a wicked and adulterous generation, as payers of tithes of anise, mint and cummin, and neglecters of the weightier matters of the law! &c.

Nor can it be true that he did not correct their errors of doctrine. They had no idea they were children of the devil; and yet he assured them such was the fact. He did not hesitate to declare unto them that they worshipped in vain, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," that they "made the word of God of none effect" by their traditions. That does not look like fearing to instruct them contrary to their belief! On the contrary, we are strongly persuaded, that in all his instructions, where his auditors entertained erroneous views, he aimed to correct them. Thus, when the disciples inquired of the destruction of the temple, his second coming and the end of the world, supposing they were all to transpire together, his immediate reply was, "Take heed that no man deceive you:" they were deceived in thus connecting all those events. When he told his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," and they thought "he had spoken of taking rest in sleep, then said Jesus to them plainly, Lazarus is dead." When he spoke of his death and resurrection under the figure of a temple, its being destroyed and raised up again



in three days, lest he should be misunderstood, it is recorded that "he spake of the temple of his body." And when the Sadducees inquired whose wife, of seven husbands a woman had been married to, she would be in the resurrection, he promptly responded, "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God;" and then he proceeds to inform them that in the resurrection they do not marry, but are as the angels. Now if he was fearful of shocking the prejudices of any, and therefore accommodated himself to their opinions; he would, when conversing with the Sadducees respecting the resurrection, have accommodated himself to their belief and taught there was no resurrection, nor angel or spirit; and thus, when instructing different classes, he would have taught different doctrines. But as he always taught the same doctrines, and never *accommodated* himself to the Sadducees, the inference is, that he always spoke the "*absolute truth*," irrespective of the opinions of his hearers.

But says the Professor, he accommodated himself to their opinions when he replied, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" But here our Savior did not assert that their children could cast out devils. He offered no opinion on that point; and therefore, such an illustration is not analogous to a positive declaration. When we are shown any declaration or positive statement, in which respect was had to the notions of the Jews, it will be time enough to admit the principle of "accommodation." But till then we must regard the clear enunciations of our Savior, as words of "*absolute truth*" and verity. Consequently when he affirms that he will raise up his children at the last day, we are constrained to believe that it will be even so.

John xi. 21—26. "This," says the Professor, "is a passage of a similar import with the preceding, and is to be construed on the same principle." It follows then that all which has been said on either side of the preceding passage, is applicable to this also. He argues that Martha "merely echoed the general sentiment of the age;" and though "our Lord does not, indeed, in so many words, assure her that her belief was founded upon an incorrect view of the truth," yet he "designed to correct something that was erroneous" in "her belief."—p. 246.

That which he would correct, seems to be that while Martha fully believed Lazarus would "rise at the last day," yet she had no clear conception that he could then, be raised.



Our Savior, however, convinced her of his ability to raise the dead, and thereby that he would fulfill his word and raise them at the last day, and also of his power to raise the dead at any time, by raising Lazarus when he had been dead four days.

Acts ii. 29—35. The scope of this passage, he contends, is that David is not exalted in the sense that Christ is, and that it has no reference to the resurrection of his body. But we would inquire, if that is the doctrine here taught, how the fact of David's sepulchre's being then with the Jews, could be any evidence of his not having ascended? We are strongly inclined to the belief that the Professor's *comparison* must be very much larger than his *causality* to induce him thus to reason from *cause* to *effect*, if there could be no possible connection between the body of David and his ascension into heaven. If the apostles thus reasoned, they must have been strange logicians!

Acts xxiv. 14, 15. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

The Professor asks:—

"First, upon what authority does Paul affirm that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection, 'both of the just and the unjust?' Secondly, supposing the assertion to be well founded, how are his words to be construed in consistency with what we assume to be the true doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject?"

In answer to the first, he endeavors to show that the Pharisees *did not* all believe in the resurrection of the wicked; and yet he brings no *positive* testimony to that effect. He quotes Josephus as saying:—

"They (the Pharisees) also believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again.' (J. A. L. 18. c. 1.) Again, 'They say that all souls are incorruptible; but that the soul of the good man only passes into another body, while that of the wicked is subject to eternal punishment.' (J. W. L. 2. c. 8.)"—p. 252.

There is, however, in the above, no such positive declaration that they believed the wicked would never be raised, as Professor Bush would demand for proof that the righteous will be. He then shows from various texts and other quotations, that *the* resurrection was considered as only the portion



of the righteous; but we have shown, we trust, that the resurrection of the righteous is thus termed by way of distinction, to denote its priority and superiority to that of the wicked. But he admits that some of the Pharisees thus believed, and that "of this fact the apostle, in the passage before us, doubtless takes advantage." We, however, are fully satisfied with Paul's opportunities of knowing the opinions of the Pharisees,—having been himself one of the "straitest sect," brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; and we have the fullest confidence in his veracity; so that what he says respecting their faith, we have no hesitation in believing.

As to his second question, he concludes that,—

"There can be no doubt that he would conform his averments to those of Christ. These, we have already seen, when considered in the letter, announced, in some cases, the resurrection of the wicked as well as that of the righteous."—p. 255.

He then applies the same principles of explanation to the language of Paul, that he does to the language of the Savior. So that what we have remarked respecting that, is applicable to this also.

Before we leave this passage, we will quote an extract Professor Bush makes from Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew:—

"If you have met with certain persons, called Christians, who do not confess this, but have the boldness to blaspheme the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that immediately on death the soul is received up into heaven, do not consider them as Christians, any more than, properly speaking, you would give the name of Jews to the Sadducees, and other heretical sects. . . . I, however, and as many as are altogether orthodox, believe that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a millennium in Jerusalem restored, adorned, and enlarged, according to the predictions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets."—p. 253.

Professor Bush quotes the above to show that "in that early age there were some who came very near" entertaining the same views as he himself does. It, however, cannot be very flattering to him, that such should be called "heretics" and unworthy the name of "Christians," by the saints to whom the faith was once delivered! He refers to it as "gleams of truth" appearing even in that early age; but we find a "gleam" of the same faith at a still earlier age, when "Hymeneus and Philetus" taught "the resurrection is past already," which overthrew "the faith of some."

Nothing is more clear than that the Jews and early Christ-



ians believed that the saints do not enter heaven at death, but are waiting for the resurrection, for the consummation of their hopes. It is only a modern belief that locates the saints in heaven soon after death. And it is this very *error* that is the ground-work of the denial of the resurrection of the body. For if the soul at death enters the full enjoyment of the heavenly kingdom, all are ready to inquire the need of a resurrection?—why should the glorified saint leave the joys of heaven, to enter again the body laid aside at death? And such questions would be pertinent. But when it is seen that the crowns of the saints are deferred to the last day, that their inheritance is reserved in heaven ready to be revealed in the last time; then the resurrection is seen in all its glory, as an object of desire to every saint, living or dead.

Rom. viii. 10, 11. "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But 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."

This he understands to refer "to the spiritual quickening of the body by the vitalizing influence of the Holy Ghost in the present life." His reasons are, 1. The Holy Spirit is here said to quicken; "but a literal resurrection of the dead, even supposing it taught at all, is not elsewhere attributed to the Spirit. 2. That "mortal" signifies "tending to death" but not dead, so that on this theory the apostle would say, "God shall raise to life your living dead bodies," and 3, "This interruption destroys the continuity of the apostle's discourse." —p. 257.

We can see no force in this last objection; for, to us, the doctrine of the resurrection is intimately connected with the subject of his discourse. As to the word "mortal," it is true that it denotes "tending to death;" but the apostle did not affirm they would be raised *while mortal*. The sense is evidently that these "mortal bodies" we now inhabit, after they are dead, will again be quickened by the Holy Spirit. His first objection is also equally invalid. For frequent mention is made of the resurrection by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Christ himself was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," 1 Pet. iii. 18. In Rev. xi. 11, the "two witnesses" are raised by the Spirit of life from God entering in to them. "Except a man be born of the Spirit," which we understand is complete only in the resurrection, "he cannot



enter the kingdom of God."—John iii. 5. And in Ezekiel xxxvii. 14, it is said the whole house of Israel are to be brought out of their graves, by God's putting his Spirit in them, that they may live.

Romans viii. 22, 23. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

Professor Bush contends that the word "*body*" in this text, denotes the "collective body of the saints;" and that otherwise the apostle would have said "the redemption of our *bodies*." And also that "this is to be the realized consummation of the Christian's hopes, that to which they are all to come as one redeemed, regenerated, sanctified *body*"—"their common inheritance." He says:—

"We believe, moreover, that the apostle in adopting the phraseology had his eye on the parallel expression in Isaiah xxvi. 19,—'Thy dead men shall live, together with my (i. e. our) dead body shall they rise.' But it does not follow that he intended by such a tacit reference, to suggest the true exposition of that text."—p. 259.

We see nothing in this to disprove its application to the resurrection of the body. Paul's use of the term "*body*" in the singular number, does not *prove* that he had reference to the "collective body of the saints." Even "ourselves, [each one of us] "which have the first fruits of the Spirit," "groan within ourselves," "waiting [individually] for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." But suppose it has reference to "the collective body of the saints," might it not as well apply to their *resurrection*, as to their *etherealization*? He admits this state is "identical" with "the manifestation of the sons of God"—their final state.

2 Cor. v. 2—4. "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not because we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

Here his argument is, that "the house from heaven for which the apostle longed, is the same with the 'spiritual body' of which he speaks, 1 Cor. xv. 44." This we admit; and also that in "the very unanimous opinion of commentators" this "is the resurrection body." But he says "the apostle uses the *present* tense, *we have*" a building, &c., first verse;



“and not the future tense, *we shall have.*” And he adds:—

“Secondly, it is clear, we think, that Paul expected to be clothed upon with this heavenly house *as soon as he left the material body.*”—p. 260.

To this it may be replied that as Paul had not then left the body, this spiritual house was not then received; so that upon the Professor's hypothesis it was still *future*. It might therefore not be received for eighteen hundred years; and still, if it was *certain* then to be received, the apostle might say we *have* such a house. But how is it “clear” he expected to enter it at death? Says Professor Bush:—

“This is evident from the whole strain of his discourse, but especially from verses 6, 8. ‘Knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord.’ What other inference can we draw from this, than that he expected at once to assume that celestial tenement which would capacitate him for being with Christ?”—p. 260.

He then claims, if he sleeps till the resurrection, it would not “be to be absent from the body. It would rather be to be *with* the body, if the soul is so united with its destiny that it sleeps with it in the grave, and only awakes when it awakes.” And if Paul was to be “with his Savior in his disembodied spirit,” he would not be “clothed upon.”

It is however clear from the context that Paul is speaking of three distinct stages of being:

1. In this tabernacle;
2. Absent from the body and present with the Lord; and
3. Clothed with our house from heaven.

If Paul could not be present with the Lord until he had received his “*spiritual body*,” he would not *then* be *absent* from the body.” It is worthy of remark that when he speaks of being only “absent from the body,” he merely says “We are confident and *willing* rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord.” But when he speaks of receiving his resurrection body, he exclaims:—“For in this we groan, *earnestly desiring* to be clothed with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked.” Then he proceeds to say,—“For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: *not* because we would be *unclothed*, but *clothed*, that mortality might be swallowed up in life.” It is therefore evident that while he looked forward to his resurrection with the most



earnest desire, he was even *willing* to be absent from the body a while and present with Christ. Or, as he says, Phil. i. 21—24,—“For me to live is Christ, and to die is *gain*. For I am in a straight betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is *far better* ;” although to abide in the flesh was more needful for the church. Not so does he speak when he refers to his resurrection, as merely “*gain*,” or something “*far better* ;” but he speaks of it as “the *glorious liberty* of the children of God,” for which they *groaned and travailed in pain* waiting for it, with *earnest expectation*.—Rom. viii. 19—23.

But the Professor *has* one text to prove that the resurrection body is *another* body than that deposited in the tomb. Hear him :—

“As our Savior said, Mark xiv. 58, in speaking of his resurrection, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another *made without hands*,’ which must certainly refer to his spiritual body in contradistinction to his natural ; so also the ‘house from heaven *not made with hands*,’ for which the apostle longed, was to be immediately assumed.”—p. 261.

Here we unexpectedly do find *one* passage of Scripture which our author is willing to understand in its most *literal* import. And we rejoice that he pays so much deference to the inspired word as thus to receive a *single text*. Unfortunately, however, for the Professor, that which he has quoted as the language of our Savior, is only what the *false witnesses* testified he had said: Mark xiv. 56—59,—“For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together. And there arose certain, and bare *false witness* against him, saying, ‘We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands.’ *But neither so did their witness agree together.*” The language of Christ was, John ii. 19,—“Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up”—not *another* temple, as the false witnesses testified, but the one that is destroyed ; and lest any should suppose he referred to the Temple, it is recorded that “he spake of the temple of his body.”

We are sorry, when the Professor is so willing to rest on the *literal* averment of *any* text, to be obliged to take it from him. But he may still refer to it as a “gleam” of light in “that early age,” as evidence that the *ones* who did thus



speak, gave utterance to sentiments similar to his own view of the resurrection.

He further claims that "Moses and Elijah certainly had" bodies "when they appeared" with Christ "on the holy mount;" and that "the angel who appeared to John, Rev. xxii. 9, and declared himself one of his 'fellow-servants and of his brethren the prophets,'" was clothed in a resurrection body. "And if he, why not others?"

We reply that Elijah never died: so that his body was the same as would have been his resurrection body. And it is no more incredible that Moses, while unclothed, should have a visible personal appearance on the mount, so that the disciples were *miraculously* enabled to see him, than it is that the rich man in the world of spirits, when his body was buried and his five brethren were still living in the flesh, could see Abraham and Lazarus afar off.—Luke xvi. 19—31. And the angel that appeared to John might have been Enoch or Elijah, who were never "unclothed;" or he might have been like Moses on the mount; or he might have been one of the saints who arose at Christ's resurrection. So that these cases are no evidence of a resurrection at death.

2 Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

This text he contends does not prove that all will appear before the judgment seat in the *bodies* in which they sinned; although they are to be judged for the sins done in the body.

We are not disposed to controvert the idea that the *body* need not necessarily appear before the judgment seat of Christ. For we are inclined to the opinion, that the judgment is after death and before the resurrection; and that before that event the acts of all men will be adjudicated: so that the resurrection of the righteous is their full acquittal and redemption—their sins being blotted out when the times of refreshing shall have come, Acts iii. 19; while the fact that the wicked are not raised, proves that they were previously condemned.

1 Thess. iv. 13—17. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with



a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first : Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air : and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

As an objection to the common view of Christ's bringing with him at his coming, the saints who have slept in him, he asks :—

"How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him? And how can they be with him, unless they shall first have risen for that purpose? And how can they have risen, without having undergone a resurrection? And how can they have been the subjects of this resurrection, if they are yet reposing in the dust? This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence that follows: 'The dead in Christ, (i. e., those that have slept in him,) shall rise first,' i. e., shall rise, or shall have arisen *previously*.'—p. 266.

He then argues that the saints are in heaven with, and will come from heaven in their resurrection bodies: so that when Paul says, some man will ask, 1 Cor. xv. 35, "How are the dead raised, and with what body do they *come*?" it is "not with what body do they *come up* out of the ground, but with what body do they *come down* from heaven?"!!

All the above interrogations are answered by the text, in 2 Cor. v. 8., where it is taught that when Paul should be absent from the body he would be present with the Lord. And if Paul in the *interim* between death and the resurrection is thus present with the Lord, why are not all the saints who sleep in Jesus? And if they are thus with Jesus, when he shall descend to raise their bodies, God will bring them with him. We admit the *usus loquendi* that "shall rise *first*," is "shall rise *previously*." But it must still be previous to something which follows; and that is evident, by the ascension of those who are alive and remain, together with the risen saints. "Then," he says, "we who remain" shall be caught up; but the dead in Christ must rise *previously*, or they could not ascend *together*, which Professor Bush says is "simply" "shall be caught up to *be with him*." We however might ask, if they at death enter upon their eternal reward, how can they be said to sleep? And if they sleep not, how can they wake from sleep? And if they now sleep, and it is their eternal state, will they not sleep forever? How can they ever be said to awake? But he adds:—

"How then, it may be asked, shall we avoid the conclusion drawn from the apostle's language in this passage, that the resurrection is to be simultaneous, and destined to occur at the second Advent? Our answer will be inferred from the previous tenor of our remarks. We have



already adverted to the *principle* which we regard as forming the key to this kind of diction, wherever it occurs. Christ and the apostles expressed themselves on this and kindred topics in language conformed to the formulas of speech to which they had been accustomed from the necessities of their Jewish birth and training."—p. 269.

How far this may harmonize with another remark we find on the same page, that, "We feel not at liberty to put the least constraint upon the out-speaking purport of any text," we leave others to judge. It is sufficient for us that Professor Bush admits the apostle *supposed* he *was* teaching a literal resurrection, and that his hearers thus understood his meaning.

Phil. iii. 21. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

This he deems an "announcement of a similar condition, as the prospective lot of the whole multitude of the saints in the day of their final manifestation; an event not to transpire in the natural, but in the spiritual world;" where they have glorified bodies like "Moses and Elias;" and that the apostle has in view rather "the *translation* of the *living*, than the *resurrection* of the *dead* saints."

The language of the apostle is, however, explicit, that he "will *change*," not *ex-change* "our *vile body*, that *it*," not another body, "may be *fashioned* like unto his glorious body." And the explicit declaration of *Paul* that *our vile* body is to be thus *fashioned* anew, is certainly as demonstrative as the testimony of the "*false witness*" that Professor Bush adduced to prove it was *another* body.

2 Tim. ii. 16—19. "But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already: and overthrow the faith of some. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

This portion of Scripture is the last which he quotes in this connection. He says:—

"In the absence of any definite knowledge of what they really held on the subject—as to which all ecclesiastical testimony halts—it cannot be properly affirmed that the error charged upon their creed by the apostle is one that is chargeable, also, on the same grounds, upon *the view* we are now advocating. This makes the resurrection indeed to be *passing*, but not *past*. Men are not raised from the dead till they die, and they do not die till they live. It is only *past* when it has embraced the totality of its subjects."—p. 273.

To say nothing of the small distinction in the *tense* of the two views respecting the resurrection, or of *dying* being considered a resurrection *from* death, we would suggest to the Professor that possibly Himeneus and Philetus merely expressed themselves in accordance with certain "diction" and "formulas of speech" then current, so that when they taught the resurrection was *past*, they only *meant* it was then *passing*. And if so, why are not they as good authority as those whom Justin Martyr called "heretics," to whom the Professor refers as having received some "gleams of light" in so early an age.

In view of all these passages, our author comes to the conclusion that "the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine sanctioned either by reason or revelation, as far as we have hitherto interrogated the testimony of each." But how logical such a conclusion is, our readers, from the evidence here presented, have an opportunity to judge. For ourselves, we have found nothing to weaken in the least, but have rather been strengthened in our previous conclusions. He has not as yet satisfactorily answered the inquiry of the apostle, "*Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?*"

"THE RESURRECTION VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE  
JUDGMENT."

Under this head he gives a long argument to show that,

"The moral power of the doctrine of 'a judgment to come,' does not truly rest so much upon the imagined form or concomitants of the process, upon its being held upon the *assembled* multitude of its subjects, at a particular time or place, or as marked by certain forensic solemnities, as upon its bearing upon individual character and destiny." . . . . "But we are still unable to resist the conclusion, that the essence of judgment is adjudication, and that this is independent of time, place, and circumstance."—p. 276.

He claims the character of each man is decided at death. He says:—

"Lazarus died, and was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and in hell he lifted up his eyes in torment. This is a virtual judgment." . . . . "Consequently no subsequent judicial sentence can be conceived as reversing that which is in effect passed at the instant the soul leaves the body; nor can the object of such a general assize as is usually understood to be announced under the title of the 'general judgment,' be to enact *de novo* a process which has really been accomplished upon each individual of the race as he entered, in his turn, the world of retribution."—p. 277.



We have no hesitation in admitting that so far as the judgment has respect to the *adjudication* of the individuals of the human race, that the above conclusions are correct. The records of the "Book of Life" must be perfect when it is opened; and those only will be delivered at the first resurrection, whose names will "be *found* written in the book." The judgment at the coming of Christ we regard as the bestowal of the award, or the infliction of punishment, under the previous decision respecting the allotments of the human race, for which the departed wait till the resurrection morn. In Matt. xxv. 31—33, we read "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left."

This gathering can only have respect to the nations living at Christ's Advent. The wicked dead are not raised until a thousand years from this period, and there is nothing here said respecting a resurrection. The separation here spoken of must consequently have respect only to that which will take place between the righteous and the wicked, when the former shall be caught up to meet their Lord in the air at the Savior's "right hand," while the latter class will be left to be burned in the conflagration at the regeneration of the earth. But as the Professor's argument here has respect only to the adjudication of the human race, it can have no bearing upon this view of the judgment of the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom, when he will reward every man as his work shall be. It however leaves the same "*hiatus* of two thousand years between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew," p. 287, that the old view does; but as we have seen no proof that the twenty-fourth does *not* extend to the end of this period, it leaves no "*hiatus*" for which *we* feel particularly called to account.

Professor Bush claims that the Second coming of Christ was at the destruction of Jerusalem. His argument is:—

"Now we deem the evidence decisive that this economy of 'judgment' was to commence synchronically with that predicted 'coming' of Christ which is so splendidly set forth in the vision of Daniel," "where the Son of man receives his kingdom from the Ancient of days. But let it be borne in mind that this 'coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven,' announced by Daniel, is *precisely the same coming* with that announced by our Savior in the Gospels, especially Matt. xvi. 27, 28: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels;



and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here that shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' So again, Matt. xxiv. 34, 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' So also, Matt. x. 23, 'Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come.' We hold it to be utterly impossible, upon fair canons of interpretation, to divorce these predictions of Daniel and of Christ from a joint reference to one and the same coming, and that, too, a coming that was to be realized in its incipient stages at the destruction of Jerusalem. We are satisfied, indeed, that that event did not exhaust the import of this pregnant prophecy. We doubt not that it embraces a grand series of events—a dispensation, in fine—extending through the lapse of hundreds of years, down to the period when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. But the commencement of this train of occurrences is to be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem."—pp. 285, 286.

In the foregoing it is claimed that the prophecies of Christ respecting his coming have respect to his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, that these prophecies synchronize with those of Daniel, and that as Christ refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, Daniel's must have referred to a "coming" at that time. But on page 288 he claims that the prophecies of Christ cannot refer to a future judgment because those of Daniel do not. This looks to us like "reasoning in a circle:"—Daniel cannot thus refer because Christ does not; and Christ cannot because Daniel does not. We will therefore first examine the prophecy of Daniel.

In the seventh of Daniel, to which reference is made, the prophet in a vision saw "four great beasts" rise out of the sea,—“the first like a lion,” “a second like a bear,” “another like a leopard” with “four heads” and “four wings,” and “a fourth beast dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly,” with “great iron teeth,” “and it had ten horns;” then “another little horn” arose, and plucked up “three of the first horns,” the saints of the Most High “were in its hand a time times and the dividing of time,” and it was to make war with them and prevail “against them until the Ancient of days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” Then “the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.—A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set and the books were opened.”



Then the fourth "beast was slain,"—the "dominion" of the three first having been previously "taken away,"—and his body given to the burning flame." And then there was given unto "one like unto the Son of man," "dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Such was the order of the events presented to the inspired Seer, in prophetic vision, by symbolical imagery. The "four beasts" were explained by the angel to denote "four kings," or kingdoms; and Professor Bush admits that they respectively symbolize the four universal monarchies of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. "The ten horns" of the "fourth beast," Professor Bush admits, are the ten divided kingdoms from the Roman empire; and of the "Little Horn" he says: "This Little Horn is unquestionably the ecclesiastical power of the Papacy."\* The "time, times and the dividing of time," or one thousand two hundred and sixty days of its tyrannical power, he also admits are symbolic of one thousand two hundred and sixty years. He says, in writing to Mr. Miller, "In taking a *day* as the prophetic time for a *year*, I believe you are *sustained* by the *soundest exegesis*, as well as fortified by the high names of Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton,"† &c. And in writing to Professor Stuart, he says of this period: "I have in my own collection, writers on the prophecies, previous to the time of Mede, who interpret the one thousand two hundred and sixty days as so many years, and who are so far from broaching this as a *new* interpretation, that they do not pause to give the grounds of it, but proceed onward, as if no risk was run in taking for granted the soundness of the principle which came down to them accredited by the immemorial usage of their predecessors."‡

Now if the order in which these successive symbols as presented in the vision to the prophet, is the order of the fulfilment of the successive events which they respectively symbolize, it must follow that the giving of the kingdom "under the whole heaven" to "One like unto the Son of man," will succeed the destruction of the Roman empire, in its decem-regal form as symbolized by "the ten horns." And,

\* Hierophant, Vol. I. p. 109. † Ad. Her. Vol. VII., p. 33. ‡ Hiero. Vol. I., p. 245.



as far as they have been fulfilled, this order has been observed. Thus Babylon, symbolized by the first beast "like a lion," was succeeded by Medo-Persia, symbolized by the "bear." This in its turn was succeeded by Grecia, symbolized by the "leopard;" and when it had been divided towards the four winds, as symbolized by the "four heads" of that beast, it was in like manner succeeded by the Roman empire as symbolized by the "fourth beast." When this had continued its time, it assumed its divided form,—ten kingdoms arising within its territorial limits; among these came up the "horn" of Papacy, subverting three of the first kings, as symbolized by the "horns" of the beast, the "saints of the Most High" were in subjection to it for one thousand two hundred and sixty years, and it has warred against them even to the present day, and is now prevailing. Thus each individual particular, as shadowed forth in the vision, has been fulfilled in its *exact* order,—excepting what future events pertain to the judgment and the everlasting kingdom. And shall the order of these be an exception to the order of the fulfilment of all the preceding portions of the vision? Shall every other particular be fulfilled in the order of its symbolical representation, each succeeded by the other, and shall these be fulfilled during the fulfilment of the preceding symbols? The analogy in the fulfilment of the vision will certainly be observed in the fulfilment of these portions of it.

Again, the vision in all its symbolical representations has thus far been fulfilled *visibly* on the earth; and will the analogy in this particular be departed from, by an *invisible* fulfilment of these predictions? As all the events predicted in the vision are represented by symbols, are we not to expect there will be a relative proportion between the symbols and the things symbolized? Thus if a "lion" symbolized the Babylonian empire, a "bear" the Medo-Persian, and a "leopard" the Grecian, to make the symbols of the vision harmonize, must there not be the same relative proportion between the symbolical judgment and the majestic events symbolized by it, so that they will be as much greater than their symbols and as real, as those mighty empires were greater than the "beasts" by which they were symbolized? This must certainly be a correct position. Therefore JEHOVAH only could be symbolized by the "Ancient of days," and



Jesus Christ, by the "One like unto the Son of man;" and the scenes of the last judgment,—in the overthrow of human governments, the rewarding of every man as his work shall be, the conflagration in the purification and regeneration of the earth, and the giving of the kingdom under the whole heaven to Christ,—only could be symbolized by the closing scenes of the vision. If this view is correct, the coming of the "Ancient of days" can only be at "the end of the age," when all things that offend will be gathered out of the kingdom. And as the kingdom "*under the whole heaven*" is to be given to Christ, it can only succeed the demolition of all human governments, and be fulfilled in the personal and everlasting reign of Christ with his saints on the earth, as explained by the angel to Daniel, vii. 18, 27: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

But we have one more argument to prove that the coming of the "Ancient of days," as symbolized in this vision, could not have been at the destruction of Jerusalem.—There is but *one* such coming presented in the vision. This is after the "Little Horn" has continued its time; for Daniel says, verse 21, 22, "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, *until* the Ancient of days came, *and* judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, *and* the time came that the saints *possessed* the kingdom."—Professor Bush admits that this "Little Horn" is Papacy, and that the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of its tyrannic rule are one thousand two hundred and sixty years.—Consequently the "Ancient of days" could not come until after the end of the one thousand two hundred and sixty years of Papal persecutions, and his coming must usher the saints into their everlasting kingdom.

Now as Professor Bush claims that this prophecy of Daniel, and Christ's predictions of his coming, must synchronize each with the other, it follows, as the judgment in Daniel can only synchronize with "the end of the age," that the like predictions in the New Testament must have respect to the same period. We will however briefly examine the *three*



texts upon which rests *all* the evidence of the "Second Advent" at the "destruction of Jerusalem."

1. Matt. xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."\*

The point upon which this passage turns, is, whether "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," is his coming "in the glory of his Father with his angels" to "reward every man according to his works"? or is it a *miniature* representation of his coming and kingdom, which some standing there were to be permitted to see, so that in proclaiming his Advent they might be assured they were giving utterance to "no cunningly devised fable"? We incline to the last opinion. And the evangelist proceeds to record, that, "After six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him."—Matt. xvii. 1—3. Here, then, was a perfect miniature representation of his coming in his kingdom. And, following so immediately, and being recorded as if it were an explanation of the Savior's promise, we are unable to see how it can be understood otherwise than as its fulfilment.

That this is the true exposition of this passage is more clearly seen by a comparison of it with Luke's record of the same events. He has recorded it, vii. 27, 28: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God. *And it came to pass* about an eight days *after these sayings*, he took Peter, and John and James," &c., and was transfigured. Here we are expressly assured that this promise of their seeing the kingdom, *came to pass* about an eight days after. Peter, also, one who witnessed this glorious vision, testifies

---

\* Bishop Horsley commenting on this text, says, "He says not who shall not die, but 'who shall not *taste* of death.' Not to *taste* of death, is not to feel the pains of it—not to taste its bitterness. In this sense was the same expression used by our Lord upon other occasions, as was, indeed, the more simple expression of dying. 'If a man keep my saying, he shall never *taste* of death.'" He then contends, that then, when the Son of man shall come in his kingdom, the wicked who were then standing there, will taste the second death, "in comparison with which the previous pangs of natural death are nothing."—*Sermons* p. 144.



that this scene was received as an evidence and demonstration of his second coming. He says: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory *when* there came such a voice from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven *we heard* when we were with him in the holy mount." 2 Peter i. 16—18.

2. Matt. xxiv. 34. "Verily I say unto you, this *generation* shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

This text upon Professor Bush's own explanation, proves nothing for his position; for he adopts Mr. Cunningham's translation of the Greek word, rendered fulfilled, who says its original signification is not "to be *completely fulfilled*," but "the strict rendering of the clause" is, "*shall be fulfilling*, or shall *begin to be*." If, therefore, the true rendering is that those predictions of our Savior would begin to be fulfilled during the generation then living, it would not follow that Christ's Second Advent must then occur. For his prediction of Jerusalem's overthrow was fulfilled within forty years; but the coming of Christ is one of the last events predicted in that discourse, and would not necessarily then transpire, unless *all* those events must then be "completely fulfilled." But Prof. Bush says the prophecy will not be then *exhausted*, but will extend through a lapse of hundreds of years. If it must be thus extended, the coming of Christ, one of the *last* events in that prediction, could only transpire at the end of that lapse of centuries. We, however, incline to the opinion previously expressed, that this *generation* to which Christ referred, was the last of which he was speaking which should witness the signs of his coming, which would not be seen till "*after* the tribulation of those days"—extending through the Pagan and Papal persecutions,—and which have all been seen by the present generation."\*

3. Matt. x. 23. "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

---

\* The sun was darkened May 19, 1780. The night following, the moon, although at full, did not give her light; and, Nov 13, 1833, the meteoric stars fell from heaven, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs when shaken by a mighty wind.—Rev. vi. 13.

What going over the cities of Israel, and what coming is here referred to? It will be seen by the context that our Savior was now sending forth his twelve disciples on their first mission. "And it came to pass when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence, to teach and to preach in their cities." So then the only fair construction which can be put upon this text, is, that it had respect to their going over the cities of Israel on that mission whither he himself would come before their mission would be completed; and we read, Luke 9: 10, that "The apostles when they were returned, told him all they had done," i. e. when they were returned from going over the cities of Israel, from preaching the word every where, whither they had been sent.

We thus find that the *three* passages which are supposed to prove the setting up of Christ's kingdom, at the destruction of Jerusalem, are no certain demonstration of such a fulfilment; while other portions of Scripture expressly contradict such an interpretation.

"THE FIRST RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE  
DEAD."

Professor Bush claims that the judgment portrayed in Rev. 20, "is identical with that of Daniel, as related in his seventh chapter," which he exhibits in the following parallel between the two prophecies, taken from Mede.

DANIEL 7th.

V. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were pitched down (i. e. till the judges sat.)

22. "And judgment was given to the saints of the Most High.

And the saints possessed the kingdom (viz. with the Son of man, who came in the clouds, v. 13.)"

JOHN 20th.

V. "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them.

And judgment (i. e. authority to judge B,) was given unto them.

And the saints lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

We admit with the Professor that "the judgments here described" are "the same"; also that "the judgment of Daniel assuredly commences synchronically with the commencement of Christ's kingdom," and that "the judgment of John must be assigned to the same period." But as it has not been *proved* that the judgment of Daniel begins with, and "flows on," "during the Gospel age," it *does not follow* that "the



Millennium of John *must* be referred to a past, and not to a future period of history": the proof of which, Prof. B. says, "evidently depends upon the correctness of the interpretation we have given of the true sense of Daniel's oracle," p. 303.

Rev. xx. 4—6. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

The "thousand years," the Millennium here brought to view, Prof. Bush locates in the *past*. He does not give us the year of their commencement, or termination; or give us any clue by which we may satisfactorily arrive within a few centuries of either *terminus*. But as these "souls" that "lived" were "of them that were beheaded," he argues that

It "carries us back to a very early era of Christianity;" and as they "had not worshipped the beast," it "transports us to the past," "when the Roman beast" was "in the height of his power." And as some were designated "who did not 'worship' the image of the beast," it "conducts us to a period still later, when the *ecclesiastical* form of the Roman empire was established;" and as all "these several classes 'lived'" "within the limits of the specified thousand years," we are "thrown back for their commencing period to a very early epoch of the church." "For," he says, "we strenuously maintain that it is the same persons who live and reign, and judge, and are beheaded, and all too *at precisely the same time*." And "though they become the victims of Pagan and Papal persecution, and seal their testimony with their blood, yet their higher and truer life, their enemies cannot reach."—As our Savior says, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me *shall never die*."—pp. 305. 306.

We have thus given a synopsis of his argument for the location of this period in the past, "the precise *termini* of which," he says, "we are not competent, nor do we deem it necessary to fix with absolute precision." But, it will be remembered, he admits "the stress of the proof" of its correctness, "depends upon the correctness" of his "interpretation" of "Daniel's oracle." And as we have seen the incorrectness of that "interpretation," this position still *lacks* its proof. We see no evidence that this *living* and *beheading* are transpiring at the *same time*. He says,

"This period defines an era, marked on the one hand by the prevalence



of the power of the Roman beast, and the errors, apostacies, and persecutions of the Roman church; and on the other, by the spiritual quickening and spiritual reigning of the martyrs and confessors of the truth, whose faithful testimony was illustrated by the fires kindled around them by papal cruelty, and towering, as beacon lights in those dark ages, above the stakes on which they were tied. This state of things the prophet beholds in entranced vision. He saw their 'souls' living in the midst of the slaughter of their bodies, for it is only by exegetical violence that their 'beheading' can be separated from their 'reigning.' The true version is 'did not,' instead of 'had not;—I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which *did not worship* the beast, neither his image, neither *did receive* his mark in their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.' That is, there was a succession of such faithful witnesses living, dying, rising, reigning, throughout that whole period."—p. 309.

He supposes the "quickening" is a "spiritual quickening," the same as in Dan. 12: 2,—“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” &c.; although he does “not question” that “a *corporeal* resuscitation, in the limited sense before explained, may be alluded to in the words of the prophet”; and he quotes from Cressener that “both Grotius and Porphyry confess that the words are very wonderfully and artificially put together, to hint at the mystery of the resurrection—so wonderfully, indeed, as it is to be admired how they can be made to intend anything else”!

We have already seen that the 12th of Daniel brings to view most clearly a *literal* and *corporeal* resurrection; so that nothing is gained by claiming that this quickening is the same as that, which we admit. We can also see no particular force in the argument respecting the *tense* of this vision, even by adopting Prof. Bush's version. To say they “*had not*” worshipped the beast would imply a time previous to this “*living*”; but if it was merely “*did not*,” it does not prove that it has no respect to a prior time; it is all in the *past* tense, and some of the references might have been to earlier and others to later points of time. Thus John saw them, they were beheaded, before,—not *being* beheaded; they did not worship the beast when they were under his power, neither his image, nor receive his mark *to save* their heads, so that at this first resurrection, as a reward for their previous faithfulness, they *lived* and reigned with Christ 1000 years. This slight variation of the *tense* need not affect the application of the text.

But says Professor Bush:—

On the supposition that the millennium of John is yet future and coincident with the seven thousand years from the creation, we hold it to be impossible to assign a satisfactory reason why the saints *then living* should be



characterized by attributes that pertain to the pious of another and entirely different period."—p. 306.

We should admit the full force of this objection if it was made in respect to a spiritual or temporal millennium. And the question may well be asked, why the favored inhabitants of such an age of the world should be so highly blessed above all who have gone before them, and should be spoken of as martyrs, or as having the spirit of martyrs, when there is no martyrdom to suffer, no persecuting enemy, and no tempting adversary? But the view which we oppose to that of the Professor entirely does away with this objection. This view represents the martyrs who were beheaded, with all who have overcome the world in all ages, as being raised "*from the dead,*" as having attained unto the first resurrection, and as reigning on the regenerated earth under the personal reign of Christ. The language of the text is therefore perfectly applicable to this view, while the objection holds good against a *probationary* millennium in the future.

But another reason why he adopts his views of the Millennium, is, that he can find no evidence of any end of the world. He says :

"As to any such event as the *physical destruction* of the globe which we inhabit, or the *physical passing away* of the heavens, we are constrained to acknowledge that we have sought the evidence of it in vain throughout the oracles of inspiration. No language to this effect can possibly be more expressive than that which teaches the contrary. 'Who laid the foundations of the earth, *that it should not be removed forever.*' 'One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; *but the earth abideth forever.*' 'And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven,* (consequently *upon* the earth), shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.' Prophecy contains nothing that carries us beyond this."—p. 308.

This objection, like the other, is a valid one against the common view of the end of the world, that the earth will cease to be. But this is not the Scriptural doctrine; and these texts prove that the earth *will* abide forever. How then, is it asked, can it be physically burned? It is upon the same principle that it was once destroyed by water: it none the less abideth forever. It was not annihilated: neither will it be by the conflagration in its *regeneration*. That, instead of being its *destruction*, we look upon as its *restoration*, as "the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets." Prof. Bush admits that the "destruction" announced in 2 Pet. 3: 7—12, "whatever it be, is plainly *anterior* to the ushering in of the New Jerusalem state, or the New Heavens



and earth of Isa. 65: 17." But he denies that that is a *literal burning*.

But if this is not to be a literal conflagration, we must deny that the flood was a literal *deluge*. Peter says, "The world that then was being overflowed with water perished; but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." If one of these events is literal, both must be. But Peter is still more positive: he adds, "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also; and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." It would seem from the prediction that this earth had become so corrupted and defiled with sin, that it could be purified and made fit for an angelic residence only by a deluge of fire. And that no one may suppose this is the termination of its existence, he continues,—“Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” The earth then is restored to a condition wherein it may *abide forever*, where the “kingdom *under the whole heaven*” may be an everlasting kingdom, and where those who sleep in the dust of the earth, whose names are written in the book of life, when they shall awake *from the dead*, may reign with Christ to all eternity. In applying the judgment in question to the commencement of this period, all is harmonious. But he says:

“I saw the souls of them which were beheaded, &c. This is language appropriate to a *mental* and not an *ocular* perception, the objects of which were not *risen bodies* but *risen souls*.”—p. 312.

It will be seen by a reference to the text that the vision is progressive. There is first the binding of Satan, &c., then thrones, then the thrones are occupied by those to whom judgment is committed, and then he saw the *souls of them* that were beheaded. If these *souls* were then in their resurrection bodies, it would be the *souls* which were beheaded; but they were only *souls of them*. The next he saw was that they *lived*, &c. which is explained to be “The First Resurrection.” But says the Professor,

“John does not say that he saw that the men who were beheaded lived *again* on the earth. He asserts merely, that he saw the souls of them that were beheaded, not living *again*, but *living*.”—p. 311.

This is true; but when he speaks of the “rest of the dead,”



he says *they* lived not *again* till the 1000 years were finished; which implies that these are living *again*.

He then claims, "the 'rest of the dead' neither awake during the 1000 years, nor at any other time"; that the Old Testament does not teach the resurrection of the wicked, and that the Jews believed in no such resurrection. It is however sufficient that the New Testament teaches there will be "a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust," and when the text asserts they will not live again till the end of the 1000 years, it may be that they *then will live* again. As the term living again is applied to the wicked,\* it shows they have previously been alive. And though they will never participate "in that principle of divine life of which Christ is the sempiternal source," yet they will arise at the resurrection of condemnation.

With this view all the Scriptures harmonize. But Prof. Bush, in locating this period during the dark ages, must show that Satan was then bound so that he could not deceive the nations, during the very time he was practicing his most wicked arts and deceiving the greatest numbers. He also makes *saints* of all the subjects of the second resurrection, when none are pronounced blessed and holy, or exempt from the second death, but those that have part in the first resurrection, which implies that none others will be exempt or blessed. And he makes a succession of persons live and *die* during a period *through* which *those who were martyred* should *live*.

Rev. xx. 11—15. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

In the elucidation of the subject here presented, Prof. Bush has gone into a lengthy train of reasoning, mainly dependent

---

\* Professor Bush says, "In the established text of the earlier editions of the Greek Testament," it is properly rendered "*lived not again*, and after this, our translation was made. But all modern editions unanimously reject this reading and adopt *lived not*."

To give this any weight, it must be shown that *modern* editions are more correct than the "*earlier editions* of the Greek."



upon his preceding conclusions, but which bear with more force upon the common application of the end of the world, than on the views we advocate. The principles upon which this part of his argument rests have been so fully presented, and this review has been extended to so great a length, that we can here give but a mere synopsis of his general reasoning. He locates this scene at "the sounding of the seventh Trumpet," when "the time of the *dead* is come *that they should be judged*"; who, he claims, "are the *spiritually dead*." He claims that this transpires "within the veil," that there is here no restoration of the wicked to their "*bodies*," and though "the judgment is here presented as concentrated to a point, to a single act," yet that "the *truth*, divested of all drapery, undoubtedly is, that each individual of this countless multitude *was actually judged*," when "he became a denizen of the world unseen." He claims that here mankind become endowed with "an increased power and intensity of spiritual vision," so that the "mental eye" can pierce "through and beyond all envelopes," so that the "scenes of the interior world shall be astonishingly disclosed to the realizing perception of the spirit"; that "this will be a *virtual* abolishing the old heavens and the old earth, and the opening of a new world to the wondering gaze of the illuminated spirit"—"the material universe" being as it were "*seen through*"—"opening heaven and hell to the spiritual perception of living men." This view he elucidates with much minuteness; but it will be seen that it depends for its truth upon the correctness of his previous expositions; and as it is more an endeavor to harmonize this portion of Scripture with his theory, than to obtain from it an independent argument in its support, we shall content ourselves with presenting this synopsis of it, and pass to that which may have a more particular bearing upon the question at issue. But, is the inquiry made, how are these conclusions to be refuted? Says Professor Bush:—

"The only possible basis on which a refutation of our position can be made to stand, is the denial of the *identity* of the state described in the closing chapters of Isaiah and John; and if this *identity of state* is denied, then the *identity of language* employed in describing each, must be accounted for, and the *principle* clearly laid down which requires us to admit this diversity of application."—p. 334.

The above, it will be seen, has reference only to those who still adhere to the common view of the end of the world,—that after the judgment, men have nothing more to do with



this earth, and that the New Jerusalem state precedes the advent. Those who adhere to that position, must refute it in the manner described by Professor Bush, or they must adopt Prof. Bush's views of the resurrection, as will be seen by the following extract:—"The New Jerusalem

Supervenes immediately or speedily, upon the overthrow of the mystical Babylon, another term for the False Prophet, whose destruction synchronizes with that of the beast, the symbolical designation of the fourth or Roman empire. The passing away of the Roman empire in its decem-regal form, is the result of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, and the seventh trumpet announces the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ; and this, according to Daniel, is the kingdom of the saints which endures for ever and ever, and consequently this must be the same as the New Jerusalem, unless there are to be two kingdoms both universal, or two eternities in succession. Now to what coming state of Christ's kingdom, do Isaiah's glowing description apply but to that set forth in Daniel, which is the same with the New Jerusalem of John? We confess to the intensest anxiety to know by what process of interpretation this result is to be set aside. If it stands, then must stand our collocation of the 'judgment of the dead,' for this takes place at the time of the passing away of the old heavens and the old earth, and it is the introduction of the new heavens and the new earth, which constitutes the New Jerusalem; and the announcement of this is the closing theme of revelation. We have no account of a judgment or anything else subsequent to it."—p. 334.

This last argument we regard as most clear and lucid, and it presents in a concise and forcible manner the scriptural and chronological relation of these prophecies to each other. It proves conclusively that if there is to be any resurrection of the body, any coming of the Lord, any burning of the world, any new heavens or earth, or any final judgment, they must all transpire at about this time: which Prof. Bush admits. Consequently with the common view of the *spiritual* reign of Christ, as it is a period subsequent to the first resurrection and conflagration, the judgment resurrection, &c. must also be *spiritual*. For if there is a literal resurrection, there cannot be afterwards a spiritual reign. And that this reign of Christ, whatever it may be, is subsequent to the period called "the end of the world," the last quotation from Prof. Bush fully proves. We do not wonder, then, that in writing in reference to the common view of a *spiritual* reign of Christ, Prof. Bush should feel that his conclusions were irrefutable. Indeed, it would be the only conclusion to which we could arrive that would even *seem* to harmonize these relative events.

—We, however, in contending for a *literal* fulfilment of *all* these events, arrive at a result equally harmonious, and which has the advantage of the spiritual view, in that we are sus-



tained by the *literal* reading of all the various passages of scripture here examined; and they can only be forced into a support of the spiritualizing *phobia*, by giving to them "*great elasticity of import.*" If the personal advent, the resurrection of the body, the cutting off of the wicked from the earth, and the purification and regeneration of the earth are all at the end of the fourth kingdom and the introduction of the New Jerusalem dispensation, as we contend, it follows that the reign of Christ and his saints will be on the earth, in an everlasting kingdom under the whole heaven. This was the faith of the church in its purest and best ages; and Prof. Bush admits that the apostles, in writing the inditings of the Spirit, clothed the truths communicated through them in language in accordance with the literal view, on account of their own belief in the literal fulfilment of those events. While therefore we are pained and astonished that any should relinquish the literal view, we are fully satisfied that all who continue to adhere to the *spiritual reign*, if they will harmonize these relative events, will be driven to adopt Prof. Bush's view of the resurrection, judgment, &c. If after such an attempt to harmonize those events, any shall still adhere to the view of a spiritual coming of Christ, they must contend with Prof. Bush that "the Scriptural evidence of the resurrection of the body" is "evaporated in the crucible of logical and philological induction." The Professor however did not to inform us how this *evidence* could be *evaporated*, unless there *was* evidence in the Scriptures to evaporate. We however find no necessity for evaporating, adumbrating, or rendering elastic, any portion of God's word. For, in receiving it in its obvious and grammatical import, all the various portions of the Scriptures harmonize with each other, like goodly stones in some fair and well proportioned building.

Professor Bush contends that—

"The New Jerusalem state which ensues is obviously a state developed on the earth, and among men in the flesh. This is evident from its being said that the leaves of the Tree of Life are for the healing of the Gentiles, and the kings of the earth are to bring their glory or riches into the holy city."—p. 332.

We admit that this will be on the *earth* and among men in the *flesh*, in the sense that Job used the term, Job xix. 26, when he gave utterance to his expectation that after the worms should have destroyed his body he should see God in the flesh, i. e. when he should rise from the dead. We know not



just what is implied by the healing of the *nations*—it does not read *Gentiles*.—But when the nations of the dead shall awake, they may receive an immortalizing healthful influence from the leaves of the Tree of Life—not a *restoration* from sickness,—but a preservation therefrom,—which will enable those who partake thereof to live for ever. For this reason Adam was driven from Eden,—“lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the TREE OF LIFE, and eat, and *live for ever*” —Gen. iii. 22. The “nations” referred to, are in the same connection affirmed to be “the nations of them which *are saved*,” Rev. xxi. 24—not Gentiles who are *not* saved, but the redeemed who will sing, Thou “hast made us unto our God KINGS and priests, and we shall reign on the earth”—Rev. v. 10. Then the “riches,” which they will bring into the Holy City, must necessarily be the treasures they had laid up in heaven, the rewards and emoluments pertaining to that state. The above specifications cannot therefore militate against the millenarian view.

Another consideration we find adduced in support of the Professor's view, is, that, according to it,

The saints will “pass at once from their corruptible to their incorruptible existence, and appear in his presence clad in his likeness. No centurial sleep of the soul—no imperfect state of disembodied consciousness—no semi-celestialized condition—awaits the heirs of ‘the resurrection and the life.’ The deposition of their garments of flesh is but the signal for their enrobment with the vesture of light, in which they shall shine forth as the brightness of the sun in the firmament of heaven.”—p. 347.

The above is evidence of a *beautiful theory*. But what saith the Scriptures in support of such a theory? Had he incorporated with it the salvation of all men, it might have been regarded as still more beautiful. But is it Scriptural? is a more important question. A beautiful theory will avail nothing, unless it is the truth; and being convinced that the Bible teaches a *different* doctrine, we feel constrained to abide still by its teachings, however beautiful that may be which does not harmonize with it. With the view we advocate, we have a theory which not only has the advantage of being Scriptural, but to us it is far more beautiful than the one just contemplated. What can be more lovely than Eden? And what more beautiful than the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets?



## "THE TIMES OF THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS."

Acts iii. 19—21. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

In attempting an "exegesis" of this passage to bring "it in the attitude of alliance" with his "conclusions," Professor Bush first gives us a criticism on the phrase 'the times of refreshing,' the result of which is that—

"On the whole, we collect from these authorities the leading idea of cooling from the agitation of the air and that consequent refreshment and invigoration which is the result of a freer and fuller respiration, to one who is well nigh exhausted by oppressive heat or fatigue. It implies a kind of *return to the body of its animating principle*, and an effect which we should express in English by the word *inspiring*, as the relation of the original word to *soul* is very obvious."—p. 351.

It thus seems that after all criticism is exhausted on this phrase, it is still admitted to denote *more* than is expressed in our translation, even the "*inspiring*," the "*return to the body of its animating principle*," so that it is *re-souled*, as he renders a kindred expression in another scripture. And he says in reference to the various uses of this and kindred terms, that "In all these cases the predominant sense of what may be termed *freshened animation* is obvious." But while he admits "this idea is closely related to that of *resurrection*," he endeavors to avoid what we regard as the necessary and legitimate conclusion, by considering it only in the "sense of *moral or spiritual revivification*."

He next remarks that the phrase, "*when the times of refreshing shall come*," &c. should read, "in order that they may come"; so that "the purport of the apostolic injunction is, that they should repent *in order that* the times of refreshing might come." He then shows from Lightfoot that it would be an absurd view of the text if it means—

"Repent ye now, that your sins may be blotted out two thousand, or I know not how many hundred years hence, when the calling of the Jews shall come." And he adds, "If this be not the sense that they make of this text, that produce it to assert Christ's personal reign on earth for a thousand years,—I know not why they should then produce it; and if this be the sense, I must confess I see no sense in it."

This sense, "that our sins may be blotted out *at* the time of



refreshing," can be no more absurd than the view, "that our sins may be blotted out so that those times may come." For if such times are to come, they will come whether the sins of individual men are blotted out or not: although without their being blotted out, none could participate in the refreshing. But such is not the sense we attach to this text. We understand it as implying, not that our sins will be blotted out *when* it shall come, but that our sins may *be blotted out* when it shall come; i. e. that when the times of refreshing shall come, it may find our sins all blotted out, so that we may then become partakers of Christ's glory. But this text speaks of the times of refreshing as being, when Peter spoke, in the *future*; while Professor Bush's view makes it represent "a state of things *which had already come*." He, however, endeavors to obviate this difficulty by the consideration, that—

"We are expressly taught to pray that the 'kingdom of God *may come*,' although that kingdom was long ago established, and has been in fact *coming*, from age to age, ever since the ascension. In uttering this prayer, we merely express the desire that the kingdom *may continue to come*."—p. 355.

This example however can be of no authority in the present case, for we admit that if one of these passages is thus to be understood, both are. But we claim that both are to be understood solely in reference to the future, and the second advent. We find several attempts, in the work before us, to establish a "*usus loquendi*" in favor of the *spiritual* view, by a reference to a similar use of language in various places, while we contend that all the examples thus referred to have reference only to the literal interpretation. A *disputed* interpretation of one text can never *settle* the interpretation of another text. Neither can the disputed interpretations of two or more passages respectively settle the interpretation of each other, which is the principle too often made use of in the volume under review. As our Savior expressly commands us to pray "thy kingdom come," we regard it as a strong proof that it is *still future*; so that a reference to the use of the words there, is evidence to us that the present text refers to the *future*. Again he adds:—

"*And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you;*" that is,—'And the promise of sending Jesus Christ shall be fulfilled.' It does not, *any more than the former phrase*, imply the *futurition* of the sending relatively to the time when Peter uttered the words, but in reference to the time when the promise was given."—p. 356.

We admit that it is not future "*any more than the former*



phrase," and he might continue thus to rear his superstructure; but how durable would it be without a *sure* foundation? The greater the superstructure the greater would be the danger when it should fall. The key-stone of an arch will be of no service when the base shall give way. We must therefore continue to understand "shall send," "shall come," "thy kingdom come," &c. as having respect to the future only.

"Whom the heaven must receive," &c. This "may be rendered," says Professor Bush, "either, 'whom the heaven must receive' or 'who must receive the heaven.'" But he prefers the latter, in the sense of occupying the heavens; but he says, "the drift of the announcement is substantially the same on either construction."

"Until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." Professor Bush regards "until the times," in "the sense of *during*, implying not the *terminus*, but the *continuance* of the period in question," i. e., "during the restitution of all things." He adduces, in support of this rendering, various passages, as, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together *until now*; i. e., during the whole past interval till now," &c. &c. But if this interpretation is admitted, it will only prove that the heavens will receive Christ until the restitution is accomplished. But says Professor Bush:—

"There is no necessary implication that he will *even then*, in any sense, vacate it, or return to the earth in any different *manner* from that in which he had continued to visit it during the whole period of his heavenly session."—p. 359.

The fact that a certain period is allotted for the heavens to receive him, seems to imply that when that period shall have been fulfilled, they would then no longer receive him; but the question we regard as settled by the promise to "send Jesus Christ." The expression is admitted to be in the future tense; and if it is not to be fulfilled in the future, we can see no *sense* in the allusion to the heavens receiving Christ. It seems to us as though the whole expression was so worded, to avoid the construction which the Hymenuses and Philetuses of that day might put upon it to bring it in alliance with their views, that the resurrection was *past* already; and which we think might be rendered "*passing*;" IF "thy kingdom *come*" can be rendered "*coming*." Thus



when Peter spoke of "the times of refreshing" which should come, and of the sending of Jesus Christ, had he not been so explicit, the question would very naturally have arisen, whether Peter did not refer to some event already past, then *passing*, or as immediately to transpire. But when told that "the heavens must receive him until the times of restitution," it would avoid all such and kindred questions. Unless such was Peter's design, we can see no reason for such an allusion. And if Christ is then to come, we can see no propriety in the allusion, if his coming is to be only "his spiritual and providential presence," the same, though in a greater degree, as he has been ever present.

But what is the import of "*Restitution*"? Says Professor Bush:—

"The original term" is derived from a word "of which the primitive sense is *to restore*, as for instance a sprained or dislocated limb to its former soundness, a diseased body to health, a captive people to their own country, a distracted or lawless community to order and good government. Hence the noun is defined by philologists by *emendatio, restitutio in pristinum statum, mutationem in meliorem conditionem*; all importing *restitution* or *restoration to a better state and condition*. With this is obviously closely related the idea of *consummation, completion, perfection*."—p. 361.

There appears to be nothing in the above at variance with the doctrine of the restitution of the earth to its Eden state. As Professor Stuart defines it, the phrase is still more explicit. He says its "simple and literal meaning" "is *restoration*, i. e., the putting of any thing which has been injured, has decayed, or is worn out, into a renewed and good condition."—*Hints*, p. 168.

Professor Bush contends that this restitution is progressive during "the spiritual reign of Christ"; and he selects several Jewish testimonies\* illustrative of their belief of the Restitution "under the reign of the Messiah." Viz:—

"Man shall be restored in that time, namely in the days of the Messiah, to that state in which he was before the first man sinned." *R. Moses Nachmanides in Deut.* § 45.

"R. Berakyah, in the name of R. Samuel, said: Although things were created perfect, yet when the first man sinned, they were corrupted, and will not again return to their congruous state till Pherez (i. e. the Messiah) comes." "There are six things which shall be restored to their primitive state, viz., the splendor of man, his life, the height of his stature, the

---

\* "As for my opinion," saith R. Menasse, "I think that after six thousand years, the world shall be destroyed, upon one certain day, or in one hour; that the arches of heaven shall make a stand, as immovable; that there will be no more generation or corruption; and all things by the resurrection shall be renovated, and return to a



fruits of the earth, the fruits of the trees, and the luminaries (the sun, moon, and stars.)"—*Bereshith Rabba*, Fol. 11, Col. 3.

"In that time, (i. e. of the Messiah) the whole work of creation shall be changed for the better, and shall return into its perfect and pure state, as it was in the time of the first man, before he had sinned."—*R. Becai*, in *Shilcan Orba*, Fol. 9, Col. 4.—p. 360.

The above quotations are expressive of what we expect in the *restitution*, i. e., that it will be the restoring again of that which is greatly marred or injured, to its original condition,—that this earth with all the redeemed will be restored to their *Eden state*. And this we expect will be "under the reign of the Messiah," as the ancient people of God believed,—that *reign* not being yet commenced: Christ being still in the performance of his priestly office.

This restoration we expect at the *commencement* of the millennium, with the return of Christ in person to this earth to reign: the Church defers his personal advent to the *close* of the millennium. Says Professor Bush:—

"Of these two views, the *former undoubtedly involves the more correct interpretation of the term*, which denotes the act or process of restitution, but it is, in our view, utterly erroneous in regard to the time to which this process is to be assigned."—p. 362.

Professor Bush places its *time*\* as beginning at the reception of the Lord in heaven, and "to be going on on earth,"

---

better condition." Menasse also assures us that "this out of doubt, is the opinion of the most learned Aben Ezra," who looked for it in the New Earth of Isaiah lxx. 17.

The following Jewish Testimonies are from Brook's Elements of Pro. Intr. Literatist, Vol. 3, pp. 33, 34.

"RABBI ELIEZER the great, is supposed to have lived just after the second temple was built. He, referring to Hosea's prophecy (chap. xiv. 8,) applies it to the pious Jews who seemed likely to die without seeing the glory of Israel, saying: 'As I live, saith Jehovah, I will raise you up, in the time to come, in the resurrection of the dead; and I will gather you with all Israel.'"

The Sadducees are reported to have asked Rabbi Gamaliel, the preceptor of Paul, whence he would prove that God would raise the dead. Nor could he silence them till he brought against them Deut. xi. 21, "Which land the Lord sware that he would give to your *fathers*." The Rabbi argued, that as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had it not, and God cannot lie, therefore they must be *raised from the dead* to inherit it.

RABBI SIMAI, though of later date, argues the same from Ex. vi. 4, insisting that the law asserts in this place the resurrection from the dead—to wit, when it is said: "And also I have established my covenant with them, to give them Canaan, &c.; for (he adds) it is not said to *you* but to *them*."

"Besides the foregoing statements," "there are likewise various traditions of the early Jewish church, which are entitled to attention from the general respect shown to them in all ages: though they cannot be urged in the light of direct testimony. Among these is the commonly received opinion, that the world was to last in its present state, during six thousand years; and that in the seventh millenary it was to be renewed, and all the promises of God made to the fathers, accomplished at that time."

\* While Professor Bush places the time of the millennium, and the commencement of the restitution and resurrection, &c. in the past, he admits that "we have



to "the complete subjugation of every opposing power, and the universal and heartfelt acknowledgment of his supremacy as King of kings and Lord of lords."

We also believe that it will result as above expressed, but we believe it *will be* a "complete subjugation of every opposing power." And when that is accomplished there will be no *sin* on the earth; for if there were, every opposing power would not be *completely* subjugated. And if there shall be no more sin, there will be no more death, for death is the *consequence* of *sin*; and if there is no *death* or *sin*, man must have approximated far towards his primitive condition.

But this is to be "the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets." To get then a full understanding of the import of this term we need to have recourse to the sublime predictions of the inspired Seers, "who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." It seems from Peter's testimony, that the prophets of old not only gave utterance to the teachings of the Spirit, but they actually *spake* or *wrote* as they were thus moved; i. e. they did not choose their language in which the teachings of the Spirit

---

arrived at a momentous era of the world," and that "if we take the ground of right reason, we must believe that the present age is one expressly foretold in prophecy, and that it is just opening upon the crowning consummation of all prophetic declarations." He admits that we are now approaching the fulfillment of all those predictions which speak of the end of the world; and that the destruction of the fourth beast of Daniel, and of Paul's Man of sin, the conflagration of Peter, and the seventh trumpet of John, &c., are about to be consummated. He only denies the manner of their fulfillment.

In the time of this fulfillment there is no dispute between us. In writing to Mr. Miller he says: "I do not conceive your errors on the subject of chronology to be at all of a serious nature, or in fact to be *very wide of the truth*. In taking a *day* as the prophetic time for a *year*, I believe you are *sustained by the soundest exegesis*, as well as *fortified* by the high names of Mede, Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, Faber, Scott, Keith, and a host of others who have long since come to *substantially your conclusions* on this head. They all agree that the leading periods mentioned by Daniel and John *do actually expire about this age of the world*, and it would be strange logic that would convict you of heresy for holding in effect the same views which stand forth so prominently in the notices of these eminent divines." "Your results, in this field of inquiry, do not strike me as so *far out of the way* as to affect any of the great interests of truth or duty."—*Ad. Her. Vol. 7. p. 38.*

In writing to Professor Stuart, he says:—"I am not inclined precipitately to discard an opinion *long prevalent in the church*, which has commended itself to those whose judgments are entitled to profound respect. That such is the case in regard to the *year-day* calculations of prophecy, I am *abundantly satisfied*, and I confess, too, at once to the pleasure that it affords me to find that that which is sustained by *age* is also sustained by *argument*." Again he says:—"Mede is very far from being the first who adopted this solution of the symbolic term *day*. It is the solution naturally arising from the construction put in *all ages* upon the oracle of Daniel, respecting the SEVENTY WEEKS, which by Jews and Christians have been interpreted weeks of years, on the principle of a day standing for a year. This fact is obvious from the Rabbinical writers *en masse*, where they touch upon the subject, and Eusebius tells us (Dem. Evangl. viii. p. 258.—Ed. Steph.) that this interpretation in his day was *generally*, if not *universally admitted*." "It is plain that this canon of interpretation is no modern novelty."—*Hierophant, Vol. 1. p. 243.*



were clothed, but spake the words the Holy Ghost dictated. And if we pay any deference to the *words* spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets,—and we can get no clue to their communications only by their words—we must certainly admit that they have spoken of the “restitution” of “the wilderness,” that it shall “be as *Eden* ;” and of “the desert,” that it shall be as “the garden of the Lord ;” of the earth, that it shall be created anew ; of man, that those written in the book shall be awakened from the dust of the earth ; and of Messiah, that his dominion shall be under the whole heaven, and have no end.

“CHRIST’S ‘DELIVERING UP THE KINGDOM.’”

1 Cor. xv. 24—28. “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.”

Upon this passage of Scripture has been based the belief that Christ’s kingdom was set up at his first advent, that it is merely a mediatorial kingdom—(as though the office of a king was to mediate between two opposing parties!)—and that at his personal coming it will be relinquished. But this is the only passage that the most remotely favors such a doctrine, and a close examination shows that even this lends no support to such a tenet. With many of the Professor’s remarks under this head we are much pleased.

‘*Then cometh the end.*’ The true import of this, as Professor Bush shows, is “to perfect, to finish,” and it “is much more nearly allied to perfection or consummation than to termination.” He adds :—

“A river that sinks away in the sands and suddenly disappears, comes to an ‘end.’ But a river that merges itself in the waters of the ocean, comes to an ‘end’ in a very different sense. Yet this last is much nearer the Scriptural import of the word than the former. The chain of inspired revelation conducts us to a grand consummation in the universal establishment of Christ’s kingdom on earth in the New Jerusalem economy, and there leaves us. It gives us no intimation of anything like a *physical winding up* of the present mundane system.” The phrase, “‘end of the world,’” conveys indeed the idea of a *close*, but it is the close of a *dispensation*.”—p. 368.



The above is expressive of our views on this point. We look for no physical winding up of this mundane system. We look for its *regeneration*, its *restitution*, at the commencement of Messiah's reign,—at the end of this *age* or dispensation and the commencement of an endless kingdom on the *earth*, the subjects of which will be only those "who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that *age*, and the resurrection *from the dead*": who can never "die any more; for they are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."—Luke xx. 34—36. Then will be the "*river*" of probation merged into the "*ocean*" of reward.

"*When he shall have delivered up the kingdom.*" Professor Bush correctly remarks that, "Upon the true construction of this clause hinges the genuine purport of the whole passage." He then gives the prevailing views of Christendom in respect to this, viz. that "the government which Christ as a man administers in heaven, will continue only while the present constitution of the world lasts," that then he "will lay down his former charge and give it over to the Father," &c. Professor Bush assumes that the "nominative" of "shall have delivered, is not Christ, nor is the kingdom spoken of Christ's kingdom, at least prior to its being delivered up." He then adduces the following evidence of "the perpetuity of Christ's dominion."

2 Sam. vii. 16. "'Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.' This, though originally spoken to David, is obviously to be fulfilled in Christ, as we learn from Luke i. 32, 33, 'He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob *for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.*'

Is. ix. 6, 7. 'Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, *from henceforth even for ever.*'

Dan. ii. 44. 'And in the days of those kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, *which shall never be destroyed*: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, *and it shall stand for ever.*'

Dan. vii. 14. 'There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: *his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*'

Heb. i. 8. 'To the Son he saith, Thy throne, O, God, is for ever and ever.'



Rev. i. 5, 6. 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, *to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.* Amen.' The invocation of perpetual dominion undoubtedly implies the promise of it.

Rev. xi. 15. 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; *and he shall reign for ever and ever.*'

Rev. v. 13. 'Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and *unto the Lamb for ever and ever.*' This passage receives a great accession of weight in its present relation when viewed in connexion with the closing chapters of the book, where we learn that after the judgment by him who sat upon the great white throne, —when death and hell had delivered up the dead that were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works, and death and hell, and whoever was not found written in the book of life, were cast into the lake of fire,—*after the formation of a new heavens and new earth, and the descent of the New Jerusalem,—after all this we find the 'throne of the Lamb' still subsisting, and the river of the water of life proceeding out from under it.* But we have already seen that this must inevitably be long subsequent to the time of the delivering up of the 'kingdom' of which Paul here speaks.

Heb. vii. 21. 'The Lord sware and will not repent, *Thou art a priest for ever—after the order of Melchisedec.*' But Christ's kingship undoubtedly runs parallel with his priesthood. The perpetuity of the one, supposes that of the other. He is to 'sit a *priest upon his throne;*' i. e. combining the sacerdotal and legal dignity, and that for ever.

Heb. i. 2, 'Whom he hath appointed *heir of all things.*' The evidence from this is *inferential*, but still *conclusive*. Heirship denotes perpetuity. An estate received by inheritance does not revert back to the original possessor. Christ has received by inheritance, as the Father's eldest and only Son, 'the first-born of every creature,' 'the excellency of dignity and the excellency of power,' and of this inherited pre-eminence he can never be conceived as voluntarily divesting himself, much less as being deprived of it against his will. Wherefore, as *heir of the kingdom*, he holds his prerogative in everlasting fee."—pp. 370—372.

The above argument and citations, to our mind, prove conclusively the ever-enduring sovereignty of Christ, and the eternity of his kingdom. The question then is, What is his kingdom, which is thus eternal? Professor Bush affirms that "The kingdom of the Messiah is the *mediatorial kingdom*, and that of that *alone* is the apostle here speaking." But an objection to that is that his mediatorial office is no where in the Scriptures called *a kingdom*, and much less is it, *the kingdom*. The phrase, "*mediatorial kingdom*," is an absurdity of itself. For, a kingdom is under the government of its king; the exercise of the mediatorial office is not the exercise of kingly power, but it is mediating between two opposing parties, it is interceding for a party at the court of a superior. Such is Christ as an Advocate interceding for us with the Father: as our great High Priest, who is passed into the heav-



ens, making continual intercession for us; but how does it become the office of a king to make intercessions for others?

Again we hear it called "the Gospel kingdom," but it is not thus written in the Scriptures. It there reads, "The Gospel of the kingdom"—the Gospel being "the glad tidings of the kingdom." But, again, it can have no reference to Christ's mediatorial office, for that commenced with his ascension to heaven; but according to Dan. vii. 14, cited above, this kingdom is not to be given to Christ until the "Ancient of days" shall come, and that is not until the "Little Horn," which Professor Bush admits is Papacy, has continued its appointed time, which he also admits is 1260 years; for we read in the 21st and 22d verses of that chapter, that this "Horn" will war with the saints and prevail against them, until the coming of the Ancient of days, when the saints will possess the kingdom. And as the same Horn is still warring against the saints, it follows that the Ancient of days is not yet come, nor the kingdom given to Christ and the saints, as heirs and joint-heirs. But as he has been already invested in his mediatorial office for eighteen hundred years, that cannot be the same with his kingdom which is yet future. This kingdom is also to be given to Christ, according to Rev. xi. 15, cited above, which is at the ushering in of the New Jerusalem state, the time the kingdom in the text is to be delivered up.

But what are we to understand by the "delivering up of the kingdom"? Says Professor Bush:—

"In the solution of the problem involved in the language, we adopt as a criterion the general scope of inspired prophecy as to the destinies of the kingdom of Christ. This is to be gathered mainly from the predictions of Daniel and the Apocalypse. From the combined testimony of these oracles we learn that there is to be a succession of worldly empires, exercising from age to age a despotic and tyrannous rule over the great mass of mankind; till at length, under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the spiritual and eternal kingdom supersedes all these monarchies, and assumes to itself that dominion which they have so disastrously wielded over the subject nations of the earth."—p. 374.

He then affirms that the process of this transfer of power is "*gradual*," and has been "going on during the whole period of the prevalence of Christianity," to be "consummated" when this "epoch" "arrives." But while we agree in the time of its *consummation*, we entirely dissent from the view of its *gradual* fulfilment. No such gradual process is any where asserted in the Scriptures, while all the symbolical representations of this transfer of power are denoted by "the dashing to pieces of the image by the smiting of a stone cut



from the mountain without hands,\* the 'grinding of it to dust so that it is blown away by the wind and no place found for it,' 'the slaying of the beast and the giving of its body to the burning flame,'† 'the breaking of the exceeding great horn

\* Professor Bush, in his notes on "Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the Great Image," assumes that "the smiting stone *gradually* abolishes all antagonist dominions, and *gradually* fills the earth."—p. 14. He says the stone, "by a secret and unseen power, is borne against the huge metallic fabric, and that not in a single stroke, but in a prolonged collision, till at length the entire image is brought to the ground, and all its materials triturated to dust."—p. 72. The iron, clay, brass, silver, and gold, being broken to pieces "together," he contends "does not refer to the *simultaneous reduction* of the materials to dust, but to the *identity of condition* to which they were brought by the process intended."—p. 74.

But is there anything in the original of the words "*smite*," or "broken to pieces," that indicates a long-continued process? O no; he does not present the least criticism on those words; and he even intimates that it may "be said that the evidence of this is not an evidence afforded so much by the literal interpretation of the prophet's recital of the dream, as one reflected back upon it by the assumed exigencies of the subsequent solution."—p. 76. Now we contend that to "*smite*," legitimately denotes sudden and violent action; and unless the word is modified by some adjunct to denote that the action is repeated or continued, the inference is legitimate and irresistible that the effect is the result of a single blow. But, says Professor Bush, "The stone then, as we conceive the drift of the vision, began at the first founding of Christianity, to smite, in a comparatively *gentle* and *feeble* manner, upon the fabric of Roman despotism. It did not wage a direct aggressive warfare upon the system of government then established. It did not forbid, but commanded the rendering to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. It did not preach a crusade against the civil rule of Tiberius or Nero. But it did assert *principles*, and put forth an influence which went gradually to modify and finally to subvert the entire framework of the Roman polity."—p. 126. This, he contends "is required by the exigencies of the imagery, though not in so many words expressly declared in the text."—p. 125.

This exposition, it will be remembered, he is necessitated to, by his denial of the future Advent. But what is there in the past history of the church, that accords with the supposition that it has continued to smite and "pulverize" the Roman empire? Facts show that the church, instead of being the *smiter*, has been trodden under the foot of the Gentiles, has been driven into the wilderness, and has itself been smitten. It can hardly be said to have gently *rubbed* the Image, much less to have smitten it; and if its first collision, with all the momentum it had acquired in its descent from the mountain, produced no perceptible effect upon the Image, how long must it afterwards continue to rub against it, to grind it to powder?

But the Professor admits there is nothing in the text to denote this gradual process, and it is only resorted to on account of "the exigencies" of his theory, which reduces him to "great extremities of solution." The text is plain: the Image was to be smitten on the feet, and with a velocity that will shiver it to atoms: in the days of the toe kingdoms, the kingdom of heaven is to be set up by the advent of its King and the resurrection of the dead—the complete number of God's elect, a number sufficient to replenish the earth: then all these kingdoms will be destroyed, and it will stand forever. Thus the stone becomes—(does not grow to)—a great mountain, and fills the whole earth.

† Professor Bush also contends that the judgment of the fourth Beast is a work as gradual as the demolition of the Image by the stone. In an article on this subject in the Hierophant, he argues that the prediction, "The judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end," denotes a "progressive work."—p. 134. He concludes that "the sitting of the judgment was *prior* to the coming of the Son of man to the Ancient of days," that "this coming in the clouds of heaven *must* be referred to the Savior's ascension," and that "the consummated possession of the kingdom by the saints was not to occur till *after* the fourth monarchy was wasted away;" therefore, he asks, "how is it possible to resist the inference, that the events here shadowed forth are in fact spread over a very extended duration?"—p. 209.

This conclusion is legitimate if the premises are sound. But is it true that the



without hand,' 'the coming to an end with none to help it,' 'the binding of Satan and the casting of him into the bottomless pit,' &c. &c., none of which would be *selected* as figures symbolical of a long continued and gradual process extending through eighteen centuries.

Again, the long continuance of the process of transfer from the commencement of Christianity, would make Christ's kingdom for a time parallel with the kingdoms of this *age*, which are to give place to it. But the prophecy places it *after* the stone has smitten the image on the *feet*—not on the *legs*,—and no place is found even for any of the constituent dust of the metallic structure—*after* the fourth beast is slain and burned—*after* the kingdoms of this world are come to an end, when Michael shall stand up,—and *after* the passing away of the heavens and earth in the establishment of the New Jerusalem state, &c. We can find the prediction of no such long-continued process in the establishment of Christ's kingdom.

But, when the *epoch* alluded to arrives, says Professor Bush—

"Then it is that the 'kingdoms,' i. e., the rule, power, sway, dominion, which has been so long exercised by these various worldly empires, shall be *made over* to, and merged in, the supreme and universal kingdom of Jesus Christ. And this is precisely the 'end' which the apostle here says is to 'come.' It is the same result with that which is shadowed out in the vision of the Great Image in Daniel, that was broken to pieces, and ground to powder by the stone cut out of the mountain—which itself grew to a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. It is no other than that kingdom of Christ and the saints which displaced and succeeded the kingdoms of the four Beasts, and which also became universal under the whole heavens. Such are clearly the announcements of the Old Testament; and can we suppose that Paul, writing under the guidance of the same Spirit, would announce anything different?"—p. 374.

coming of the Son of man, is his going up to heaven? Professor Bush says the prediction of the angels to the disciples, Acts i. 11, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven," may simply mean that he "should so *arrive* in heaven, as they had seen him go towards heaven; yet he admits it "is by no means demonstrably certain."—p. 212. The transmutation of this text is produced in "the crucible of philological deduction;" but to us it looks more like a feat of legerdemain. Although the sitting of the judgment is *prior* to the receiving of the kingdom by the Son; so is the slaying of the beast recorded prior to the same event. But the coming of the Ancient of days is subsequent to the reign of the "little horn," which he says "is unquestionably the ecclesiastical power of the Papacy," (p. 109,) the time of whose reign he admits is 1260 years; for according to Dan. vii. 21, this horn prevails till the Ancient of days comes. Professor Bush also says, "the inference would seem to be forced upon us, that the judgment visited upon the ten-horned monster, was mainly provoked by the iniquitous acts of which he was guilty during the period, and under the instigation of the Little Horn."—p. 109. And, that "the enormities of the fourth Beast of the vision, his blasphemies, persecutions, and outrages, had become so grievous and heaven-daring, that a speedy divine interposition was called for; and accordingly the whole symbolic scenery indicates an order of proceeding violent and expedite corresponding with the emergency of the occasion."—p. 93. If this reasoning is correct, these events can be no *gradual* process, and must all transpire at or about the end of the fourth beast.



We fully accord with this view, with the exception of one word. It is no where said the stone 'grew to a great mountain.' It reads:—"And the stone that smote the image *became* a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." There is nothing to show that it was by any slow growth: on the other hand the context would lead us to conclude that immediately upon the disappearance of the entire image, then the stone is as it were at once transformed into a great mountain by the previous simultaneous resurrection of all the righteous dead, who swell the ranks of the righteous living then to be changed,—the subjects of Christ's universal and eternal kingdom.

"Here, then," says Professor Bush, "we have, as we conceive, the true key to the explication of his language. The scope of his intimations is the farthest possible from declaring that Christ is in any sense, or at any time, to 'deliver up' his kingdom. How should he do this, when this kingdom was given him as the *reward* of his humiliation and obedience unto death? Is his reward to cease as soon as his work is done? Are the saints to be crowned with an *eternal* reward, and the King of Saints with a *temporary* one? Shall he cease to be Lord and King at the very time that every knee begins to bow to him, and every tongue confess? Surely this is the most violent of all suppositions. What conclusion, then, is possible, but that the 'kingdom' here said to be 'delivered up'—which by the way is more properly rendered 'made over'—is the *usurped kingdom* of his enemies, and not his own?"—p. 375.

The above is a very just and scriptural conclusion, with which we are happy fully to accord. He then argues that the subject of the verb "shall have delivered" cannot be Christ, and that—

"The verb is used without any personal nominative, but has reference to the purpose of God, elsewhere expressed in his word. If this point can be completely made out, it will give, as the legitimate result, the following reading of the passage:—"Then cometh the end (the grand consummation), when the prophetic announcements of the Scriptures require the delivering up (the making over) of all adverse dominion into the hands of God, or the Godhead (the Father and the Son conjointly), to whose unrivalled supremacy every thing is to be made finally subject." This brings the oracle into parallelism with Rev. xi. 15, 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms' [kingdom] "of our Lord and his Christ."—p. 375.

This disposition of the verb respecting its nominative, he endeavors to sustain by the following rule:—

"Active verbs, especially of the third person singular (frequently also in the plural), in many cases assume the signification of the passive, *where no nominative is expressed.*"—p. 376.

The *correctness* of this rule he establishes by various citations from the Scriptures. But this rule is applicable only



“where *no nominative is expressed*;” but in the present text a nominative is at least implied, “*he shall have delivered up*,” and Professor Bush does not intimate that the ‘*he*’ is not correctly inserted in the translation. But as we come to substantially the same conclusion respecting the delivering up of the kingdom, it may be asked how we would avoid this difficulty? It is by the “general sense” of the phrase ‘*deliver up*,’ which according to Professor Bush is “*making over, transferring*,” which obtains elsewhere in the New Testament. The definition of our English word ‘*deliver*’ is very different from that which is usually assigned to it in this connection. According to Dr. Webster it is, 1, “*To free, to release as from restraint, to set at liberty.*” 2, “*To rescue or save.*” 3, “*To give or transfer*,” which, according to Professor Bush, and also Professor Mills of Andover, is the sense of its original. “*To surrender, to yield, to give up, to resign*,” are given by Webster as only the fourth signification of the term. Thus the ‘*delivering up of the kingdom*’ is the *rescuing* it from the usurpers that now administer its government, from the prince of the power of the air, and the *restoring* it to its rightful Lord.

We read that when God created the earth he pronounced all things very good. And its Creator, by virtue of his creative power was then the rightful King of the new domain. But the kingdom of this earth apostatized from its rightful Sovereign, and for six thousand years has been in a state of *rebellion*: it is a revolted kingdom. But God has made provision for its restoration. Coeval with the commencement of the Serpent’s reign, the promise was given that the seed of the woman should bruise his head, and God hath continued to predict, by the mouth of all the holy prophets that have spoken, the restoration of this earth to its Eden state under Emmanuel’s reign. It was only seen in the distant future as a bright vision of eternal glory, with no defined time for its consummation, and with no predicted consecutive events to its completion, until the thoughts came into the mind of the proud monarch of Babylon, as he reclined upon his bed, respecting “*what should come to pass hereafter.*” And the God in heaven that revealeth secrets, made ‘*known unto king Nebuchadnezzar what should be in the latter days.*’ He showed him under the symbol of a great ‘*Image*,’ that four great empires were to succeed each other, which should each in their order bear rule over the whole earth, that the last was to as-



sume a 'decem-regal' form as symbolized by the toes of the image, and that when it had passed through these successive changes, a mighty Stone would dash the entire Image to pieces by smiting it on its *feet*; and the God of heaven would again set up his kingdom to fill the whole earth,—it being then rescued from the dominion of its usurpers. The same order of events was again and again presented, with the same glorious consummation, for the comfort and encouragement of God's waiting children. And at length it pleased the Father to respond to the question, 'How long shall be the vision?' and the prophet was made to understand that it should be unto twenty-three hundred prophetic days, when the earth should be redeemed, and but sixty-nine prophetic weeks to the Messiah the Prince. "When the fulness of the *time* was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." He suffered in his own person the consequences of the *fall*, paid the price of the revolted province with his own blood, and has promised to redeem the possession, thus purchased, by destroying all the works of the Devil. His first victory over the prince of darkness was when he broke the bands of death, and arose the first fruits of those that slept, when he came off conquering and to conquer—his resurrection being a pledge of the resurrection of all his saints when the times of refreshing shall come. He then ascended on high and took his seat at the right hand of the Father, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, where he will reign until he shall put all enemies under his feet, shall rescue the kingdom from the hands of the usurper, and *restore* it to his Father, who will set his Son its King, upon the holy hill of Zion;—the heathen having been given to him—his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth—his possession; and the angels having gathered out of his kingdom all things that offend. Then 'the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him.'

"For he must reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet." This is supposed by some to denote that when all enemies are put under his feet, that he will then cease to reign. The following texts, however, are presented by Professor Bush to show that such is not necessarily the use of "until."



"1 Sam. xv. 35. 'Samuel came no more until the day of his death.' Of course, he *never* came again.

2 Sam. vi. 23. 'Therefore Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child unto'" [the same word] "'the day of her death.'

Psa. cxii. 8. 'His heart is established, he shall not be afraid, *until* he see his desire upon his enemies.'

Isa. xxii. 14. 'Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you *till* ye die.'

Isa. xlii. 4. 'He shall not fail nor be discouraged, *till* he have set judgment in the earth.'

Isa. xlvi. 4. 'Even *to*'" [the same word] "'your old age I am he.'

Matt. v. 18. "'*Till* heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' Does this imply that any part of the law shall fail, even supposing heaven and earth shall pass away ?

Matt. xxviii. 20. 'Lo, I am with you always, even *unto* the end of the world.' Would he cease to be with them then ?

Rom. v. 13. 'Until the law, sin was in the world.' It surely did not leave the world then."—pp. 379. 380.

Consequently if he shall reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet, there will be then nothing to prevent his reigning: it will be then uninterrupted.

"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Professor Bush understands "death" here, "not as synonymous with *mortality* in the abstract, but with *premature mortality*;" that death will no longer be "an enemy," or "a curse"—"not that men will then *cease to die*," but that "it will then become to the great mass of men a mere gentle metamorphosis, or, more properly, a virtual translation from the mundane to the celestial mansions."

We however must believe the positive declaration of the Revelator that "THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH." But Prof. Bush is *obliged* to assume his interpretation, to *avoid* in the context the doctrine of the resurrection. Professor Mills renders it, "He shall destroy the last enemy, death," i. e. the last enemy of the saints, their bodies being no longer holden of it.

The other portions of this passage are comparatively clear, and are not here subjects of dispute. With the above explanation the whole passage "is in entire harmony with the general scope of the prophetic Scriptures relative to the duration and destiny" of our Lord's everlasting kingdom. The following paraphrase expresses our understanding of this portion of Scripture\* :—The apostle had been just speaking of the

\* The following is Professor Mills' translation of this passage.

"Then cometh the end, when he shall re-establish the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall subdue all [opposing] rule and all authority and power: for

victory which Christ, at his coming, shall obtain over death by the rescue of his people from the power of death, in their glorious resurrection; and having declared the fact of such deliverance, he proceeds:—Then [at Christ's coming] cometh the end, [or consummation, that glorious result to which the promises of God and the hopes of Christians are specially directed,] when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom [having destroyed all the works of the devil, and rescued it from his dominion] to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all [opposing] rule, and all authority and power. For he [Christ] must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed—death: for he hath put all things under his [Christ's] feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he [the Father] is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him [Christ,] then shall the Son also himself [as before, still continue to] be subject unto him [the Father] that put all things under him, that God may [continue to] be all in all."

In the concluding chapter of his work Professor Bush briefly recapitulates the principal points in his argument from reason, which, as we have already noticed, will not again be made the subject of individual comment. A few of his remarks, however, we cannot thus pass over. In reference to his philosophical conclusions, he asks:—

"If our conclusions are authoritative to our own minds, can we set them aside when we come to deal with the letter of Holy Writ? Is not the light of human reason as truly kindled by the Spirit of God, as the light of divine revelation? Is there the highest criminality in going counter to the one, and none in going counter to the other? If so, why?—on what grounds?—p. 389.

We admit that the "light of human reason" is "*kindled* by the Spirit of God," but we deny that it is always *directed* by the same Spirit: an opposite spirit often shapes and controls "human reason," as the course of a majority of the race fully demonstrates. The "light" of divine revelation is never thus mis-directed. While therefore we may know we are criminal in going counter to the one, we may be acting wisely in

---

he must reign until he put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy, death, shall be destroyed; for he [the Father] hath [by decree] subjected all things beneath his feet. But since it is said all things have been subjected, it is plain that He is excepted who did subject all things to him. But when all things shall be [actually] subjected, even then the Son himself shall be subject to Him, who did subject all things to him, that God may be all in all."—Henry Mills D. D. *Prof. Bib. Lit. An. Theo. Sem.—Bib. Repos. Vol. 3d. p. 753.*



going counter to the conclusions of the other ; for there never was an error promulgated, but the “*reason*” of some of the human race has bowed to it. Were human reason never defective, we might always abide by it ; but among the multiplicity of opinions, where can we look for *truth* but to the word of God alone. If we could fully realize how little we actually know, we should be less ready to place human reason by the side of divine revelation. Says Mr. Locke :—

“ Our knowledge being so narrow, it will perhaps give us some light into the present state of our minds, if we look a little into the dark side, and take a view of our ignorance, which, being infinitely greater than our knowledge, may serve much to the quieting of disputes and improvements of useful knowledge ; if, discovering how far we have clear and distinct ideas, we confine our thoughts within the contemplation of those things that are within the reach of our understanding, and launch not out into that abyss of darkness where we have not eyes to see, nor faculties to perceive any thing ; out of a presumption that nothing is beyond our comprehension.—But to be satisfied of the folly of such a conceit, we need not go far.”—*Locke Hum. Underst. IV. iii. § 22.*

Says Dr. Good :—

“ It is one part of science, and not the least important, though the lowest and most elementary, to become duly acquainted with the nature and extent of our ignorance upon whatever subject we propose to investigate ; and it is probably for want of a proper attention to this branch of study, that we meet with so many crude and confident theories upon questions that the utmost wit or wisdom of man is utterly incapable of elucidating. The rude uninstructed peasant, or ignorant pretender, believes that he understands everything before him ; the experienced philosopher knows that he understands nothing. It was so in Greece, and will be so in every age and country : while the sophists of Athens asserted their pretensions to universal knowledge, Socrates, in opposition to them, was daily affirming that the only thing he knew to a certainty was his own ignorance.”—*Book of Nature, p. 322.*

Now although man may be very learned and profound, yet the Maker of man is more learned and profound than he ; and as the results to which the most wise and learned have arrived,—the various theories and systems which at times have captivated the world, and then each in their turn given place to others,—have so often been proved to be defective, when

new light has dawned ; so any theory which positively contradicts the inspired word, *may* in its turn also be found to be *defective*. We therefore prefer to abide by the letter of the Scriptures ; for should it be proved at last that we have adhered too closely to the sacred text, we should have an excuse we should not be ashamed to offer at the divine tribunal ; but if we should err on the other hand, we should be without excuse. We cannot therefore assent to the following conclusion :

" On the whole, we are unable to perceive that the principle is not a sound one, which makes the ascertained truth of physical and psychical science, the criterion by which to judge of the import of revealed truth, falling within the same department."—p. 389.

We do not conceive that it is a sound principle, because when the Bible asserts " the bodies of the saints arose," a *supposed* ascertained truth may deny it. And we had rather take the alternative, that " we can be more certain of the meaning of the Spirit," when it is clearly and positively enunciated, although it may teach " doctrines contrary to our deductions, than we can be, of the truth of those deductions themselves."

Another argument here adduced is, that "*Anastasis*," the leading word by which the resurrection is indicated, merely denotes " a new sphere of existence," and not the " restoration of a suspended bodily life ;" and,—

" With this ruling sense of the term, the truth or the fallacy of the theory becomes, therefore, in great measure, a question of *pure philology*, and by the verdict which a fair and enlightened criticism renders on the subject, it must stand or fall."—p. 392.

However much this may be a question of "*philology*," one thing is certain ; i. e. when the positive declarations of Scripture have been submitted to the criticism of the Professor, he has, as we have seen in numerous instances, admitted that there was a resurrection *asserted*, and that the sense which he is " constrained to put upon the *letter* of the sacred record may be different from that which is most natively obvious, and such as would never have occurred " to him but from its conflict with his theory ; while on the other hand he has not once claimed that he has *demonstrated* the certainty of his deductions from science, but only assumes a great degree of *probability*. So that the question finally resolves itself to this, *Shall we receive the positive enunciations of Scripture, or shall we set them aside by deductions which at best are only probable?* After all our researches, and philosophical and



philological criticisms, we must abide by one of those alternatives.

We have thus gone over the entire work of Professor Bush with as much minuteness as we had time and space to devote to it. We have endeavored to state all his prominent arguments fairly, and as fully as was practicable. We have wished to see and to admit the full force of any and all objections which could be adduced against this glorious doctrine. If we are in any measure in error, we wish to obey the dictates of truth; and we are conscious of no desire to sustain any favorite tenet of our own at the expense of truth. While Professor Bush pleads "not guilty to the charge of a morbid *cacoethes innovandi*," and has no "desire of hunting after and minting new" theories, "by reason of a profane loathing of anciently received truth," so we also plead not guilty to any similar charge, or to that of adhering to any theory because it is old, or of rejecting any because it may be an innovation upon established views. While we wish to submit every theological question to "the crucible of logical and philological induction," we also wish to submit each and all "to the Law and the Testimony: *if they speak not according to this word, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM,*"—Isa. viii. 20. And this word must be so written that its *native import* can be made plain to the understanding of man, or so frequent reference would not be made to what is there *written*. "What is written in the law?" said our Savior to the lawyer, Luke x. 20, "How readest thou?" St. Paul avowed his belief in "all things which are *written* in the Law and the Prophets,"—Acts xxiv. 14. Says our Savior, Luke xxiv. 44, 46, "These are the *words* which I *spake* unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were *written* in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." "Thus it is *written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." And, Matt. v. 18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Frequent reference is made to the reading of the Scriptures, and what is written therein. "The Scripture was fulfilled which saith,"—"Hath not the Scripture said,"—"And the Scripture cannot be broken,"—"What saith the Scriptures?"—"Do you think the Scripture saith in vain?"—"Have ye never read in the Scriptures?"—"Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,"—"Search the Scriptures," &c. Would such frequent reference be made to the

Oracles of God, if another "criterion" was to supersede them? or if the native import of the words in which the sacred teachings are expressed, as understood by the Jews of that age, would not convey to us the true understanding of the divine communications? If the revelations of God were so shrouded in an obscure diction, that all men, everywhere, for four thousand years, not excepting inspired prophets and apostles, should attach a meaning to the words not sustained by the actual truth, would it not be strange that our Savior should accuse them, when they departed from the *letter* of the law, of "transgressing the commandment of God by their traditions"? of "making the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions"? Paul commanded the church, 1 Cor. xi. 2, "to keep the traditions as he delivered them." The faith which the apostles believed, embraced the resurrection of the body; and we are commanded "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." The apostle charged them "to preach no other doctrine," and those "which caused divisions contrary to the doctrine they *had learned*, they were to avoid"; and says Paul, Gal. i. 8, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." He commanded Timothy to "hold fast the *form of sound words*, which thou hast heard from me," "and the things that thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Therefore when we read that in the *last days* "they will not endure sound doctrine," "will depart from the faith;" and are cautioned "to keep that committed to our trust, avoiding the oppositions of science falsely so called," it makes us very suspicious of any view of the divine word, which is in opposition to what it is admitted all the prophets and apostles believed, and which denies the native import of the plain letter of the text.

Having thus presented the various objections to "the doctrine of the resurrection"—the view of Professor Bush being only "the doctrine of elimination"—we will briefly present in connection the several Scriptures which more particularly sustain it—the objections to which have already been considered.

Gen. xvii. 8, "I will give unto *thee* and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting* possession." Ex. vi. 2—4, "And God spake un-



to Moses and said unto him, I am the Lord; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob," "and I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." Luke xx. 37, 38, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Acts vii. 2—5, "The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised to give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." The harmony of these several texts alone are sufficient to prove that "Abraham" and "his seed" who "died in faith not having received the promise," will surely again be raised to possess that land.

Job xix. 25, 26. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."

Psa. xvii. 15. "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness."

Isa. xxv. 7—9. "And he will destroy in this mountain, the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth: for the Lord God hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us." 1 Cor. xv. 51—54, "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" This last portion of Scripture is exegetical of the former.

Isa. xxvi. 19, 21. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise; awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." "For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity:



the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."

Ezek. xxxvii. 11, 12. "Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: Behold, say they, our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel."

Dan. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Luke vii. 12—15. "Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out." And the Lord "came and touched the bier: and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother."

John xi. 43, 44. "And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth! And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes."

Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the time is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto [at] the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto [at] the resurrection of damnation."

John vi. 40. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

Matt. xxvii. 59—66. "And when Joseph had taken the body [of Jesus], he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed." "Now the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead." "So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

Matt. xxviii. 1—9. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre." ["And they



found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.”—*Luke.*] [“And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting,” “and were affrighted.”—*Mark*] “And the angel answered and said unto the woman, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus *which was crucified.* He is not here; *for he is risen,* as he said, Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that **HE IS RISEN FROM THE DEAD.**” “And as they went to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.” “After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.”—*Mark* xvi. 12. “Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.”—*John* xx. 19, 20. And he said, “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” “And he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them.”—*Luke* xxiv. 39—43. “And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.”—*John* xx. 26, 27. “After these things Jesus showed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberius.” “This is now the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.”—xxi. 1, 14.

*Acts* x. 39—41. “Whom they slew and hanged on a tree, him God raised the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before by God, even to us, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead.”

*1 Cor.* xv. 3—23. “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.” “Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your



faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

Acts iv. 1, 2. "And while they were speaking to the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead."

Acts xvii. 18, 32. "And some said, What will this babblers say? some others, He seemeth to be a setter-forth of strange gods: because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection." "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked."

Acts xxiv. 14, 15, 21. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." "Concerning the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day."

1 Cor. vi. 14. "And God hath raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power."

Rom. viii. 11, 23. "But 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." "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

1 Thess. iv. 13—17. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Phil. iii. 21. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."



2 Tim. ii. 16—18. "But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness; and their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."

Luke xiv. 13, 14. "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

Luke xx. 34—36. "And Jesus answering, said unto them, the children of this world [age] marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Phil. iii. 10, 11. "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means, I might attain unto the resurrection of [out from among] the dead."

Heb. xi. 35. "Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection."

Rev. xx. 4—6. "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the Beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Acts xvi. 8. "*Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?*"

The above are the passages which more prominently refer to the doctrine of the resurrection. The predictions are plain and positive, and clearly enunciated. They constitute "the law and the testimony" respecting this doctrine, with which word, if any theory on this subject agree not, it is because there is no light in it. No person free from bias would venture to assert that the idea of the resurrection of the body is not there affirmed. Even Professor Bush does not deny but that in many instances, after a most critical analysis of the language of the text, the idea of the resurrection of deceased



bodies is therein contained. He admits that the Jews believed in the resurrection of the body, the revivification of that which is deposited in the ground, and that they attached no other signification to the language of the prophets, but in accordance with this doctrine; that the apostles themselves understood the teachings of Christ to foreshadow the same event; that they actually believed the body of Christ was raised from the tomb, and that all would be thus raised: and the earliest authority he presumes to bring, in support of the *antiquity* of his belief, are the "heretics" to whom Justin Martyr refers in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew. That is the earliest gleam of light he can find in the primitive age.

Thus we have on the one side, the natural construction which the vast majority of men have almost unanimously put upon the sacred text, and the belief in the resurrection of the body by those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and by those who sat under their teachings, both Jew and Gentile: which belief was received as the true faith by the ancient saints, and was transmitted from them through the church even to the present day. And what have we on the other side? Why, we have the arguments, that the constituent particles of the human body are continually varying, and are entirely changing and displacing its material, so that we have possessed many bodies, and those we once inhabited have been entirely dissipated and entered into other combinations,—that the same particles may successively enter into the combinations of many bodies, so that there will be a question to whom they will finally belong, and which of the bodies we have inhabited will be raised,—and that it is impossible to discover the connection or perpetuity of identity between the body that is laid aside and the resurrection body; with other similar physiological arguments. With these we have the argument from Scripture, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, to prove that that kingdom is set up in a world inhabited only by flesh and blood; and the testimony of the false witnesses, that Christ would be raised with another body. These arguments, which Dr. Nelson terms Infidel objections,—not dreaming that any Christian would ever use them,—and these Scriptures, sustained as they are by the creed of the "heretics" of Justin Martyr's day, are the foundation of the superstructure which is to be reared against the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. If therefore we would occupy the ground that right reason would dictate, in view of all this evi-



dence, we must continue still to adhere to the faith of the apostles, that is so clearly presented in the letter of the text.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

This is a doctrine so intimately connected with those of the resurrection, judgment, and end of the world, which have respectively been so fully discussed in the pages under review, that all the ground in support of the resurrection of the body cannot be occupied without adverting to the evidence by which the personal advent at the resurrection of the just is sustained. We are surprised that Professor Bush has not devoted a portion of the body of his work to the consideration of this question, as his argument cannot be made out unless this is disproved. In his preface he says:—

“The reader will perhaps be prompted to inquire, why, as I have treated the Resurrection in connection with the Judgment, I have not also displayed it in its definite relations to the Second Advent, with which it would appear to be equally intimately associated in the great scheme of Eschatology? \* To this I reply, that an accurate examination of what I have advanced on the general subject, will readily disclose my own opinion that the Second Advent of the Savior is not affirmed to be *personal*, but *spiritual* and *providential*, and that the event so denominated, is to be considered as having entered upon its incipient fulfillment at a very early period of the Christian dispensation. To this view I shall be compelled to adhere, so long as the declaration stands unrepealed—‘Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death † till they see the Son of man *coming* in his kingdom.’ If the word of inspiration can be shown to contain the announcement of any *other* second coming than that which *commenced* in the life-time of the generation then living; and if this can be proved to be truly a *second*, instead of a *third* coming, I shall be ready at once to embrace it.”—p. 9.

If the doctrine of a personal advent was sustained only by inferences drawn from two or three disputed passages, as is the argument adduced in disproof of it, we should relinquish it at once. But as it is not thus weakly sustained, and as its truth and the truth of the resurrection of the body are dependent upon the truth of each other, we feel justified in this connection, to sustain the doctrine of the resurrection by the Scriptural evidence that there is to be a future personal advent at the resurrection of life.

\* “The doctrine of the last things.”

† “Death,” says Professor Bush in another place, “is here to be understood in precisely the same sense—not as synonymous with mortality in the abstract, but with *premature* mortality.” “It is not that men will then *cease to die*,” “but death will then be deprived of his sting, and the grave of its victory.”—pp. 380, 381. If this is a correct rule there applied, it would obviate the objection brought to bear against the present text, i. e., according to Professor Bush’s rule, they might still die, but were not to die prematurely.



We have already given the evidence on page 375, that the text on which Professor Bush relies, is no proof that the second advent is past, and that it had no reference to his second advent, but to a miniature representation of his coming and kingdom; which we deem sufficient to settle the question that Christ's transfiguration was for the purpose of giving some who stood there a glimpse of the kingdom of God, in proof of the reality of Christ's second advent; and that it was what they were to see before they saw death. But as this was fulfilled about an eight days after, and *during* Christ's first advent, it cannot be the *second* coming referred to, for he could not come the second time until he had been absent after the first; consequently a future coming would not be a *third*, but a *second* advent.

But notwithstanding the evidence which was presented to Peter on the mount, that the coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ is no cunningly devised fable, he says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." Peter makes the "word of prophecy" even "more sure" than that which he saw and heard for himself. We will therefore have recourse to the testimony of the prophets; and we may do, in this connection, but little more than to present the words of "the prophecy" that "came not at any time by the will of man, but by holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

As many of the acts, predicted in the Scriptures to be performed by the Savior, were not performed at his first advent, it is necessary that there should be a second coming to finish the great plan of salvation. The first intimation we have of the second advent is in Gen. iii. 15, "And I will put enmity between thee [the serpent] and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." To bruise the heel denotes a partial victory; but to bruise the head of an enemy denotes his entire destruction. Some contend that in Christ's crucifixion he bruised the serpent's head. But that must be a strange victory over another which resulted in the death of the victor. This, however, we regard as the fulfilment of that part of the promise that Satan will bruise Christ's heel. The head of Satan cannot yet have been bruised; for he still goes about as a roaring lion deceiving the children of



men. But when Christ shall bind him and cast him into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are to be tormented day and night for ever and ever, Rev. xx. 10, his head will be effectually bruised. And this must be at Christ's second advent.

We read in Numbers, xxiv. 17, "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, that shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." This has always been considered by commentators as a prediction of Christ's advent; and as these events were not fulfilled under his first, they must have respect to his second coming.

Job testified, xix. 25, "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." This he connects with his resurrection; for he says that after the worms have destroyed his body, he shall see God in his flesh.

In the 2d Psalm, speaking of the future, God says, "yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen—thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth—thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This must refer to the destruction of the wicked at Christ's second coming; and it can afford but little evidence of the world's conversion, in support of which it is so often adduced.

Psalm l. 3—5. "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice."

Psalm xcvi. 11—13. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth."

Psalm lxxxix. 34—37. "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." This can only have respect to Christ as the Heir to David's throne. Thus the angel spake to Mary, Luke i. 31—33. "Thou shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over



the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." This must be the everlasting kingdom that is to come, and is to be set up under the whole heaven. And James declares, Acts xv. 16, that this is to be after God has taken out of the Gentiles a people for his name—"After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up"; which he says agrees with the words of the prophets.

Isaiah, after bringing to view the resurrection, when death will be swallowed up in victory, says, xxv. 9, "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Again, in a subsequent chapter, after showing that the earth will cast out her dead, and that the dead men of Zion will arise with his dead body, he adds, xxvi. 21, "For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity."

Daniel, after showing us the destruction of the fourth beast and all human governments, says, vii. 13, 14, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." This must be a future coming; for it is after the destruction of the horn of papacy; and it must be the same coming referred to by Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 8, when the Man of Sin will be destroyed,—that Wicked "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Also, according to Daniel, Christ's kingdom is to succeed the present governments of the world, is to dash them to pieces, and to take their place; and in the 12th chapter he shows us that it is when the many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, that Michael is to stand up, when all human government shall come to its end, and none to help it.

Zech. xiv. 34. "Then shall the LORD go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east." We then read that "the LORD my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." And the LORD shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one."

Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 29, 30, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?\*" "For as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming\* of the Son

---

\* In this, and in all the subsequent passages quoted in this connection, the word *coming*, when it is indicated by an asterisk (\*) is from the Greek word *parousia*, de-



of Man be." "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn. And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."

Matt. xxiv. 37—39. "But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the *coming* \* of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the *coming* \* of the Son of man be."

Luke xvii. 26—30. "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all; even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

Luke xix. 11, 12. "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable: because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, a certain Nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." This Nobleman must be the Lord Jesus Christ; and this parable is evidently spoken to correct the impression that his coming was to be an event of that day.

Mark. xiii. 34. "For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house and gave authority to his servants and to every man his work; and commanded the porter to watch."

Matt. xxv. 31, 34. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." "Then shall the King say unto them on the right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

John xiv. 3. "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will

---

noting his actual *epiphany* and *personal revelation*. That word is used but twenty-four times in the New Testament, seventeen of which are here quoted in reference to Christ's *coming*. In the remaining seven places where the same word occurs, no one will deny that it has reference to the actual *personal presence* or *arrival* of the person to whom it is applied, as the following instances of its use will show. 1 Cor. xvi. 17, "I am glad of the *coming* of Stephanus and Fortunatus and Achaicus." 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7,—"God comforted us by the *coming* of Titus; and not by his *coming* only." 2 Cor. x. 10—"But his bodily *presence* is weak." Phil. i. 26—"That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my *coming* to you again." Phil. ii. 12,—"Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my *presence* only, but now much more in my absence." Phil. v. 9,—"Even him whose *coming* is after the working of Satan."—See *Literalist*, Vol. 3, p. 129. This must establish the *usus loquendi* of the word; and if it denotes the personal presence in every other instance of its use in the New Testament, it must when used in reference to the Savior's coming.



come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Acts. i. 11. "Which also said, ye men of Gallilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Acts iii. 20, 21. "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

1 Cor. i. 7, 8, "So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

1 Cor. xv. 20, 23. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his *coming*."\*

Phil. iii. 20. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ."

Col. iii. 4. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

1 Thess. i. 9, 10. "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living God and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come."

1 Thess. ii. 19. "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming*."\*

1 Thess. iii. 13. "To the end that he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the *coming* \* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints."

1 Thess. iv. 14—17. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the *coming* \* of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."

1 Thess. v. 23. "I pray God your whole spirit and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the *coming* \* of the Lord."

2 Thess. i. 7, 8. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Thess. ii. 1. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the *com-*



ing\* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him."

2 Thess. iii. 5. "And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ."

2 Thess. v. 8. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."\*

1 Tim. vi. 14, 15. "That thou keep this commandment without spot unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords."

2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

Titus ii. 13. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ."

Heb. ix. 28. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation."

James v. 7, 8. "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming\* of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming\* of the Lord draweth nigh."

1 Pet. i. 7, 13. "That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ." "Wherefore gird up the loins of your minds, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

1 Pet. v. 4. "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

2 Pet. i. 16. "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming\* of our Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, 12. "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?"\* "Looking for and hastening into the coming\* of the day of God."

1 John ii. 28. "That when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming"\*

1 John iii. 2. "Behold, now are we the sons of God; and 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."

Jude 14, 15. "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophe-



sied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all."

Rev. i. 7. "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him; and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall mourn because of him."

Rev. xi. 15, 18. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth."

Rev. xxi. 3. "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God."

Rev. xxii. 20. "He which testifieth these things, saith, Surely I come quickly; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Matt. xiii. 30, 39—43. "Let both (the tares and the wheat) grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."

"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world [*aionos*—*age*]; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

The above texts, to any who will admit the "native import" of their language, must settle the question, that at the time assigned for the resurrection of the just and the regeneration of the earth, there will be the personal appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick and the dead and reign upon the throne of his father David for ever and ever. They also plainly show that this appearing was the great event for which the early Christians and martyrs prayed, which they ardently desired, and for which they waited with earnest expectation. That this is the true exposition of those texts has been admitted by the church in all ages, excepting these last



days ; and it was never questioned by the pious, for the first five hundred years after Christ.

And how can their native import be obviated ? It is only attempted to be by the supposition, that these glorious predictions, in which Christ's personal appearing and presence are asserted, only have reference to his spiritual appearing, his invisible coming to destroy Jerusalem, his coming at death, or his providential coming. But any such application comes far short of the event indicated by the glowing language of the text.

That the glorious epiphany here predicted is not the coming of Christ at death, is evident from the fact that at death, instead of Christ's coming to us, we "depart" "to be with Christ," (Phil. i. 23.) And the apostle assures us that when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, all the dead in Christ will be raised to life, and the righteous living will be changed, (1st Thess. iv. 16,) so that Christ's coming, instead of being the signal of death, is the signal for the resurrection from the dead.

That these predictions have no reference to a coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, is evident from the fact that the Apocalypse was written about twenty-six years after that event, and in that are contained predictions of his future coming. Also, in the 24th chapter of Matthew's Gospel, we find that the very signs that were to *precede* his coming were not to be seen until *after* the tribulation, which commenced with the destruction of that city, and continued through the Pagan and Papal persecutions. That they can have reference to no providential or spiritual coming, is also evident from the fact that Christ is never spiritually or providentially absent. He has promised to be with us even to the end of the world, and as he has never left the world by his Spirit, he cannot be said to come spiritually *again* ; for how can that which is with us, be said to *come* to us ? Besides, such, instead of being his *second* coming, would be a *multiplicity* of comings.

That the coming of Christ can be no spiritual or providential coming at death, the destruction of Jerusalem, or in any other invisible way, is also evident from the signs which were to precede it, which to such events would be entirely inapplicable ; and our Savior has expressly cautioned us, that if any say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there," we are to "believe it not" ; and "if they shall say to you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not



forth ; behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not.—For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even to the west ; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. And they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven.”—Matt. xxiv. 23, 27, 30. Consequently the coming of the Lord can only have reference to his personal and glorious appearing in his kingdom. If the coming of Christ is personal and literal, the Resurrection and the Restitution of all things at the end of this age, must be of a nature to correspond. And before Professor Bush can disprove the doctrine of the Resurrection, he must also do away with the literal fulfilment of any and all of these coetaneous events, each of which is, independent of the others, sustained by the most overwhelming and positive testimony of the Word of God. But as we conceive that he has signally failed in producing evidence from the Scriptures, or from reason, to disprove the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, or of either of these kindred events, we must continue still to believe that they are immutable truths, sustained by the Divine testimony. We therefore believe that it is incumbent upon us, like the saints of old, to live in “the patient waiting for Christ,” who will raise all the righteous from their dusty beds, and judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom. May God hasten that glorious consummation.

The only remaining topic of interest, the conflagration of the earth, which is legitimately connected with the doctrine of the Resurrection, is considered in the following article, in which we have reviewed a disquisition in the “Hierophant,” from the pen of Professor Bush on that subject.

---

#### ARTICLE XVI.

*The Conflagration of the Heavens and Earth. A Review of “The Millennium and New Jerusalem, by Geo. Bush.”*

Under the title of “The Millennium and New Jerusalem,” we find an argument in the “Hierophant,” by Prof. Bush, which is so legitimately connected with the doctrine of the Resurrection, that we have thought best to review it in connection with the subject of the preceding article.



The question of a literal conflagration of the earth is so nearly allied to the doctrines of the Resurrection, Second Advent, &c., that in an article in the New York Tribune, of January 24th, Professor Bush says, if "the usual sense put upon the phrase 'end of the world,' as implying the physical conflagration of the globe we inhabit," be true, "there is no possible alternative between it and the theory of Millerism, except, perhaps, in regard to the precise day or year."

Professor Bush assumes—

"That the New Jerusalem state, as described both by Isaiah and by John, is locally an earthly state—a dispensation, economy, or polity, to be developed on the material globe that we now inhabit."—p. 49.

To this proposition we fully subscribe. The nature of this future dispensation and of the events which will usher it in, are the questions here at issue. He says:—

"We affirm that the beatific state of things announced in the predictions of Isaiah—when the desert shall bud and blossom as the rose—when the valleys shall be exalted, and the mountains and hills made low—when the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain—when the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together—when the Gentiles shall come to the light of Zion, and kings to the brightness of her rising—when instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier, the myrtle-tree—when for brass shall be brought gold, for iron silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron—when Jerusalem shall be created a rejoicing and her people a joy—when the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying—when the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and they shall no more hurt nor destroy in all the Lord's holy mountain—that this state is *identical* with the New Jerusalem of John. The proof of this can only be made palpable by a tabellated display of the parallelisms occurring in the two prophets which we now present to the reader."

JOHN XXI. 1, 2.

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea.

And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

JOHN XXI. 19, 20.

And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald;

ISAIAH LXV. 17, 18.

For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.

But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.

ISAIAH LIV. 11, 12.

O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted! behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires.

The fifth, sardonyx ; the sixth, sardius ; the seventh, chrysolite ; the eighth, beryl ; the ninth, a topaz ; the tenth, a chrysopterus ; the eleventh, a jacinth ; the twelfth, an amethyst.

JOHN XXI. 23.

And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it : for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.

xxii. 5.

And there shall be no night there ; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun ; for the Lord God giveth them light : and they shall reign for ever and ever.

JOHN XXI. 24—26.

And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it : and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.

And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day : for there shall be no night there.

And they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it.

JOHN XXI. 4.

And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes ; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain : for the former things are passed away.

And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones.

ISAIAH IX. 19, 20.

The sun shall be no more thy light by day : neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee : but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.

Thy sun shall no more go down ; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself : for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.

ISAIAH IX. 3, 11.

And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.

Therefore thy gates shall be open continually ; they shall not be shut day nor night ; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought.

ISAIAH LXV. 19, 20.

And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people : and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying.

There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days : for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed.

*Hierophant, pp. 8—12.*

The above Scriptures prove conclusively that the parallel passages are descriptive of the same glorious period. But the question here arises whether they are descriptive of a probationary state, or of the glorious kingdom of the risen saints ? Professor Bush contends for the former. His argument is, that, of this state it is said—

“ ‘ There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days : for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall



build houses and inhabit them ; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit ; they shall not plant, and another eat : for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble ; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer ; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock : and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.'—Isa. lxx. 20—25.

This most assuredly is the picture of a *mundane* state of things, and it is only by a downright violence done to the text that it can be *spiritualized* into a prediction of the purely celestial blessedness. But if the new creation of John is *identical* with this of Isaiah—and on what principle of exegesis can it be shown to be different?—then John also describes a *terrestrial* economy, and his mystic city can only be said to come down out of heaven from God, on the ground of its being developed into existence in execution of the divine purposes."—p. 9.

All of the above we admit ; and yet the question arises whether it is a probationary state on the earth, or the resurrection state on the earth ? That it is the latter, is settled by the testimony of John, who gives us "the unequivocal assurance that 'THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH,' there." It follows, then, that if the two states are *identical*, there can be no death in the state described by Isaiah. But, says the Professor :—

"God alone could make known the future to either, and we see no good reason for ascribing to John or Peter a higher grade of foresight or infallibility than to Isaiah, Ezekiel, or Daniel ; nor, if the one is to be interpreted by the other, do we know any grounds on which we should be required to interpret Isaiah by John, rather than John by Isaiah. Indeed, if that necessity should be supposed, we should, for ourselves, feel warranted of the two to give the preference to the former, inasmuch as both Christ and the Apostles continually refer to the Old Testament annunciations as *fulfilled* in their doctrines and disclosures, and inasmuch as the very title of John's predictions, 'Apocalypse,' implies the *unveiling* or *revelation* of the mystic and hidden sense of the prophetic oracles, previously uttered by his inspired predecessors. The Old Testament predictions are plainly regarded as the most *original* of the two, and in all professed paraphrases, explanations, and expansions of the sense of *original documents*, we feel at liberty to compare for ourselves the pure originals with the avowed expositions, even though these expositions come to us bearing the stamp of divine inspiration. If both are actually inspired, it is possible that the former may in some points reflect light upon the latter, as well as the latter upon the former."—pp. 8, 9.

That the former may reflect light on the latter, is not denied ; but, if we are to have respect only to the *earliest* prediction, is it not setting aside subsequent explanations ? If the predictions of Isaiah needed no explanation, the revelations of John would have been uncalled for. And as both



spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, the very fact that God saw fit to give a subsequent revelation respecting the same points, is evidence that this subsequent revelation was necessary for the correct understanding of the former. We are to remember that the same Divine Mind is the *author* of both prophecies, so that to interpret the earliest prophecy irrespective of the subsequent explanation, would be like explaining some of Professor Bush's earlier writings irrespective of his subsequent explications of them: even if it should be in opposition to positive interpretations he may himself have made. He would hardly relish such liberties with his productions; and yet it is the liberty he takes with the revelations of God!

Again, the claim that Professor Bush makes for the liberty to compare for himself the two prophecies, no one would deny. But if he means,—and we confess we can find no other meaning—that he has the right to give an exposition of the *original* prophecies, as he calls them, irrespective of John's inspired interpretations, it looks a little like placing himself upon a par with John, and claiming an equal ability to *unveil* the prophetic oracles. We however will receive any explanation the Professor may make to this, although upon his own rule we might take *this* passage to explain what he may subsequently say respecting it.

To take Isaiah to explain John, would be like taking the previous will of a deceased man to a Court of Probate, to explain and contradict, if need be, a codicil to his last will. But of all the *original* logic we have of late seen, we have found nothing to compare with the argument, that as the "title of John's prophecy, 'Apocalypse,' implies the *unveiling*" "the hidden sense of the prophetic oracles, previously uttered by his inspired predecessor," that therefore we are to take these previous oracles to unveil the hidden meaning of that which unveils them!! Now the fact that John *unveils* the hidden meaning of Isaiah, proves that Isaiah cannot be correctly understood without being thus unveiled. Consequently John must be regarded as the inspired interpreter of Isaiah; and John's positive statements must not be *contradicted* by any thing which may be only inferred from Isaiah. But it is asked, if John positively asserts "*there shall be no more death*" there, does not Isaiah as positively assert that the child will die an hundred years old? and can Isaiah contradict John?

We reply, that to make Isaiah assert there is death in the



new earth, will not only make him contradict John, but it will make him contradict himself. That inspired Seer, in the same prediction, had just affirmed that "Jerusalem should be created a rejoicing and her people a joy," and "that *the voice of weeping should be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying.*" It follows then that there can be there no sickness, pain, or death, as otherwise there must necessarily be weeping. But the prophet adds: "*There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days.*" If then there are no more thence any *infants*, there can be no births there, and consequently no deaths; and if there are to be there no old men, it must be a state of perennial youth. But the question may be asked, how it is there are no infants? will not the little infants come up in the resurrection, of whom it is said "they shall come again from the land of the enemy," "thy children shall come again to their own border"? But the prophet responds and gives the reason why there will be no children there: "For, the child shall die an hundred years old,"—i. e. as none are able to enter there but those who die and come up in the resurrection, and those who will be changed at Christ's coming—the child when it dies becomes *matured*, and comes up as vigorous in mind as if it died an hundred years old; "but the sinner, though an hundred years old, shall be accursed" when he leaves this state, and will never enter there. The very punctuation of this text, as adopted by Professor Bush, conveys this meaning,—the two clauses being separated by a colon(:) it denotes that the latter clause is exegetical of the former. This interpretation makes Isaiah consistent with himself; while the other interpretation makes him contradict both John and himself.

But, it is said they shall be blessed and their "offspring with them;" will there be generation in the new earth? No,—*There shall be no more thence an infant of days.* But the redeemed will walk there—not only parents, but all their pious offspring that had fallen asleep in Jesus. But Isaiah speaks of the animals there? So were there animals in Eden. And if there is to be the restitution of all things spoken, of by *all* the holy prophets, there may be animals in Eden restored. The apostle Paul in the 2d of Hebrews shows us that the 8th Psalm, where all sheep and oxen, &c. are spoken of as being put under the feet of man, has reference to "the world to come whereof we speak." And as the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but on account of man's trans-



gression, it is only an act of justice, in the regeneration, for them to be restored to the condition for which they as well as ourselves groan. But, inquires another, will there be eating and planting and building in the new earth? If such things were not inconsistent with Adam's condition in Eden, it may not be in Eden restored. God told him to dress the garden and keep it, and to eat freely of the fruit of all its trees, save one. Christ ate after his resurrection; the angels who visited Abraham partook of his hospitalities; and Israel in the wilderness "did eat angel's food." Their houses, however, will be only just such houses as such inhabitants will need in such a world: where there will be no call for bolts, or bars, or shelter from the winter's cold or summer's sun. And the labor must be without fatigue—not the earning of bread by the sweat of the brow, as under the curse,—but more like the "dressing of the garden and keeping of it." The prophecy of Isaiah is thus easily reconciled with that of John; and yet had not John given us a fuller and more explicit understanding of this future age, we might have been left to draw conclusions very similar to those arrived at by men who *reason backwards*, and take the earlier prophecy as a commentary and explanation of later ones!

But to avoid the necessity for any such conclusions, God has *unveiled* to us in the "Apocalypse," that he "shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." Also that then "he that is unjust will be unjust still, and he that is filthy will be filthy still." And, as if to remove any doubt as to the correctness of John's explanation of Isaiah, he adds:—"For I testify unto every man that heareth the *words* of the prophecy of *this book*, if any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall *take away* from the *words* of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." As the interest of each one in the holy city is presented as a motive to abide by the *words* of this prophecy, it is another evidence that it is the destined residence of *all* the saints.

The only reason why so many object to this description, as pertaining to the resurrection state of the saints, is because the idea has become prevalent that the heaven of the Chris-



tian is a purely etherealized condition, existing in almost empty space; but where is the Scripture for such an abode? it is not within the lids of the Bible. But if men would believe God when he assures us his eternal kingdom is to be "*under the whole heaven,*" and is to be Eden restored, and that the meek will inherit the earth and dwell therein for ever; these objections would not be offered. And any who would object to a residence in Eden restored, might have been dissatisfied in Eden, when God pronounced all things very good, had they been in Adam's stead.

THE PROPHECY OF EZEKIEL XL—XLVIII.

The next argument of Professor Bush respects the last chapters of Ezekiel, commencing with the 40th, which is the commencement of a new prophecy given in the twentieth year of the Babylonish captivity. His argument is, that the subject of this prediction is also identical with that just considered, the new creation of Isaiah and John. There would be some plausibility for this supposition, were it not for one consideration which has entirely escaped the Professor's notice, viz. that it is a *conditional* prophecy. Those prophecies which are *absolute* must be fulfilled in their appointed time and manner; but there are another class of promises which depend upon certain conditions, which must be complied with, or the promises will be null and void. Thus in the 26th chapter of Leviticus, when God promised the Jews that he would give them rain in due season—that the land should yield her increase and the trees their fruit,—that their threshing should reach unto their vintage and their vintage unto their sowing time,—that they should eat their bread to the full and dwell in their land safely,—that they should lie down and none make them afraid,—that he would rid evil beasts out of their land, and the sword should not go through it,—that they should chase their enemies, who should fall before them by the sword, five of them chasing a hundred and an hundred putting ten thousand to flight,—that he would multiply them, make them fruitful, and establish his covenant with them,—that he would set his tabernacle among them, walk among them, and be their God, and they his people;—it all depended upon the *condition* that they should worship no idols or graven image, or set up any image of stone or standing image to worship, that they should keep the sabbaths of the Lord, reverence his sanctuary, walk in his statutes, and keep his



commandments and do them. The Jews refused to comply with these conditions, and God bestowed upon them cursings instead of blessings.

So is this last prophecy of Ezekiel also *conditional*. The prophet was set upon a high mountain in the land of Israel, and shown what was "as the frame of a city." He was commanded to hear and see all that was shown him, that he might declare it to the house of Israel. Then he saw and measured the various gates, walls, porches, thresh-holds, chambers, posts, windows, courts, tables, hooks, steps, &c. &c., as described in the fortieth and forty-first chapters. Afterwards, xliii. 2—8, he beheld, and "the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east," and came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is towards the east," and "filled the house." "And he said unto me, Son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name, shall the house of Israel no more defile, neither they, nor their kings in their high places." The remaining chapters go on to speak of the law of the house, the ordinances of the altar, the duties of the priests and people, the division of the land, &c. which they were to observe if they should comply with the conditions, so that the Lord could fulfil this vision; and the consummation of which would be that "the name of the city from that day shall be THE LORD IS THERE. All this the prophet was commanded to offer, saying, "to the rebellious house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you for all your abominations;" and they were to receive it upon these conditions.—"Now, let them put away their whoredom, and the carcasses of their kings, far from me, and I will dwell in the midst of them for ever. Thou son of man, show the house to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities; and let them measure the pattern. *And IF they be ashamed of all that they have done*, show to them the form of the house and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof," "and all the laws thereof, and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof and do them," xliii. 6—11.

This seems to be a prophecy in reference to their restoration from Babylon, at the end of their seventy years' captivity, *if* they would comply with its *conditions*. But the Jews did not comply: they did not put away their gross sins and abom-

ADVENT SOURCE COLLECTION

General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists

WASHINGTON, D. C.



inations, and were not ashamed of their iniquities and all that they had done ; so that if Ezekiel showed them the form of the house, they did not build the temple after the pattern. And thus continuing in their sins, the glory of the Lord, THE HOLY SHEKINAH, never dwelt in the second temple as it did in the first ; and none of these promises were fulfilled to them, as they would have been had they complied with the conditions. Thus the prophecy, being a conditional prophecy, cannot have respect to a state identical with the absolute prophecies of Isaiah and John in the New Earth.

Being thus far agreed that the new creation of the prophet and of that of the revelator are identical, and to be upon the earth, we now approach the question respecting the nature of the events to usher in this glorious state.

#### THE REGENERATION OF THE EARTH BY FIRE.

Professor Bush is of the opinion that “the glorious *denouement* which we are taught to anticipate in the sequel of the world's destiny, is to be brought about by human agency,” in connection with “extraordinary events,” but with no “stupendous miracles” to break up the existing order of things. The most descriptive prophecy respecting the changes to precede this dispensation, is that in 2 Peter, iii. 1—14. Says Professor Bush :—

“The *letter* of the apostle's language is apparently so explicit in announcing the physical dissolution and passing away of ‘these aspectable heavens’ and this material globe, *prior* to the introduction of the New Jerusalem, that it has scarcely entered into the thoughts of the readers or expositors of revelation, that any other construction could be proposed.”—p. 51.

The difficulty Professor Bush finds in arriving at a different conclusion may be gathered from the following :—

“We do not profess to exhibit an interpretation devoid of all difficulty. We have not succeeded, in our own estimate, in so completely eliminating the subject from all embarrassment, as to feel that no serious objections can be urged against the view which on the whole we are constrained to adopt.”—p. 52.

“The grand question that now awaits our solution is, whether the language of Peter, rightly construed, necessitates the conclusion, that the heavens and the earth are to undergo a physical destruction by volcanic or other fire, previous to the occurrence of that state which is denominated in the Apocalypse the New Jerusalem. If this be indeed the true and indubitable import of his words, then we must at once relinquish the position we have assumed above ; for such a catastrophe is fatally at war with the view advanced of the *gradual* ushering in and supervening of that blissful period upon the previously existing state of the church and the world. The two theories are utterly incompatible, and the one or the other must inevitably give way. With whatever impetus the present order of things



may be moving onward to such a grand consummation, it can never acquire a momentum sufficient to enable it to shoot the huge gulf made by the dropping out from under it of the solid globe itself. But let us look at the *ipsisima verba* of the apostle. We cite the passage in full.

2 Pet. iii. 1—14. 'This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance: that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior: knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat! Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.'

This, it must be admitted, is strong language, and taking the passage by itself, independent of its relations to any other portion of Scripture, we see not how any but the plain literal sense could easily be deduced from it. The *prima facie* evidence is certainly in favor of the popular and accredited interpretation, and if we are led to seek any other, it is because we are forced to it *ex necessitate rei*, or by the stress of collateral considerations."—pp. 53, 54.

The Professor then proceeds to give his reasons for being forced to a different conclusion, and,

1.—He claims that the Bible is designed simply "to teach man his *duty*"—that its drift "is *moral*," and is not designed "to instruct men in *absolute verities*, either of Astronomy, Geology, Physiology or Chemistry"; but "speaks in accommodation to the then existing state of knowledge, or to the popular notions then entertained, without assuming to pronounce upon them as correct or incorrect." So that we should look for the fate of this earth, "rather in the Apocalypse of Newton, Laplace or Herschell, than in that of John."

The defect in this argument is, that instead of ascertaining



the design of the Author of the Bible from what is therein written, he has gone to work backwards to ascertain what is written, from what is assumed to be its Author's design. Now we admit the design of the Bible is not to instruct in scientific verities, and that language is used in accordance with popular notions—like the standing still of the Sun, its rising and setting, &c. But we deny that a positive declaration is any where made in the Scriptures, where *instruction* is being communicated, that is in *opposition* to the *absolute verities* of science. When the Bible speaks, its *design* is to tell the *truth*; and we may as well argue that Peter is not to be understood as speaking of a literal flood, as that he is not, of a literal fire. The argument of what it designs to teach would militate as much against the letter of the one, as of the other; and if the Bible can record an *absolute verity* respecting the destruction of the earth by water, it *may* thus teach respecting a deluge of fire. Because its design is to teach man his duty, it does not follow that it is limited to that.

2.—His second argument is that "John speaks as truly under the influence of inspiration as Peter, and as we read *his* discourses, they as imperatively enforce upon us the inference of the world's continuance, as do Peter's of its termination," and that John's new earth is after "the dissolution predicted by Peter"; so that the common construction "inevitably brings the apostle into *literal* conflict with other portions of the inspired volume."

The whole of this objection rests upon a departure from the letter of Scripture. Peter does not affirm that the earth will cease to continue; he says it will be *dissolved*, but, nevertheless, there will be a new earth; i. e. it will be regenerated. He says the old world perished by water; and yet it was not annihilated—so that if John does assert this "world's continuance," Peter does not conflict with him. But John, instead of asserting this world's continuance, independent of any change, expressly affirms that he "saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new." There is nothing in John to disprove that this change is to be its dissolution by fire: so that John and Peter agree. They both assert the passing away of the old heavens and earth, and the creating, or re-arranging of the new. But while John only states the fact, Peter states *how* it will be done. It is true that if we refuse to let John speak his own



words, he may contradict Peter ; but when they are both permitted to speak as they have spoken, there is no contradiction between the two.

3.—His third argument is that—

“Peter, it will be observed, after describing the melting of the elements and the passing away of the heavens and earth, immediately adds, ‘Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.’ Here is a distinct allusion to a special promise contained in some other part of the Scriptures, announcing a superlatively happy period to ensue after the precedent destruction described by the apostle. Where then is this promise, and how is it to be understood? A reference to Isaiah lxxv. 17—25, at once discloses to us the prophetic intimation which the apostle had in mind.” “For behold I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad, and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.” &c.—p. 56.

He then argues that the prediction of Isaiah is descriptive of a state at variance with the idea of its previous destruction. But this argument we have already replied to. He then adds:

“But it is clear that the *literal statements* of each are directly inter-repugnant, and that the one or the other must receive a *spiritual* interpretation. Which shall it be? Shall we make Peter conform to Isaiah, or Isaiah to Peter? Shall we read Isaiah as predicting a *physical* change in the visible heavens and earth, or Peter as announcing a *spiritual* one?—for upon one horn or the other of the dilemma we are inextricably fixed. The point is one on which, for ourselves, we do not hesitate. The evidence is to our mind convincing, that whatever may have been the apostle’s private personal views, the Holy Spirit, who spake by him, designed to set forth the same great moral change in the state of the world which is depicted in the earlier prediction of Isaiah. The apostles, for the most part, act the part of mere *expositors* of the *true sense* of the Old Testament writings, and the very title of the closing book of the sacred canon—‘Apocalypse’—is doubtless adopted for the reason that it contains a *revelation*, or *development* of the *hidden purport* of the ancient prophets. It is much seldomer than is generally imagined, that we meet with any original and independant disclosures. The germs of all New Testament truths are to be found in the Old, and it is only by a deadly violence that one moiety of the great body of revelation is sundered from the other.”—p. 59.

This is the great point upon which the whole question turns. We admit that Isaiah and Peter, if rightly understood, “must harmonize.” But are “the literal statements of each” “directly inter-repugnant?” We cannot see that they are. Isaiah does not assert that there will be no physical change in this earth; and he expressly asserts that God will create new heavens and a new earth, and that the former shall not be remembered. How this creation is to be effected he does not inform us, and therefore, when Peter affirms that it is to be by



the melting of the elements, it can be no contradiction of Isaiah; for he still assures us that there is to be a new heaven and a new earth according to Isaiah's promise. Now if we are willing to admit that the new earth will be the abode of the risen saints, that it will be Eden restored, and that man will have recovered what Adam lost by the "curse," it will harmonize with Isaiah's description of the new earth, and will not be inconsistent with Peter's description of the conflagration unto which the earth is reserved. But when we deny the letter of all those texts which bring to view the resurrection and the restitution of all things, and then on account of such denial are obliged to give an interpretation to Isaiah which makes him conflict with Peter, shall it be received as an evidence that the letter of Peter is to be departed from, to make it harmonize with such interpretations, when there would be no want of harmony in understanding *all* those Scriptures literally? Certainly not. But Professor Bush's objection to the letter of Peter is based upon a previous rejection of the letter of other Scriptures, so that he is necessitated to reject the letter of Isaiah also, to harmonize his theory. But the discrepancy is not between Isaiah and Peter, but between Peter and Professor Bush.

But says Professor Bush:—"The apostles, for the most part, act the part of mere *expositors* of the *true sense* of the Old Testament writings." If, then, they are the *expositors* of the earlier predictions, being inspired, they are inspired expositors. An expositor is one who explains that which is obscure or hidden; and if the New Testament writers "*develop*" the "*hidden purport*" of the Old, does it not follow that we should be unable to perceive, or, should mistake respecting their "hidden purport" without these inspired expositions? And if we have these inspired expositions, why should we not receive them as such, especially, as Professor Bush admits, they give "*the true sense* of the Old Testament writings"? It would certainly seem that Professor Bush's own argument, in admitting they are "expositors," and give "the true sense," makes against his own position, and gives him no excuse for rejecting Peter's explanation.

We have thus endeavored to show how Peter's regeneration of the earth by fire harmonizes with the obvious tenor of Isaiah and the Apocalypse; and as Professor Bush admits that if this can be shown on clear and satisfactory grounds, he will at once relinquish his stand against the *literal* mode of inter-

pretation, we hope he may be induced so to do. We have not the vanity to suppose that any thing we might advance would effect so mighty a revolution in his mind. But we trust the Professor will see that, by his own admissions, he has at best only probable evidence with which to oppose the positive declarations of the word of God; and also that this probable evidence is less sustained by reason and philosophy, than it is by imaginary difficulties, which can militate nothing against the omnipotence of Him who made the sea and dry land. We think it cannot be denied that Peter and John have given "*the true sense*" of the 65th of Isaiah, in their inspired "*expositions*" of that portion of Scripture. And if the conflagration of Peter is a literal melting of the earth,—and from the "*plain narrative* announcement of the event, and its comparison with the deluge," we see not how this conclusion can be avoided—it must follow, that the resurrection and second coming of Christ will be of the same literal nature. Sustained as all these questions are by proofs of the most positive and convincing kind, we regard them as truths as immutable as the purposes of God can make them, as truths which all the wisdom of this world can never gainsay or resist; but which will shortly be fulfilled in all their grandeur. May God prepare us for the ushering in of that glorious day, that we may attain unto the resurrection of the just, be kings and priests for ever in the kingdom of God, and reign with Christ on the earth. May "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN," be speedily "given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an EVERLASTING kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him:"—when "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom *for ever, even for ever and ever.*"



# THE REVIEW.

Boston, April, 1845.

---

## THIS NO. OF THE SHIELD.

THOSE of our readers who are fond of a variety may be somewhat disappointed with this number of the Shield, as it is entirely devoted to the consideration of the views of Professor Bush. Those, however, who consider the importance of these questions at the present moment, will not regret that so much space is occupied in their discussion. Besides, were it not for the purpose of presenting a review of this whole subject, the present number would not thus early have been issued.

The review of Professor Bush's work on the Resurrection was commenced with reference to its publication in the Advent Herald, as intimated in the last number of the Shield. But we soon found that we could not do justice to this question if restricted to so narrow limits. And as we wished to present fairly the full force of all the Professor's arguments, with a candid reply to the same, we have concluded to issue them in the present form. How successful we have been in meeting and setting aside the force of his reasoning, we leave to the decision of others.

We have regarded the appearance of no work, that has of late been published, with more interest, than we have the work under review. We regard it as the exponent of the views of a large, and an increasing body of communicants in the churches. And we conceive that it will be productive of a great change in the minds of many who shall give it a perusal. His argument, showing the identity of the new creation of Isaiah the new earth of Peter and the New Jerusalem of John, we regard as invulnerable. And all who admit its force must go with him in his views of the resurrection and end of the world, or they must admit the correctness of the principles of interpretation for which we contend. But we venture to predict that the great mass of the spiritualists who admit the resurrection of the body, will content themselves with disproving his argument from reason, and will not venture to approach that part of his argument that has reference to the identity of those predictions. All we have noticed of that class who have thus far adverted to, or reviewed the work, have avoided the dilemma in which they would thus be placed, by leaving that part of the book untouched. But that is very unfair; for if a single

argument there advanced is at variance with any theory, let it be fairly met, and either be disposed of, or its validity admitted.

We entertain the greatest respect for the gentlemanly and intellectual qualities of Professor Bush ; and although the perusal of his work has not inspired us with any very exalted ideas of his "profound reverence for the Sacred Oracles," i. e., for the *letter of the text* ; yet it would be doing him injustice to intimate that he is actuated by other motives than a sincere desire to arrive at the *truth* of the various questions herein discussed. If, therefore, there may have escaped us any expressions which may be deemed disrespectful to him, we can assure him that they are not so designed. We have ever regarded Professor Bush as one of our most honest, honorable, and candid opponents. He has never resorted to any unfair, or unmanly course for the purpose of opposing the doctrine of the Advent. But while he has ever expressed himself as directly antipodal to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, he has always met these questions like one who was willing to receive whatever might be shown to be the truth, feeling, if his arguments could be shown to be fallacious, no desire to resort to personal invective in their defence. We have the fullest confidence in the unsoundness of his reasoning, and we hope that he may yet be induced to take his stand upon the literal—the only safe and sure foundation of prophetic interpretation. In the mean time we are anxious that some of the spiritualists should attempt to meet his argument on the new creation : while they fail to come up to that, they neither do justice to their own cause, or to Professor Bush.

---

## NOTICES.

---

### THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE SHIELD.

THIS No. completes the first Volume of the Shield which was commenced about one year since. As the second No. was so long delayed, we have been enabled to give but three Nos. for this Volume. It will, however, make a very good sized work, of nearly 450 pages. If time shall continue, the first No. of another Volume may be expected in due time. There are several important topics, with the presentation of which we hope to enrich its pages.



## THE TITLE-PAGE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

As those who obtain the three Nos. of this Volume, might wish to bind them, we have thought best to append to this a title-page, and table of contents for reference. A title-page was appended to the first No., but its date was not correct for the title-page to the Volume: and the table of contents on the back of that title-page, was also necessarily imperfect.—Those therefore who may wish for a perfect Volume will thus be enabled to supply those deficiencies.

## IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION DEMONSTRATED.

As the article commenced in the last No. of the Shield, showing the impossibility of the world's conversion, from the prophetic destiny, modern history, present attitude, resources and intentions of Popery, is not continued in this No., our readers may expect a word in explanation. As it was thought proper to devote the whole of this No. to the important works of Professor Bush, no other article of any considerable length could be admitted. Should we be permitted to commence another Volume, the unfinished article will doubtless be completed.

We have a supply of No. 2 of the Shield on hand, with which we can furnish those who may wish for the last No. The edition of the first No. is exhausted.

ERRATA.—We find, on a critical examination of the articles contained in this work, that there are several typographical errors. Some of them are not very important, while others materially affect the sense, which are as follows:—

- Page 9, (in the note) for "Kirby," read *Faber*.  
 " 20, 13th line from the bottom, the clause, "by a new title, viz. Revelation," the last word should read in the plural, "Revelations."  
 " 36, 11th line from top, for "ignus fatui," read *ignes fatui*.  
 " 38, 13th " " " for "was invested," read, *are invested*.  
 " " 4th " " bottom, for *a happy delusion*, read *an unhappy delusion*.  
 " 112, 17th " " top, for "secures," read *deserves*.  
 " 114, 13th " " " for "anti-type," read, *great type*.  
 " 115, 20th, and also in the 12th line from bottom, for "representation," read *representative*.  
 " 189, 4th line from bottom, for "Conscience," read *Convenience*.  
 " 238, 18th line from top, for "exactly," read *nearly*.  
 " 385, 19th " " " for "did not to inform," read *did not inform*.  
 " 432, 12th " " top for "and of that of the revelator," read, *and that of the revelator*.

# THE ADVENT SHIELD AND REVIEW.



THIS work will be continued as the cause we advocate shall demand it. Notice will be duly given in our papers when another number will be issued.

---

## AGENCIES.

The SHIELD may be obtained at 14 Devonshire Street Boston, 9 Spruce Street, New York, by addressing J. V. HIMES; 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia, Pa. J. Litch; Rochester, New York, 17 Arcade, J. Marsh.

The SHIELD will be sent, by *Mail*, to any part of the United States, when ordered. To Postmasters, or others who remit ONE DOLLAR, free of expense, we will send THREE copies. Single copies at 37½ cents.

---

## SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

Of every description, can be procured either at 14 Devonshire-street, Boston; 9 Spruce-st, New York, or 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia. J. V. HIMES.

---

POSTAGE.—Seven Sheets—under 100 miles, 10 1-2 cts.—over 100 miles, 17 1-2 cts.

---

DOW & JACKSON'S POWER PRESS, 14 DEVONSHIRE ST. BOSTON