Art. IX.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.*

Unlike as the titles of these works may seem, they have enough in common to make it proper and convenient to bring them under review together. They come from a president and a professor of the same nominal faith, and they discuss, in part, the same great question of natural and revealed religion,—a resurrection from the grave. They interest us as advancing some new and liberal principles of interpretation, and manifesting the best spirit, without the slightest reflection upon any who differ from them. At the same time, we are constrained to question some of their assertions and reasonings, especially in the case of Dr. Hitchcock. Indeed, we are disappointed in both books, as regards their ability or thoroughness. The nature of the subjects, and, still more, the position and repute of the writers for learning, led us to expect a good deal; more, perhaps, than we ought, when we consider that neither of the treatises attempts anything like a profound or complete view of the subjects treated.

The first is a book of illustration rather than discussion. It consists of four lectures, with texts from Scripture, on "The Resurrection of Spring," "The Triumphal Arch of Summer," "The Euthanasia of Autumn," and "The Coronation of Winter." These Dr. Hitchcock treats religiously, in parts very beautifully and impressively, bringing to their elucidation a little, but far less than we expected and desired, of his large and varied scientific knowledge. The outside title of the volume is, "The Phenomena of the Seasons Spiritualized," and the author aims to present their most spiritual aspects, or rather analogies, for the enforcement of the highest truths; devoting one lecture to the distinct subject of Resurrection,


as viewed by natural and revealed religion. In only one or two instances is there betrayed the influence of a peculiar theology; but one of them caused us, we own, no little surprise, as coming from so eminent a geologist, as well as divine, and one who once argued against Professor Stuart so ably in defence of the free interpretation of the "Days of the Creation," and the gradual formation of the earth's surface for the abode of man. This abode, as he now intimates, has been changed physically, as well as morally, by man's sin. He would lead his readers to believe, that the very laws of nature would have been different, and the material universe far richer and more beautiful, had not sin defaced it. He says,— "It does seem as if God had so balanced and adjusted the agencies of nature, that once or twice in a generation he allows some splendid development of unearthly beauty, to teach us what might perhaps have been a settled order of things, had not sin impressed her harpy fingers upon the face of nature." Is not this a singular picture of the world and its Creator? It bears too near a resemblance—much nearer than the men bear to each other—to the "Philosophy of Religion," in which Dr. Dick speaks of the earthquake and the volcano as the effects of man's sin, and the expressions of God's displeasure! We believe Dr. Hitchcock's religion, as well as science, has inclined him more and more to take a different view, and make a better use, of those mighty elements and agencies with which he is so familiar. Most of the views of this very volume are calculated to encourage higher and more healthy conceptions of the wisdom and goodness of God. The only remarks to which we should take serious exception are those which pertain to the resurrection of the body; of which we propose to speak, in connection with the other volume before us.

Professor Crosby, well known to many before as a sound scholar and an efficient instructor in Dartmouth College, has recently come into notice as a theologian, or at least as an independent thinker, and a moderate but fearless advocate of truth as it appears to his own mind. His recent pamphlet on "Foster's Views of Future Punishment, with a Letter to the Directors of the American Tract Society," though published anonymously, has brought upon him no little attention, and led in some way, it is
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rumored, to the resignation of his office in a college, whose head, if we may judge from recent appearances, is seriously alarmed at the progress of error and the boldness of innovators. How he and his friends will be affected by this new demonstration from Mr. Crosby, we do not yet know. There is no direct attack here upon the "fundamental doctrines," but there is a wide departure from received modes of interpretation, touching the great facts of the resurrection and judgment to come. The writer evidently rejects the popular form of belief in a future general resurrection, and a general, formal judgment; though we must say he does not make it perfectly clear what precisely his own view is. It is a defect of his book that it deals more in the negative than the positive. It is chiefly made up of passages from Scripture, so classified as to show what they cannot mean, without an explicit and full statement of what, in his opinion, they do mean. Yet his general idea cannot be mistaken. He understands the "second advent," with all attendant circumstances and changes expressed by the "end of the world," the "resurrection of the dead," and the "general judgment," to be comprised in the destruction of Jerusalem, the passing away of the old dispensation, and the coming in of the new. He asserts that "Christ expressly declared," and the Apostles "evidently expected," that the second coming, with all the associate events, would take place during the life of some of those who heard the predictions, and that all did take place, and have long since passed. And his conclusion is thus expressed, in his sixth leading proposition:

"The predictions in the Scriptures of the second coming of Christ, the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment with its awards, must be explained in a figurative or spiritual, rather than a literal sense, and in such a sense as admits an application to what has already taken place."

In this broad proposition, as in the whole of Professor Crosby's treatise, there is to our mind a great deal of truth, and most important truth, with some extravagance of statement, and a want of discrimination and needed qualification. As is usual in pressing a theory, he has drawn into its service passages of very doubtful relevancy; so doubtful, in some instances, or rather so plainly irrelevant, that we can ascribe it only to that common frailty
of our nature, which makes us unconscious of the dangerous influence of a prepossession, even where it is on the right side. Nay, in establishing the proposition, that the "Apostles evidently expected that the second coming of Christ, with its associate events, would take place before the death of some who were then living," one kind of proof adduced is the absence, in the Apostles, of all regard to worldly interests, the throwing their property into common stock, or the giving it away when wanted by the poor; their indifference, also, to civil institutions and religious forms, their extreme liberality of faith, and the almost "latitudinarianism and spirit of conformity" of Paul especially, in regard to meats, sacred days, circumcision, baptism, and the like, as if all forms were "weak and beggarly elements." This indifference and apparent laxity, Mr. Crosby thinks, would be naturally caused by the expectation of a speedy end of the Jewish polity, the destruction of the great temple, and dispersion of the whole people, but cannot be accounted for in any other way. This is substituting "indifference" for that which was really a noble independence, and leaving the Apostles small credit for their magnanimity and spirituality of view. Whatever they expected outwardly, we believe they would have granted the same liberty of conscience, and claimed the same superiority for the new religion. We agree in believing, that much which they wrote in reference to the "last days," the "day of the Lord," the "Lord at hand," the "end of all things," the "judge standing at the door," those "on whom the ends of the world are come," and "we, which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," may be more reasonably understood as expressing their conviction of an early termination of the "Jewish state," than as showing a mistaken apprehension of the literal "end of the world" as very near. Without thinking the Apostles omniscient or infallible, admitting, as we well may, in such company as Stuart, Woods, and Barnes, that inspired men may use language whose meaning they do not fully understand or correctly apply in every instance, and that both the Apostles and Prophets may possibly have fallen into some errors, we yet do not see the need of suspecting error where a free spiritual interpretation is all we want. Nor have we the least doubt,
that such an interpretation is just, in reference to nearly all the language in question. When the Apostles said, in any way, "Brethren, the time is short," we suppose they meant very much the same that we mean when we say the same thing. Why imagine that they were always thinking of the destruction of Jerusalem, or the destruction of the world? Christ came in these, but not in these only. He came in the whole power of his religion, and is coming now, in the spread of his truth, and the blessings of his kingdom.

It is true that the Epistles abound in this peculiar exhortation and warning, as Mr. Crosby shows, by quoting page after page of similar import. But for this very reason, partly, we incline to give it a large spiritual signification, rather than a local and temporary one. Suppose all such language to refer only to an outward event, and one that has long since passed, it deprives the Epistles of half their interest and efficacy. Barnes, in his Commentary, admits that even Christ, "as man," did not know the exact time of the future judgment, and that therefore the disciples could not know it, and may have erred in their expectations. Crosby thinks they erred, not in regard to the time, but only the mode; they did not believe the end of the world was near, and did not intend to imply it; they did believe, and believed rightly, that the end of the Jewish polity was near, but "had too objective and literal views of the nature of the events which were then to take place," when the Son of Man would come, and his religion be completely established. Both these opinions may find support in different passages; but we doubt very much whether the Apostles, for the most part, had any thing more in view than the importance of diligent and devout preparation for whatever might come. "The end of all things is at hand; be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer."

But whether right or not in regard to the Apostles, we have no doubt of the soundness of Professor Crosby's view of the import of our Saviour's language, in relation to what is termed the "second advent." That the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew refers explicitly and wholly to the fall of Jerusalem, with its antecedent and subsequent events, we consider as clear and sure as words can make
We say wholly; for as to the theory of a double sense, we hold it to be a figment of "carnal reason," as dangerous as it is needless in the interpretation of Scripture, and altogether dishonorable to the sincerity and simplicity of Christ's character and teaching. We have never been able to comprehend how those who contend for the obvious sense of our Lord's words often give to them a sense directly the reverse of obvious; and, with the doctrine of a "double nature," ascribe to him a "double meaning," and that which in others might be called "double dealing." Although his vivid account of coming events, in Matthew, is in answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"—it is conceded by all scholars, that this glowing and powerful description agrees wonderfully with the account which Josephus gives of actual events, and agrees also with the bold metaphors of the Prophets, when describing occurrences known to be near and temporal. No terms that Christ employs, not even those which nearly all readers associate still with the final and literal dissolution of the universe, exceed in strength or terror the language of Isaiah, in predicting the doom of Babylon:—"Howl ye, for the day of the Lord is at hand [words, whose exact resemblance to those of Christ, is itself instructive]; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. . . . . For the stars of heaven, and the constellations thereof, shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. . . . . Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger. . . . . And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."—Isaiah xiii.

Why is it, then, that all such language, when used by the Saviour, is supposed, whatever its first and obvious meaning, to refer to a distant day of judgment, a visible coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, and a general, simultaneous resurrection of all the bodies of all people who have ever lived and died? What ground is there for such an inference? Where do humble believers get the courage to contradict the plain words
of the great Teacher? When he says,—“There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom,”—how can they insist that none then living did see that event, and none ever will till the end of all things? When Christ says again,—“Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled,”—how can any be bold enough, even if ignorant enough, to attempt to evade the common sense of the passage, by attempting to show that “this generation” means “mankind,” or some equal folly? And again, when Christ says, so impressively,—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live,”—“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,”—what manner of humility or docility is that, which declaresthat this does not refer to any thing that “now is,” for that none of the dead have even yet come out of their graves, nor is their judgment passed?

It is in connection with such questions that we particularly value the book now noticed, and are glad it has been sent out from such a source. It is needed. It will find thousands who may be taught by it, and thousands who will not believe it. To such unbelievers, we commend, not merely the great array of texts and continuous passages adduced by Professor Crosby, in support of his interpretation, but also the Appendix, in which he has quoted largely from Lightfoot, Gill, Clarke, Watts, Scott, Stuart, Robinson, and Barnes; all of whom, in different ways, give support to his views. From the many petty, yet confident, interpreters of the present day, it is good to go back to such an authority as Dr. Lightfoot, and read such a version as this of the old and new creation:—“The heavens and the earth of the Jewish church and commonwealth must be all on fire, and the Mosaic elements burnt up; but we, according to the promise made to us by Isaiah the prophet, when all these things are consumed, look for the new creation of the evangelical state.” So, also, is it an encouraging sign of the times, to see that such a scholar and such
an orthodox believer as Dr. Robinson, after quoting those strong declarations of Christ in regard to the "sending his angels to gather together his elect, from one end of heaven to another," comes to the conclusion, "that the language of the verses under consideration does not necessarily in itself apply to the general judgment; while the nature of the context shows that such an application is inadmissible."

Here arises the important question; one that gives to the whole inquiry, both as to interpretation and influence, an interest that it might not otherwise have. If the strongest language of Christ in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, language similar to that in other parts of the New Testament supposed to refer to a future general judgment, do not refer to it, is there any language that does? Do the Scriptures teach a simultaneous, visible resurrection, and a formal, general judgment, at some remote and unknown period? To this question we wish to devote a few pages.

Let it first be noted, that it is not a question as to the truth of the resurrection or judgment, but only the time and mode. No truths are more clearly taught, no facts more indisputably established, by the Christian revelation, than that there will be a resurrection from death, and "after this the judgment." But are these to be distant, material, visible, and all at one time, or instant, spiritual, and individual? This is the single and simple inquiry,—whether the resurrection and judgment are connected with the close of life, or with the end of the world.

Next, it is to be remembered, that the word itself, ἀνάστασις, 'resurrection,' determines nothing for this inquiry. It means simply 'standing again,' or 'standing up,' and is as consistent with one theory as the other. Its prevailing import in Scripture is that of continued future life, the standing and living again. The phrase "resurrection of the body" does not once occur in the Bible; nor the term "general resurrection." The fact of a resurrection, and this only, is plainly taught; whatever else men believe is inference or conjecture.

Next, it is worthy of remark, how few are the passages on which the common inference or conjecture is raised, as to the resurrection of the body, and the future, simultaneous rising of all bodies. The stress is chiefly laid
upon two passages, one in the Old Testament and one in the New. The first is the declaration of Job:— "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." That the word here rendered 'Redeemer' means rather 'vindicator,' referring to God, who, as Job believed, and as the result proved, would vindicate and restore him "upon the earth," even "in his flesh," though now so wasted and almost consumed,—that his predicting or expecting a future state of retribution is inconsistent with other assertions of Job, and with the whole character of the argument, not one of the speakers referring to it, while, if held, it would have appeared first, and been decisive,—that, in fact, the passage has no relation to the present inquiry,—is the opinion of the most learned and best critics of every name; as Calvin, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Eichhorn, Jahn, and others. We stop not to interpret the "vision of dry bones," in Ezekiel; for though often used, now for present revivals, and now for a future resurrection of the body, and though, so far as its language goes, it is as strong for the last doctrine as any that can be found, it explains itself, and settles the question in its final clause. "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." Nor need we dwell upon the one passage in the New Testament most relied upon, the words of Jesus in the fifth chapter of John. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Nothing is said here of their coming forth in "bodies," or of their coming "together." It is a simple assertion of the fact that all will rise; and it is closely connected, indeed introduced, by expressions not easily reconciled with any but a moral regeneration and a spiritual life, such as Christ is already giving. "The hour is coming, and now is." "They that hear shall live." "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life."

Such are the passages most cited as proof-texts. Do they prove a resurrection of the body, or a distant general judgment? If not, it will be difficult to prove those
doctrines by any other passages. Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians, does speak of their being "caught up to meet the Lord in the air"; but whatever he meant by these expressions, he evidently expected that the event was near; for he says, "We, which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." And even in his eloquent, familiar reply to the question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" he says not a word to confirm the present popular belief, and expressly distinguishes between the natural and the "spiritual body."

This brings us to another point. There seem to be none now, if there were ever many, who believe in the resurrection of the same body. Dr. Hitchcock, while he labors to prove, and after all only asserts, that "the germ of the resurrection-body proceeds from the body laid in the grave," denies that there is any identity of particles or organization between them; and concludes most remarkably, that "it is not necessary that the resurrection-body should contain a single particle of the body laid in the grave." So an able reviewer of Bush's "Anastasis," in the "Christian Review" for September, 1845, admits that "philosophical identity cannot be predicated of the human body in any two successive moments, and, of course, the Scripture doctrine of the resurrection has no reference to such identity." Why, then, speak at all of the resurrection of the body, if the body is not raised? If it be only meant that a new body of some kind is given to the disembodied spirit,—i.e. that it will have some form, vehicle, or expression, resembling the present expression, and leading to recognition,—there need be no controversy. We are glad that Dr. Hitchcock speaks as he does of the certainty of recognition hereafter, marvelling that any could ever have doubted it. Yet we do want to ask him whether he believes that no such recognition has ever yet taken place among the millions who have died, but that all are still waiting to be clothed upon, not from "heaven," but from "earth," waiting from the beginning of the world until now, and to wait an indefinite period longer, until they may be permitted to gather up from the mouldered or scattered dust of centuries that indescribable "germ" of the old body, which is to be joined to the new, so that
life, recognition, and happiness may at last begin? We infer no less, when we read, on the thirty-first page of the "Seasons Spiritualized," of the myriads of human beings yet to be called up from all the cemeteries, seas, and battle-fields of the earth. Take the following picture:— "Think of Jerusalem, which for more than 2,000 years has been the great central slaughter-house of the world; where human relics and comminuted dwellings have accumulated on the surface to the depth of 40 or 50 feet, and the whole has been soaked a thousand times with blood. O, think of the scene, when the millions that lie buried there shall start into life at the shout of the descending Judge and the Archangel's voice." We are far from wishing to make light of any part of this subject; but such descriptions do not dignify it, and, except that they are in prose, seem little better than Blair's poor attempt to describe in verse a similar scene; where some broken member of the risen body,

"Amidst the crowd,
Singling its other half, into its arms
Shall rush, with all the impatience of a man
That's new come home, who, having long been absent,
With haste runs over every different room,
In pain to see the whole."

If it be for not holding such a theory, that a council in New Hampshire not long since refused to ordain a man who did not believe in the "resurrection of the body," one of the council pronouncing this doctrine "the basis of the whole fabric of the Christian religion," the opposers of progress may dismiss some of their fears. It is a long time since John Locke wrote thus to the Bishop of Worcester:— "When I wrote my Essay, I took it for granted, as I doubt not many others have done, that the Scripture had mentioned in express terms 'the resurrection of the body.' But upon the occasion your Lordship has given me, to look a little more narrowly into what revelation has declared concerning the resurrection, and finding no such express words, I shall, in the next edition, change the words of my book, 'The dead bodies of men shall rise,' into these of the Scripture, 'The dead shall rise.'"

We have not room for the many considerations that occur in favor of the individual, spiritual resurrection of
every soul, when the body dies. It does seem a waste of time to labor the proof, that it is the body only which dies, not the soul, not the man, of whom Christ says he "shall never die." The common doctrine says he shall die utterly for a time, and a very long time; he shall become more "of earth, earthy," after the body perishes, than before; body and soul, mind, heart, memory, love, hope, fear, faith, all shall lie down in the grave, and turn to clay, and remain for ages dead dust! Who believes it? Who does not deny it in his heart and his speech every day? What preacher is there, who does not contradict it every time he comforts the mourner with the assurance that his departed friend lives, and is happy in heaven? This is false, if the common theory be true. There is no heaven yet, nor hell, for mortal men,—they are all in the grave. The saints, the martyrs, the apostles, prophets, patriarchs, are not yet suffered to live. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is not the God of the living, but of the dead. Moses and Elijah did not appear and talk with Jesus in the Transfiguration, unless raised from the dust for that one moment, to return to it the next. Dives and Lazarus could not have conversed immediately after death, for they were then in their graves. Christ's promise to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," must be an exception to the universal law!

We are not trifling. To our most serious thought, all these declarations of the Saviour, himself "the resurrection and the life," the general tenor of the Christian Scriptures, and the prevailing discourse and commonsense belief of preachers and sufferers, are entirely at variance with the doctrine of an intermediate state of unconsciousness after death, and a long waiting for the resurrection-body. It may not be a practical evil. The faith of the affections, the power of reason, and the speech of the life, are stronger than the creed. We have heard an eminent clergyman tell his weeping hearers, that their departed pious brother was already blessed,—judged, accepted, crowned,—and another clergyman, equally eminent, follow him with a picture of the "last day," ages distant, when this body before them, with all the bodies of the saints, would be re-formed and
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raised! And not a hearer seemed aware that there was any inconsistency between the speakers!
God provides for his own. He has given the soul a principle that cannot die. He has given the heart a trust that will not be mocked. Christ has come. "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death."

E. B. H.

ART. X.—REPRESENTATIVE MEN.*

Mr. Emerson's writing has a bold beauty that wins or arrests attention. He is one of the most notable and brilliant of American authors. In a sublime discontent with what exists, he aspires beyond all mediocrity of achievement. He takes the most adventurous positions, maintaining them by force, not of logic, or any method of philosophy, but by a defying statement and a soaring imagination. It is hard to pass critical sentence on him, for the subtlety of his mind abjures all system, and gives no bond of consistency. He is not so much a seer steadily beholding the globe of truth with the clear intuition of a capacious mind, as a watcher, catching occasional bright glimpses of spiritual realities, and opening upon us lightning-flashes of startling conjecture, rather than the calm noonday of wisdom. There is no waxing power or widening stream in his progress through a subject, no vast gain from the combination of arguments, no Greek phalanx from closely ordered thoughts, but he is throughout aphoristic and oracular. His intellectual life seems interrupted in its circulation, his pulse of feeling intermits, and when we try to survey his whole drift, we are stopped, as in gazing at those crystals in which the shining laminae run in cross and faulty directions. In the midst of his discussions, masterly and original in their single points, we look back, at a loss, like a man with a vague clew in the centre of a labyrinth. He is not self-forgetful and inspired, but intensely conscious in his mood, and, though a celestial current sets into his soul, the tide never rises so as to carry away him and his reader