

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

should be accepted as good evidence for its reality, as Professor Tyndall tells the world it should; why is not the same kind of proof valid evidence for these spiritual truths, these higher attributes of the divine nature? Certainly, no one who accepts the current theories or the established principles of science can rightly object to the reasoning.

ARTICLE III.

DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT WARRANT THE HOPE OF A PROBATION BEYOND THE GRAVE?

BY PROF. E. D. C. ROBBINS, NEWTON HIGHLANDS.

Preliminary Remarks.

THE present discussion is intended to be exegetical mainly. Still, as preliminary to a right understanding of particular passages of Scripture, and to clear away some objections which arise in some minds in reference to what God ought to have done if he intended the punishment of sin to be endless, a few suggestions cannot be amiss. No argument, perhaps, is so much dwelt upon by the advocates of universal salvation or restoration as the fact that future endless punishment was not clearly and specifically revealed before, near to, or after the advent of the Messiah. A leading authority¹ for this doctrine asks, "Is it probable after an utter silence

¹ Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., in a Sermon preached in Columbus Avenue Church, April 7, 1878. The special topic of the Sermon as reported was: "If the Doctrine of Endless Punishment is moral in its influence, why did God reject it as a motive to obedience for at least four thousand years?" In Thayer's Theology of Universalism too, we find this impassioned appeal to the reader: "If the doctrine of endless punishment be true, then for four thousand years God made no revelation of it. From Moses to Malachi the Scriptures are entirely [?] silent on the subject. What shall we say of that justice which could see the millions of earth through all this time, in utter ignorance of their future, plunging into the gulf of endless torment and despair, without one word of warning? Think of this for a moment, that God should suffer the world to go on for forty centuries with not the slightest hint of danger to those who were daily and hourly sinking into the flaming abyss! Is it possible to believe such monstrous blasphemy against the God who is love?"

in relation to endless punishment for four thousand years that it was revealed with and as a part of the gospel of Christ?" By parity of reasoning, is it any more probable that life and immortality are first brought clearly to light in the gospel (2 Tim. i. 10)? Why also was the future blessedness of the righteous ignored as a source of moral influence during all the early ages of the world? Why did God almost entirely, if not exclusively, use temporal retribution as a motive to right action during all the period of his special guidance of the patriarchs and their descendants, until near the close of the old dispensation? Must we not in reference to all these things say in humility that they are done "according to his good pleasure which he has purposed in himself." Even more than this, why were the heathen left to grope their way to the truth through the light of nature alone, with their vain imaginations and foolish, darkened hearts, and only now shone upon by some incipient gleams from the blessed gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? We can only say with the reverent docility of the apocalypticist, "Lord, thou knowest"; we are ignorant. It may be that we on this earth are made a spectacle for other worlds, or that God in his wisdom chose to make proof to man of the futility of all other means of salvation before he gave up his Son as a full and complete sacrifice for the sins of the world. Certain only is it that we cannot, relying on our wisdom and our own interpretation of the acts of him with whom a thousand years are as one day, forestall the just interpretation of him who spake as never man spake, and of those who were under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, unless we would bring upon ourselves the reproof of the apostle (Rom. ix. 20, 21), "Nay but, O man, who are thou that repliest against God? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor." How far these dealings of God with men were superinduced by his plan for the free agency of the intelligent universe it is not for us absolutely to determine. Our reliance is upon the "law and testi-

mony" as given to us in the words of inspiration. Besides, in all these speculations in reference to what the "God of love" ought to have done, do we not forget that man was made in the image of God, and as far as he lives in accordance with that nature he is accepted of God? As Paul says: "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ."

It should be borne in mind, too, that there was a belief, quite settled at the time of Christ's advent and after, that mankind are to be judged after death, and to enter upon a state of endless blessedness or misery according to the deeds done in the body. Intimations of this kind occur more frequently in the later prophets than in the earlier books, but this feeling had become much more pronounced near and at the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Josephus¹ says: The Pharisees believe "that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life, and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison; on account of which doctrines they are able greatly to persuade the body of the people." The Book of Enoch, composed probably not earlier than in the first or in the last part of the second century B. C., abounds in intimations of a belief in the separation of the good and bad, and of an unending life corresponding to the character formed while on this earth. "In the same way," he says (as described in sec. 9, 10), "are sinners separated when they die, and are buried in the earth, judgment not overtaking them in their life-time. . . . Moreover, abundant is their suffering until the time of the great judgment, the castigation and the torment of those who eternally excrete, whose souls are punished, and bound there forever."² "Their souls shall not be annihilated in the day of judgment, neither shall they arise from this place, . . . a receptacle

¹ Antiquities, 18. 1. 3, and Bell. Jud. 2. 8. 5. 14.

² Laurence's Enoch xxii. 11, 12.

for the souls of unrighteous men.”¹ “Then Uriel, one of the holy angels with me, answered and said : ‘ This accursed valley is for those who shall be accursed to eternity ; here must assemble all of those who utter with their mouths unseemly speeches against God, and blaspheme his glory ; here they are to be gathered, and this is the place of their punishment,’ a just judgment on these forever.”²

So much of the instruction of the New Testament is based upon a belief of the Jews in a resurrection and judgment that it seems hardly necessary to refer to it here. It does not seem to be deemed necessary to assert the doctrine often, but to assume it as unquestioned except by Sadducees.³

In this discussion little need be said about the nature of the punishment that awaits the wicked. How far it may be considered as objective, i.e. a direct infliction of the penalty of sin by God, and how far it is the natural outgrowth of character, comes not within our purpose to discuss. That it is a direct expression of God’s disapprobation of sin, as the happiness of the righteous is of his approbation, need not be questioned. To any thoughtful person the misery, both subjective and objective, that results from sin in this life would seem to warrant the use of strong language in reference to its probable consequences in the life beyond. But all this is aside from our present purpose to find out whether the Bible gives any ground for hope of probation after death.

The question whether there “ are few that be saved ” has nothing to do with the fact of a future probation. That matter our Saviour chose to leave not absolutely decided, but gave us the hope and expectation that multitudes “ shall come from the east and the west, and from the north and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God ” (Luke xiii. 29). In the Apocalypse, too, we have intimation that multitudes that no man can number, from all the

¹ Laurence’s En. xxii. 14 ; see also quotations in Bib. Sac., July 1878, pp. 538, 539.

² Laurence’s En. xxvi.

³ See a discussion of this matter in Bib. Sac., July 1878, p. 536 sq.

nations, "shall stand before the throne of God clothed in white robes, and with palm-branches in their hands." We cannot sit in judgment upon the numbers in Christian lands who may, even in the last hours of life, be brought to accept the atonement. We only know, as we believe, that we have no warrant that penitence and the resulting dawning of immortal life will be realized beyond the present time. How many among the ancient covenant people of God, and how many in pagan lands have so far lived in accordance with the light given them that the atonement made in the councils of eternity, and realized in the death of Christ for the sons of men may be made available for them, we know not; we are sure that God's love will go hand in hand with his justice. We do not believe that it is, as Canon Farrar says, "The popular doctrine that only the few will be saved."¹

Some English Words used in the Translation of the Bible.

It is unnecessary to dwell at length upon the use of several words employed by the translators of the Bible, *in some cases* giving a needless harshness, if not an erroneous meaning, to the original words. The question of a future probation is not at all dependent upon such English words as "destruction," "hell," "hell-fire"; and is it quite ingenuous to dwell so much upon them, in opposition to those who believe this world to be the only time of probation, as if the substance of doctrine was all comprehended in these terms?² If some few preachers in former, and some even in these latter, days have made these words so prominent in their discourses as to produce the impression that all future retribution is the direct infliction of physical agony, is it a sufficient reason for making it the staple argument for universal salvation?

The words *judge* and *condemn*; *judgment* and *condemnation*; and then the execution of the judgment, *punishment*, are generally a sufficiently explicit and forcible, rendering of *κρίνω*, and *κατακρίνω*, *κρίμα* and *κρίσις*, and *κατάκριμα* and

¹ Eternal Hope, p. 225.

² See Thayer's Theology of Universalism.

κατάκρισις. That these meanings are sanctioned both by classical and New Testament usage I need not stop to prove.¹ Now if men are *judged* and *condemned* at the end of the world; and if this sentence is to be executed, which can hardly be questioned, we have the substance of the Bible doctrine so much contended against, and so bitterly vilified.

The Use of "Αδης and Γέεννα.

The writers of the New Testament chose "Αδης as the nearest representative of the Hebrew *בְּאֵרֹת*, and the word naturally has some of the minglings of Greek and Hebrew ideas and associations. In all except one (1 Cor. xv. 55) of the eleven cases in which it is used our translators have indiscriminately rendered by "hell."² It is, however, never used like *Γέεννα* to designate distinctively the state of the wicked after the judgment, though it does, as in Matt. xi. 23, distinguish the realm of the wicked in the intermediate state from that of the righteous. Nothing can, therefore, from the word itself, be determined in reference to the final destination of men, although an inference may easily be drawn, from the manner in which it is used, in reference to the permanence of the condition designated by it.

Of *Γέεννα*, too, little needs to be said. Its derivation from the Hebrew *בְּאֵרֹת הַחַיִּים*, valley of Hinnom, is plain, and the manner in which the Jews came to use it as the place of future everlasting punishment has often been described. It is used eleven times³ by our Saviour, and once in the Epistle

¹ These meanings, even Canon Farrar admits: "The verb 'to damn' in the Greek Testament is neither more nor less than the verb 'to condemn,' and the words translated 'damnation' are simply the words which in the vast majority of instances the same translator's have translated, and rightly translated, by 'judgment' and 'condemnation.'" — *Eternal Hope*.

² It seems to me to be unfortunately so rendered in all cases, though others decide differently. See President Bartlett, in *Smith's Dict.*, and others.

³ In reference to some of these passages, Canon Farrar (*Eternal Hope*, Exc. ii. p. 196), says: "'The damnation of Hell' is the very different 'judgment of Gehenna'; and 'hell-fire' is the 'Gehenna of fire'; an expression which on Jewish lips was *never* applied in our Lord's day to endless torment." He also says in *Preface to Eternal Hope*, p. xxxiii, it signifies a "punishment which to the Jews, as a body, never meant an endless punishment beyond the grave." I

of James, in all which cases the reference to a future of misery cannot easily be mistaken.

Meaning and Use of עולם and of Αἰών and Αἰώνιος.

Although I leave the Old Testament almost entirely out of view, since to include it would protract the discussion too much; yet a word upon the use of עולם, for the interpretation of which αἰών and αἰώνιος are employed in the Septuagint, and which correspond to it in the New Testament, seems proper here. In the 445 times in which it is used not one instance can be found in which it denotes space. It is translated *world* in a few instances, and might perhaps have been in a few other passages, but it is always a time word. In accordance with its derivation from עָלַם, *to hide, to conceal*, it designates time in which limitation is obscure, if not hidden, and is especially used of the existence of God and of his attributes and their workings in the past, but oftener in the future (seventy-six times). This, if I may so speak, gives tone to its meaning in other cases, which, if occasion requires, can be softened down to indefinite, though not absolutely limitless, time. So without question it was the word, though others were occasionally employed, by which the Jew would express his idea of endless duration, which, obscure and shadowy in the early ages, became more definite and clear before the advent of Christ.¹

The meaning and use of αἰών and αἰώνιος are much more important in the discussion of the present topic, but so much has been written upon them, and so ably, that I will spare my readers a lengthened repetition of arguments. That they originally designated time, and not quality, seems to me evident from their use as equivalents of עולם, and especially do not care to defend the choice of words in our translation; but the thing signified by Canon Farrar in respect to the belief of the Jews, seems to be not only without proof, but contrary to the convictions of the best scholarship. See above, pp. 462, Smith's Dictionary, *Gehenna*; Schaff, in Lange's Com. on Matt. p. 114; Alford's Com., Matt. v. 22; and especially Alger's *Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 144 sq.

¹ See Bib. Sac., April 1878, p. 290 sq., and Professor Lewis, in Lange's Com. on Eccl. p. 44 sq.

from their derivation. That they have a common origin with the Greek *ἀεί*, Latin *ævum*, German *ewig*, and our *ever* is now conceded by the best philologists and lexicographers.¹ That *αἰών* has deviated from its primitive meaning a few times in Greek poetry and in the New Testament need not be questioned. But that the idea of change, indefinite succession, is everywhere present in the mind of the person who uses it to designate the world can hardly be doubted. So Professor Lewis says: "This world-sense does not denote the world in space, more properly represented by the word *κόσμος*, but the world in time, or as a time-existence."² This lower signification is plainly "grounded on the radical and higher import" of the word.³ Is it quite fair or scholarly to begin with these lower and rarer significations, and argue that, because *αἰών* sometimes designates limited time, it cannot ever be used for unlimited duration?

Αἰώνιος is used more strictly in its original import, and as really and distinctly as our *ever*, *forever*, and *eternal* retains the idea of endlessness in time more or less distinct, wherever used in the New Testament. Those passages that relate to the past, as Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 9; Titus i. 2, plainly refer to the counsels of God in his existence before the creation, and are as unquestionably limitless in time as God's existence is "from everlasting to everlasting" (Ps. xc. 2)⁴ I am aware that we are often told that *αἰώνιος* can mean no more than *αἰών*.⁵ But can this be so? For who that is accustomed to translate from the Greek and other languages does not know that nothing is more common than a weakening or strengthening of the same idea in

¹ See Bib. Sac., April 1878, p. 307, and Professor Tyler in *New Englander*, March 1878.

² See Lange's Comm., on Eccl. i. 9, Note by Professor Lewis.

³ Prof. Lewis, *Platonic Théology*, pp. 305, 306; and Bib. Sac., April 1878, p. 307, where the manner of these modifications of meaning is explained.

⁴ See Prof. Tyler in *New Englander*, May 1878, p. 319.

⁵ Whiton, in *New Englander*, March 1878, strangely says: "Manifestly the adjective 'æonian' can mean no more than the noun 'æon' from which it is formed, and from which it gets its literal signification, relating to or belonging to the 'æons.'" So Prof. Leonard, and others.

the primitive or derivative, and also that two derivatives from the same word often have quite varied meanings.¹ So that, if it could be proved, which we are far from granting, that *αἰών* is never used to designate absolute endlessness, it does not follow that *αἰώνιος* is thus limited in meaning.

I need not here discuss the classical use of these words. That they are employed as equivalents of our *everlasting*, *eternal*, etc., the definitions of Plato, Aristotle, and other masters of the Greek language plainly show. So "Homer and Hesiod and Sophocles and Plato and Aristotle and Plutarch and Josephus and Philo and Justin Martyr and other Greek authors who have anything to say of God and the future use *αἰεί*, *αἰών*, and *αἰώνιος*, just as we use *ever*, *forever*, *everlasting or eternal*, and *eternity*, to express the duration of God (or the gods), and his unchangeable laws, immutable ideas, and of souls that they believed to be immortal and indestructible."²

It would seem fitting to end the discussion upon *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* here, if the attempt had not been made so positively and persistently to explain *αἰώνιος* as qualitative and not quantitative. The general idea seems to be that all duration, past and future, is comprehended in an indefinite succession of aeons or world-periods, and that the aeon is the unit of heavenly chronology, as a year may be considered the unit of the earthly.³ Setting aside the speculations of a few philosophers as irrelevant here, what proof is there that those who lived or wrote in the early ages, or at the time of the advent of Christ, had formed or even dreamed of such a system? Is it probable that those whose knowledge and interests were so almost entirely confined to the things of this earth had established any such system of heavenly chronology? The proof which

¹ It has been truly said that in some instances "absolute contradictions are found in two meanings of the same word, and yet neither can be denied." So the Hebrew "עָלָה". "In fact, there are not always *steps* in these changes, for language leaps," Bib. Sac., April 1878, p. 308.

² See Prof. Tyler in *New Englander*, March 1878, and Prof. Lewis's *Platonic Theology*, p. 306 sq.

³ See Whiton in *New Englander*, March 1878, and *The Latest Word of Universalism*, p. 189.

seems to be mainly relied upon, that $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon$ and $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon$ are found in the plural number, $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\iota$ ¹ and $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, does not seem to be a sufficient foundation for an argument to rest upon; for nothing is better established than the use of the plural of emphasis in Hebrew, and nothing more natural and graphic than a hint at the succession of ages to denote extension of time. That the singular or plural, too, may be used for the expression of the same idea seems indisputable. In the doxologies and other similar expressions there is quite a diversity of phraseology, though the plural naturally predominates. We find $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$ in Matt. vi. 13; Rom. i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27, and 2 Cor. xi. 31; $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ in Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11; v. 11; but first singular, and then plural in Eph. iii. 21: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omega\upsilon$;² in Hebrews both words are in the singular: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$.³ It would be difficult, too, to prove that the use of the plural by Paul in Col. i. 26 and Eph. iii. 9; $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ and the singular, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, by Luke in his Gospel (i. 70) and the Acts (iii. 21), depended upon anything else than the choice of phraseology of the different writers.⁴ It is noticeable, too, that our Saviour never uses the plural $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, unless we except Matt. vi. 13, a questionable reading, and other writers of the New Testament rarely, and only when it is easy to account for it.

It seems appropriate here to examine the qualitative use of $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in some of its applications to particular passages, reserving its use with $\zeta\omega\eta$ until we speak of the signification of that word in the New Testament. In Rom. xvi. 26 we have $\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ applied to God: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, the aeonian⁵

¹ This plural is used twelve times, but without any distinct difference from the singular employed four hundred and thirty-two times. See Bib. Sac., April 1878, pp. 273 and 305.

² Cf. in Dan. vii. 18: $\xi\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\omega\upsilon\omega\upsilon$.

³ Esdras iv. 38: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \delta\iota\omega\upsilon\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$.

⁴ We have also different cases and numbers with similar meaning in John ix. 32: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, Rom. xvi. 26, $\chi\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (Dat. of time), and in 2 Tim. i. 9: $\pi\rho\omicron\ \chi\rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon$.

⁵ It seems unfortunate that Tennyson, by poetic licence, introduced the word

God, the God belonging to the aeons. What attribute of God is here designated, unless it be that of eternal existence? So of the *πνεύματος αἰωνίου* in Heb. ix. 14. In which way does the gospel belong to the aeon in Rev. xiv. 6? In 2 Cor. v. 1 is the house not made with hands, aeonian in the heavens, simply the house belonging to the age, partaking of the nature of the age? In 2 Cor. iv. 18, if *αἰώνι* is not a time-word, how does it come to be used in such intimate association with time-words?

Furthermore, if *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are not time-words, is not the idea of immortality¹ substantially eliminated from our New Testament, or at least thrown into great doubt and obscurity? For our words *forever*, *everlasting*, and *eternal*, and what they signify, would in effect be excluded from it; and in this respect it would be inferior to the writings of the most enlightened authors of heathendom. For I do not find *forever* used in the New Testament as the translation of any other words than *αἰών* (*αἰώνιος*) in some of its forms or combinations, as *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, except in two cases, Heb. x. 12, 14, where *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* is used, since the idea of unbroken succession is prominent, and these same words are translated *continually* in Heb. x. 10; vii. 3. Once only is *everlasting* the representative of any other word than *αἰώνιος*, in Jude 6, where the kindred *ἀίδιος* (from *ἀεί*) is found, which word is rendered *eternal* in Rom. i. 20, whilst elsewhere *eternal* is the translation of *αἰώνιος* or a form of *αἰών*.

aeonian in the passage so often referred to as authority for its use; as it does not seem to be recognized that it is much better suited to the general and shadowy nature of poetry than to the accuracy and definiteness of exegetical analysis. Canon Farrar's device of rendering the word *αἰώνιος*, *eternal*, and limiting the meaning of that word is quite arbitrary, to say the least. "It becomes," he says, "a clear [?] duty to keep the rendering eternal, which is a neutral word and does not mislead the ignorant," etc. Exactly why he calls eternal *neutral*, I leave my readers to decide. See *Eternal Hope*, Exc. iii. pp. 199, 200. He also says, p. xxxiv, "*Αἰώνιος* is translated rightly and frequently by eternal, and wrongly and unnecessarily by everlasting."

¹ The word *immortal*, *ἀθάρατος*, lit. incorruptible, hence *immortal*, is used, in our translation, by Paul once as an attribute of God (1 Tim. i. 17), and the abstract, *immortality*, only by the same apostle five times, either to represent *ἀθάρασία* or *ἀθανασία*.

The Use of Ζωή and Θάνατος and Kindred Words in the New Testament.

It is quite important to bear in mind the peculiar use in the New Testament of *ζωή* and *θάνατος*, and some words of kindred meaning. Thus *ζωή* is often employed to designate the Messianic life, i.e. that life which Christ came to give all who believe on him, which begins at the moment of his acceptance by faith, is continued until death, and is independent of it, and is consummated in the world beyond. It is a present possession, but not at all limited to this life. It is represented as the prominent object of Christ's mission to give life. This life he had in himself (John i. 4; v. 26; vi. 48; xi. 25), and was ready to impart to all (John vi. 33, 51, 63), but only through faith in him (John iii. 36; vi. 53).¹

That this life is the opposite of death, *θάνατος*, which designates the condition into which sin has brought our race, and from which there is no escape under the gospel but by faith in Christ, is quite plain from numerous passages, such as John v. 24: "He that heareth my word, and believeth is (has) passed from death (*ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου*) unto life (*εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*);" Rom. v. 21: "As sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign though righteousness unto eternal life;" Rom. vi. 23: "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." In verses 21, 22 the end (*τέλος*) of a sinful course is designated as death, but that of holiness as eternal life. This life is often spoken of as a present possession. So Christ says: "He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life" (John vi. 47), and "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life," and he adds, "I will raise him up at the last day (v. 54)." So often. In John iv. 14, although the present possession is implied, yet the future life is made more prominent. It is as water that once drunk shall quench thirst forever, and be

¹ The passages are numerous, especially in John's Gospel, where *ζωή* is thus used for the Messianic life. See, in addition to those quoted above, Matt. xviii. 8; xix. 17; John v. 24, 40; vi. 35; viii. 12; x. 10; xi. 25; xiv. 6; xx. 31; Acts iii. 15; xi. 18; Rom. vii. 10; viii. 6, 10; xi. 15; Phil. ii. 16; Col. iii. 4.

a well of water, springing up unto everlasting life. It would seem from such passages as these that the argument so confidently used, that this life must be confined to this present existence, is utterly without foundation. It *is*, and *will be*.¹ The believer in Christ has it as a permanent possession, independent of death, and inseparable from the deathless soul. Although there is an implication of endlessness in this word *ζωή*, yet we very often have it accompanied by *αἰώνιος*, as laying stress upon the most important element of this life, that it does not belong to this present existence alone. This it was that especially commended Christ's teaching to the thoughtful Jew and enquiring gentile, but roused the anger of those who denied the resurrection and immortal life.

There are some other words used in contrast with this *life* (*ζωή*) besides *θάνατος*, showing the terrible nature of this death, as well as the value of the life, such as *ἀπώλεια* (Matt. vii. 13 taken with 14; Rom. ix. 22; Phil. i. 28; iii. 19; Heb. x. 39, et al.) So *ἐλεθρος* in 1 Thess. v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 9. In Matt. xviii. 8 we have *τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον*; in Mark ix. 43 *τὴν γέενναν* and *τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον*, with which compare verses 44, 45, 47, 49. Similar phraseology is also found in other passages.

Are there any Indications in the New Testament of a Change of Character or Destination between Death and the Resurrection?

The condition of the soul of man in its disembodied existence, in the transition state, between death and the resurrection, is not much dwelt upon in the New Testament. The *final* destiny of our race seems to have been so much in mind by Christ and those who recorded his words, as well

¹ Prof. Leonard says: "This aeonian life *is*, not *will be*." But how he makes this consistent with what he elsewhere says, "The unfolding germ of this life (knowledge of God and Christ) is possible in this world, and whose fuller development will appear hereafter when all mortal concealments are taken away," does not appear. He claims, as favoring his view, De Wette, Meyer, Olshausen, Tholuck, Bengel, Alford, and many other German and English commentators, but seems to ignore the fact that they all, or nearly all, maintain that this life *is without end*.

as by the other inspired writers, that they sometimes seem almost to forget that there is any significant interval between death and the resurrection, so much does the greater overshadow the less. This was the more natural *as* they recognized the fact that the separation commenced at death was *final*, and that their hearers, for the most part, were in perfect accordance with themselves in this matter.¹ Still we are not left without distinct utterances in reference to the soul and its activities when it leaves the body. In Luke xvi. 19 sq., our Saviour speaks so distinctly of two individuals typifying the two different classes of men, as to leave apparently no room for doubt. Immediately after death the beggar is taken by angels into the state of blessedness² prepared for the good, whilst the rich man is consigned to the realm of woe. The latter seems to understand that his state is fixed. He appeals not to God, but to father Abraham; and does not ask for deliverance from his prison-house, only that some alleviations may be given him through the ministrations of the beggar (vs. 24), whose services he could have so readily commanded while on the earth, and that a warning be sent to his brothers, so that they may repent (vs. 30), and avoid his own doom. Not one word does he speak, or one indication give, that repentance would be of any avail to him now.

Besides, Abraham's reply to him would seem to settle that matter. No one *can* pass the barrier of separation (the great gulf) between the classes indicated by the rich man and the beggar. This is a thing *fixed* (ἑσθηρικται), so that (ὅπως)

¹ Although in the early ages the idea of the gathering of the dead to their fathers, the translation of the good, as Enoch or Elijah, the descent of the bad to Sheol, was the result of rather shadowy notions of the existence after death, and the language partook more of the nature of poetry than verity, in later times the belief became settled and strong. See p. 462 above, and references.

² "Abraham's bosom" would be recognized by any Jew, or by any one familiar with Jewish ideas, as designating the abode of all the blessed. See Alford's and Lange's Commentaries and especially Smith's Dictionary and Ref. Is it quite ingenuous in Canon Farrar (Eternal Hope, p. xxxii.) to attempt to abrogate the teaching of this passage by saying that "this phrase shows how utterly figurative the whole is"?

with the *definite purpose* that there should be no passing from one side to the other (vs. 26). Any idea of probation in the realm of spirits is emphatically excluded.

Neither does any trace of a spirit that would fit the rich man for a passage of this barrier of separation appear, — no word of penitence for sin, only a dread of its consequences for his brothers, which his own experience but too well teaches him. In his pleadings for his brothers he in fact implies excuse for himself, in that he had not had sufficient warning. “No wonder that when such an inward difference exists between him and the blessed, an outward cleft also exists, which can no more be filled up than passed over.”

The teaching of this passage is none the less significant because it is in the form of parable.¹ That there is no sleep of souls after death, but *two* separate and unchanging states of existence, with perfect self-consciousness and identity of person, is just as plainly taught as that there are different conditions of life here. “So much,” it is well said, “is shown to us at once: After death the life of the pious continues uninterruptedly, as well as that of the ungodly.”

I need scarcely to spend a moment in noticing the interpretation of those who make this parable refer to the doom that awaits the Jewish nation, consummated at the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence belonging to the past. May we not apply St. Paul’s words in 2 Tim. ii. 18 in reference to those who “say the resurrection is past already;” “Concerning the truth [they] have erred,” and “overthrown the faith of

¹ I can hardly refrain from saying a word in reference to the abuse of the old-admitted rule, “*Theologia symbolica non est demonstrativa*,” which Canon Farrar (*Eternal Hope*, p. 74) explains to mean that “phrases which belong to metaphor, to imagery, to poetry, to emotion, are not to be formulated into necessary dogma, or crystalized into rigid creed.” If this means that when it is plain what is intended to be taught by a parable, or any other figure of rhetoric, it is not just as certain as if enclosed in logical formulæ, it is manifestly fallacious; for did not our Lord, in the latter part of his ministry, teach mainly by parables? Olshausen well says, “Men are wont to say that parables prove nothing; nevertheless, comparisons often teach, by depth of meaning, infinitely more and better than all abstract arguments, seeing they are derived from nature, the mirror and glory of the unseen God, living demonstrations, as it were, of the Most High God himself” (*Com. on Romans v. 12-21*).

some"? The inappropriateness of the language to such an idea and to the persons addressed is too glaring. Who can reasonably believe that Christ's hearers could have so understood this and the immediately preceding parables? The teaching of Christ here is plainly more of a personal character, and there is absolutely nothing in the connection to call the attention to the Jews as a nation.

We are not left without other allusions to the life after the death of the body. When Christ says (Luke xxiii. 43) to the penitent malefactor, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise,"¹ can there be any doubt that this promise was conditioned upon his exercise of penitence and faith (vs. 41, 42), and was thus to be a permanent state; and any more doubt, when we take the passage in connection with Luke xvi. 19 sq., that the other malefactor in contradistinction to him went to the place to which his own irreverent and unbelieving spirit would naturally consign him? The reference to the other realm of the dead is equally plain in 2 Pet. ii. 4, where also the continuance of the fallen angels in its "chains and darkness" until the general judgment, "the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6), is plainly declared.

The fact that no reference to or hint at any change of character in the intermediate state is found in connection with the description of proceedings at the day of judgment after the resurrection would by itself seem to be conclusive in regard to any change of character or destination there. It is the deeds done in the body that decides the fate at the judgment-day (Matt. xii. 36; Rom. ii. 5 sq.; John v. 24 sq.). "The field is the world;" "the tares are gathered together, and burned at the end of the world."

¹ The connection and the original meaning would seem to sufficiently designate the import of the word *παράδεισος* here as the same with "Abraham's bosom" in Luke xvi. 22; i.e. the part of the realm of spirits contrasted with Gehenna. Here our Saviour's existence was to be from death to his resurrection; and the penitent malefactor could not have understood anything less than that he himself was to enter upon a state of existence to last until the final resurrection. See Commentaries of Lange, De Wette, and others.

Examination of some Passages that are supposed by some to imply a Probation in the Intermediate State.

There would at first view seem to be some indication in 1 Pet. iii. 19 that a time of probation is granted to some in the intermediate state. I cannot here discuss generally the import of this passage, or even hint at the many and varied interpretations that have been given of it. It is plain that Christ at his death or between that and the resurrection went in his disembodied state to the region of the dead ("Αδης), and preached (ἐκήρυξεν) to those who were disobedient when warned of the approaching flood in the time of Noah, i.e. to some of the spirits in prison (τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι). This activity of Christ is introduced by the apostle here merely to point an argument for diligence and courage in well-doing (see vs. 17). Not the remotest hint is given here or elsewhere of the nature of this preaching or its influence upon those who heard him. That there is any proof of the Catholic doctrine of purgatory and of a probation between death and the resurrection is entirely a gratuitous assumption, even if we could set aside the many passages that imply that probation ends with this life, which preclude the idea of the preaching of pardon to any after death. The fact referred to above, that no reference to any change of character in the intermediate state is found in connection with the description of the proceedings at the judgment after the resurrection, would seem to be conclusive.¹

The phrase "neither in this world, nor in the world to come," in Matt. xii. 32, is claimed by some as implying par-

¹ It has been well said that "the apostle here teaches nothing that bears any resemblance to the popish notion of purgatory nor does he intimate anything in favor of a second probation after death" (Lange's Com., Exc., on 1 Pet. iii. 18; Matt. xii. 32). It is not, perhaps, unreasonable to suppose that Christ's descent to the kingdom of the dead had some reference, which is not fully explained, to those of the old world; a token, possibly, to them that his offering of himself was not merely for those who lived and believed in him after his advent, but casts its shadow backward upon all those who manifested a spirit that would have accepted him had they believed in the enjoyment of the blessings of these latter days, and, at the same time, a token of final perdition to those who obstinately persisted in wrong doing.

don in a future life. But the parallel passage in Mark iii. 29, where we have οὐκ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα instead of οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (neither in this world, neither in the world to come), would seem to be a sufficient indication of the import of the longer phrase. Besides, it is unquestionable that the latter "was a proverbial expression among the Jews, meaning neither at present nor in the future — never." So Nast;¹ and DeWette is equally positive in his explanation: "The expression is evidently equivalent to *never* in the absolute sense, no matter whether we understand the terms, ὁ αἰὼν μέλλον, of the kingdom of the Messiah and of eternity, or only of the latter." Meyer, too, affirms: "The eternity of punishment here taught is not to be explained away."

Such passages as Matt. v. 26 and xviii. 30, 34 are sometimes quoted as implying that the debt of sin may be cancelled in a future world, and, hence, possibly between death and the resurrection; but as Alford well says, "These words (until he pay the uttermost farthing), as in the earthly example they imply future liberation because an earthly debt can be paid in most cases, so in the spiritual counterpart they amount to a negation of it because the debt can never be discharged." Furthermore, Matt. xviii. 30, 34 would seem to decide the matter, where the debtor is cast into prison, where paying is out of question, and is subject to tormentors. So Archbishop Trench: "Since the sinner could never acquit the slightest portion of the debt in which he is indebted to God the putting that as a condition of his liberation which it is impossible could ever be fulfilled, is the strongest possible way of expressing the eternal duration of his punishment."

The Certainty of the Resurrection of both Good and Bad.

That there is to be a resurrection (ἀνάστασις) of all, both

¹ Quoted by Lange. See also Owen, who says: "The whole expression ὁ αἰὼν κ τ λ is, beyond all question, an emphatic *never*." So Wordsworth, referring the expression to the Talmud, expresses some doubt in reference to the meaning, but gives up this passage, as well as 1 Pet. iii. 18, as affording any support to the doctrine of a future probation. See Commentaries on these passages.

the righteous (*ἀνάστασις ζωῆς*) and the wicked (*ἀνάστασις κρίσεως*) at the close of the present dispensation (*ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος*) is so plainly taught in the New Testament that there would seem to be little ground for a Sadducee to rest upon. But as the question of a future probation depends upon the fact of an existence beyond the grave the certainty of that future life needs a brief discussion.

John v. 28, 29, properly understood, would appear to be decisive upon this point. It is, indeed, difficult to see how any person coming to its consideration with a just appreciation of the demands of exegesis and without prejudice against the doctrine could make anything else of it than that all who have died on the earth shall be again raised to life. In the previous verses (24-27) Christ has been speaking of his power to raise from the death into which sin has cast all men to that life which he came to give, that life which begins in every Christian when he accepts Christ, and is, hence, not only a thing of the future, but *now* is (vs. 25). But in the 28th verse Christ admonishes his hearers not to be surprised ("Marvel not") at this power which the Father has given him, for a more palpable and wonderful exhibition of his power is to be given in the future, but not now as in the previous case. All (*πάντες* is without limitation); not, as above, all who believe (*οἱ πιστεύσαντες*), not all the dead, but all who are in their graves (*οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*). The word *μνημεῖον* from its derivation naturally means *memorial, monument, record* (the latter only in classical Greek), and *grave, sepulchre*, the only use in the New Testament and the only one suitable here. Can it not, then, mean the sepulchre of sin? That would, at least, be a very unusual and harsh accommodation of meaning, and would require either authority elsewhere or some intimation in the context of such use, neither of which appears. It is, on the contrary, probable that the words, *οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*, are chosen instead of *οἱ νεκροί* to call attention to the fact that there is a passing here from the spiritually dead of the preceding verses to the physically dead, which seems so much more real.

Furthermore, what force is there in the "Marvel not at this" (τοῦτο) which has been said, if what follows as a reason for it is precisely the same thing, and not something in some sense more wonderful than what is previously stated.¹ Bengel well says: "They are great things which he spoke all along from verse 21, and worthy of marvel, but greater and more marvellous are the things which follow." Olshausen says: "The less is now surpassed by the greater, yea, even the universal resuscitation at the end of time is the work of the Son of God. Christ rises now to the last and highest mediatorial act of his ἐξουσία."

It should not escape notice that the *now* is found where the spiritually dead are referred to (vs. 25), but is here wanting, implying that this is something belonging only to the future. But aside from all these plain indications of the meaning of the passage it would seem to be decisive, as Meyer says, that those who are in their graves (οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις) are in verse 29 divided into two classes, those who have done good (οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες) and those who have done evil (οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες²), whereas only the latter class could belong to the spiritually dead.³

The apostle John, too, would seem to definitely teach that this resurrection will take place at the end of the present dispensation, at the last day. So in the blessed refrain, as Meyer calls it, in John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, where Christ so

¹ See Schaff in Lange's Comm.

² For the distinction in meaning between ποιεῖν (ποίησαντες) and κρατεῖν (πράξαντες) see Alford and Meyer on John iii. 20, 21.

³ I have dwelt at some length upon this passage, because it has so often been maintained that the resurrection here referred to belongs to this life. Dr. Thayer (Theol. of Universalism, p. 330) adduces verses 24, 25 as a proof that our Saviour, in verses 28, 29, is speaking of a figurative resurrection. He says: "The expression, 'is passed from death to life,' and the resurrection, or the passing from one to the other, are all figurative and not literal—something which takes place while the persons are yet in the body, the resurrection being the result of faith in Christ." I scarcely need to add a word to what is said above to show that something very different is designated by the "marvel not," "the hour is coming" (not *now is* or *has been*), and "all that are in their graves," from what precedes. Can any passage be adduced where the passing from the death of sin to a life of holiness is called a *resurrection from the grave*?

comfortingly reiterates the assurance of eternal life for all who believe. That this can refer to anything else than the resurrection at the end of the world there does not seem to be a shadow of exegetical authority.¹ The ready reply of the sister of Lazarus (John xi. 24) when Christ said that her brother should "rise again," "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day," shows the popular belief not only in the certainty of the resurrection, but that it shall be at the end of the present dispensation. It is on this same last day that, according to John xii. 48, the unbeliever shall receive the judgment due to his unbelief.

The declaration of the apostle Paul (Acts xxiv. 15), "There shall be a resurrection (of the dead), both of the just and the unjust," could not be more explicit. That *νεκρῶν* is not found in some MSS. does not invalidate the significance of the passage, as no other resurrection "of the just and the unjust" in the future would be referred to. Besides, the word *ἀνάστασις* is almost universally applied in the New Testament to the resurrection from physical death. In verse 21, too, where there is the same reference but no limiting words, the *νεκρῶν* is added. It is significant that the apostle not only expresses his own cordial belief (*ἐλπίδα ἔχων*) in the doctrine but its reception (*προσδέχονται*) by the Jews themselves. The testimony of the Old Testament, too (Dan. xii. 2), would seem to be as plain as words could make it.² In 1 Cor. xv. 22, if it refers to the resurrection of the body, as it doubtless must, the apostle declares without qualifica-

¹ So Olshausen says: That this can denote only the corporeal resurrection, is according to the idea indicated by *εσχάτη ἡμέρα*, certain. Any reference of the expression to the spiritual ministry of Christ would occasion tautology with *ἐχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. Schaff well asks, "What stronger assurance of final resurrection to life everlasting can the believer have than this solemnly repeated assurance from the unerring mouth of the Saviour: 'I shall raise him up on the last day.' See Lange's Comm., also Alford, Bengel, DeWette, and others.

² See Alford, Meyer, Olshausen, Lange in confirmation of what is said above. How little reliance can be placed upon the declaration (Thayer, Phil. of Univ., p. 235) that "the Saviour refers to this very language [Dan. xii. 2] of the prophet, and fixes its fulfilment at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the abolition of the law-dispensation," can be farther seen from the exposition of the commentators above referred to.

tion that "in Christ all shall be made alive." "The resurrection of the evil and the good is equally implied in the πάντες."—Olshausen.

These passages, at least, state distinctly and categorically that a resurrection from death awaits all, both good and bad. Besides, Rev. xx. 12, 13, although referring especially to the judgment, is about as definite in reference to the resurrection as if it had said that all shall be raised to life: "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God And the sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them." There are many other passages that plainly imply the same thing, and are not really less convincing to the thoughtful and candid reader of the Bible, especially when taken in connection with those above discussed. In Rom. iii. 6 it is asked, "For then how shall God judge the *world*?" It matters not for our present argument whether we understand the world (τὸν κόσμον) here to mean all mankind,¹ or the gentile world; the implication would be the same—the resurrection connected with the subsequent judgment. See also 1 Cor. vi. 2; xi. 32. I need not quote farther. The passages are so many where the resurrection of all is implied that it would seem to be plain that this doctrine was reckoned as so certain that it was deemed unnecessary to reiterate it. The silences of Scripture, which Canon Farrar says (Eternal Hope, p. 91) should be no less considered than its utterances, are impressive here.

It need not surprise us that the resurrection of the righteous is so much the most frequently referred to by the writers of the New Testament. So many of the discourses of Christ were to and with those who were, or were inclining to become, his by faith in him that he would naturally and lovingly dwell upon the reward that awaited them, rather than upon the perils of those who were his enemies. Paul's letters, too, addressed to the Christians of the different

¹ So Meyer, Hodge, Tholuck, Rückert, DeWette, et al.

² So Olshausen, Reiche, et al.

peoples among whom he had labored or wished to labor (as the Romans), did not call out a frequent exhibition of the doom of the unbeliever, although the fact of a future of misery as well as of happiness underlies the whole, and is so often incidentally or without special design brought to view as to indicate that it was a settled matter that needed no confirmation.

The Judgment-day, its Time, Characteristics, and Results.

That a judgment-day is to follow the resurrection, and is closely connected with it, is no less plainly taught than the resurrection itself. It is implied in the passages that prove the resurrection. That is a resurrection to life and death (John v. 28, 29). The discrimination of the judgment is here unmistakable. In Rev. xx. 12, 13, when in the vision of the apostle the dead, small and great, were standing before God, "the books were opened" and "the dead" (those who had risen from the dead) "were judged according to their works." And upon those who were delivered from the sea, etc., the same judgment was passed.

The apostle Paul in Acts. xvii. 31 not only declares that God has "appointed (ἔσθησεν) a day in which he will judge the world," but has given assurance of it by the resurrection of Christ, the first-fruits of the resurrection of all men. In 2 Peter iii. 7, 10, 12 we have it plainly stated that the judgment is to take place when the "earth is burned up," "the heavens pass away," and "the elements melt with fervent heat." These passages sufficiently prove that this judgment does not, as some claim,¹ take place in this life. Besides, this judgment and resurrection which pertain to the wicked as well as the good are to take place at "the last day." In Heb. ix. 27 it is said that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this² the judgment." The warning of our Saviour to the unbelieving cities where most of his mighty

¹ Thayer, in *Philos. of Universalism*, says: "Death, life, and damnation are all realized in this world," p. 233.

² As Alford says, "next to death, with no more like events, comes judgment."

works were done "that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for them" distinctly implies that this was not to be a temporal judgment, for that had already passed upon Sodom (Matt. xi. 24).

The characteristics of this judgment are such as not merely imply its certainty, but show that it cannot be in form, at least, until the close of the present dispensation. It is a general and yet an individual judgment. "We must all (*τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς*) appear before the judgment-seat of Christ that each one (individually, *ἕκαστος*) may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10). So in Rom. xiv. 10, 12: "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ;" "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God." It is not only for the whole life, but only for this life. In 2 Cor. v. 10 it is specified that it is for deeds done in the body, and of course not in the disembodied spirit.

It is simultaneous for all, good and bad. So the parable of the tares indisputably represents it. Christ in explanation of this parable says: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one (Matt. xiii. 38)." "The harvest is the end of the world" (vs. 39). "As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this world" (vs. 40). "In this parable the Lord gathers, as it were, the whole human race into one life-time, as they will be gathered in one harvest, and sets that forth as simultaneous which has been scattered over the ages of time."—Alford. "It is the day in which every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it" (1 Cor. iii. 18).

It is not only an appointed day, with the judge pre-ordained and well attested by his own resurrection from the dead (Acts xvii. 31), and with a formal judgment-seat¹ (Rom. xiv. 10), but it is "the judgment of the great day"

¹ "In the New Testament," as Lange says, "*βῆμα* always means, except in Acts vii. 5, a judgment-seat where a formal trial is held." Cf. Acts xxv. 6, 10, 17, et al.

(Jude 6). It is often designated as *that day* (*ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα*), which the Jews of Christ's time could understand as no other than the great day of judgment. So in Matt. vii. 22; 2 Thess. i. 10; 2 Tim. i. 12, 18; iv. 8, and elsewhere. With reference to the wicked it is the "day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (2 Pet. iii. 7), and the day of judgment unto which the unjust are reserved to be punished (2 Pet. iii. 7); and it is also declared that these same persons shall "utterly perish in their own corruption" (vs. 12). It is also called the day of wrath. Thou "treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom. ii. 5).

It is scarcely necessary to notice further the fact so plainly revealed, that it is Jesus Christ who at this last great day of his appearing (*ἐπιφάνεια*) "shall judge the quick and dead" (2 Tim. iv. 1); or that he was ordained of God for this judgment (1 Pet. iv. 5); for it is said, "The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son" (John v. 21). Hence it is called the day of the Lord (1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 10); the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14). How vividly this day of judgment must have been portrayed to the gaze of our Lord, when three days before his death, after he had so variously instructed his disciples in reference to the nature of his kingdom, he says: "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 the nations" (Matt. xxv. 31).¹

It is important to notice here that with this resurrection and the judgment following Christ's work as Mediator ends. Does it not, then, follow that the time of probation for mortals ends also? The apostle Paul said: "Then (at the resurrection) 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" (1 Cor. xv. 24). At the judgment it is that he takes upon himself

¹ Cf. also Mark viii. 38.

the title and the office of king (*βασιλεύς*). (Matt. xxv. 34). "Stier excellently remarks that the curse (vs. 41) shows the termination of the high-priesthood of Christ, in which office he only intercedes and blesses."—Alford. Still, this name assumed for the occasion will, when the work of redemption is completed and the resurrection and judgment past, be obediently laid at the feet of the Father.

At this judgment the entire separation of all mankind into two distinct classes of opposite characteristics is sharply designated. At the time of the harvest of the world, at the end, Christ says that he will say to the reapers, "Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them into bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn" (Matt. xiii. 36-43). The separation is also distinctly portrayed in Matt. xxv. 32, 33: "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 and the goats on the left," etc. The guest who came (Matt. xxii. 13) without suitable preparation to the wedding feast was bound¹ hand and foot, and excluded from the other guests, and "cast into outer darkness." Can it be doubted that the impression made upon the hearers of our Lord Jesus Christ by his declarations in reference to the resurrection and the formal judgment following and the separation of those who had done good and those who had done evil was that this judgment would be a finality?² It is at this judgment-seat that every one must appear, and "receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10). The manner in which the resurrection is spoken of implies that it is to be to no uncertain, changing course of existence. It is a resurrection of life to those who have done

¹ The binding seems to indicate the impossibility of escape. So Meyer, Alford, and others.

² This argument is not, as we are told (see Whiton in *New Englander*) based merely upon the assumption, that if Christ's hearers had misunderstood him in this matter, he would have corrected their mistake, but on the certainty that he would not *again* and *again* have used language that would so naturally and inevitably mislead.

good, and of judgment (death) to those who have done evil (John v. 29).

Passages examined where the Duration of the Happiness of the Righteous is compared with the Duration of the Misery of the Wicked.

The passages of Scripture in which the condition of the righteous and the wicked after death is spoken of in contrast plainly teach that its duration is the same to both classes of persons, and hence precludes the idea of a future probation. The phraseology used, as we have shown above, is the strongest that the Greek and Hebrew languages afford for expressing the idea of endlessness. It would seem difficult to make out, with a fair interpretation of language, such as we should employ in the exposition of a classical author, that, whilst the eternity of the happiness of the righteous is plainly taught, that of the misery of the wicked is not equally certain. That the former is oftener referred to cannot be questioned; but how in consistency could it be otherwise? In many cases the eternal life of the good is spoken of where there is no intimation of the opposite state, but the instances where there is plainly a direct or implied contrast are so many that it hardly seems possible that the contrast in other cases is not in the mind of the speaker and hearer. The omission is, indeed, a confirmation of the doctrine, as it implies implicit belief which needs no asseveration.

The teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. xxv. 30 sq.) in explanation of the parable of the talents and illustrative of the kingdom of heaven, although so often commented upon, cannot be passed over in silence in this discussion. For the simple, graphic, and sublime combined we can scarcely find a parallel to this passage anywhere in sacred or profane writings. The doom of the servant who instead of returning his talent with use brought it to his master with the charge of oppression and injustice (vs. 24) is given in verse 30: "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." But our

Saviour, not satisfied with this, but desiring to deepen the impression of the results of faithfulness in duty and of a spirit of disobedience, goes on to the end of the chapter to enforce the truth of the final consequences of the two courses of action and life. "The repetition of particulars, too, indicates the exactness and individuality of the judgment."—Alford. In verse 31 Christ carries his hearers in thought forward to that last great judgment at the end of the world¹ when (*ὅταν ἔλθε*, indefinite time) the Son of man shall come in his glory,² and all the holy angels with him; then (*τότε*, precise time) shall he sit upon the throne³ of his glory," just as he is represented as doing in Rev. iv. 12. "And there shall be gathered before him all nations" (all the individuals of the nations, shown by *αὐτούς* in the next clause). The entire separation of the two classes ensues (vs. 32, 33), and the spirit of humble self-renunciation on the one hand and of self-justification on the other; and, finally, the everlasting doom of the latter (vs. 41, 46) and the endless happiness of the former (vs. 34, 46) are explicitly designated.

After the assembling of the universe of man before the king and judge in state, with all the attendant hosts of angels, the distinct and unqualified division and separation of all into two classes according to character, ought there to be any question as to identity of meaning when the same word is used in precisely the same position, without the slightest indication of any difference, in characterizing the result of the decision of this tribunal? If *αἰώνιος* in the one case denotes endlessness any just and unprejudiced interpreter can make it mean no less in the other.⁴

¹ There is no parable here, but as Lange says: "The judgment is set before us in its concrete form."

² Alford says: "This his glory (distinct from that in xxiv. 30) is that also of all his saints by whom he shall be accompanied; see Jude 14. In this his coming *they* are with the angels, and as the angels." See Rev. xix. 14 (cf. with ver. 8), Zech. xiv. 5.

³ Here he has assumed his kingly authority, and here only (in vs. 40) he calls himself "king."

⁴ Professor Leonard assents unhesitatingly to the exegetical necessity of understanding *αἰώνιος* as used with the same significance in both these clauses.

In defence of the interpretation of *αἰώνιος* differently in the two clauses of verse 46 it is claimed that "to all the righteous Christ has given a specific promise that the aeonian life (which only they shall receive) shall be an unending life."¹ But where is this specific promise, which would be understood as such by the hearers of our Saviour, to be found, except in connection with the word *αἰώνιος* or its cognates? Is it in John's Gospel xiv. 19: "Because, I live ye shall live also"? Would the unlettered disciples of our Lord have thought of this as giving them assurance of an endless life, or was it merely the comforting assurance that the separation from them that was soon to ensue was not final? Is it, as Canon Farrar (in *Eternal Hope*) would have us suppose, in Luke xx. 36, which is addressed to the Sadducees, and is merely an incidental mention of the immortality which awaits the righteous?

It is scarcely necessary to dwell long upon the use of *κόλασις*, which is shown by the contrast with *ζωή* to mean *death, misery*, as that denotes *life, blessedness*. So Alford says: These words "are here contraries, for the *ζωή* here spoken of is not bare existence, which would have annihilation for its opposite, but blessedness and reward, to which punishment and misery are antagonistic terms." Olshausen, too, well says: "*Κόλασις αἰώνιος*"² denotes eternal condemnation. Nor can the strictness of the antithesis be subjected to the slightest exegetical alleviation on account of the *ζωή αἰώνιος*; for the predominant idea expressed by the word *ζωή* is not that of existence, but that of holy and happy being."³

"The condemned," he says, "go away *εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, the righteous *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. Both states are expressed in language precisely parallel, and so presented that we cannot make any difference in the force and extent of the terms" (*Latest Word of Univ.*, pp. 189, 191). I scarcely need to speak of the claim that some have made (see Clemence on *Future Punishment*, p. 65, quoted by Farrar), that "*αἰώνιος* shines by a reflected light," has in itself no independent meaning, so that it must be interpreted in accordance with the word with which it is used. What *possible* difference is there between this and other words in that respect?

¹ Whiton in *New Englander*, May 1878, p. 350.

² DeWette renders these words, *Ewige Pein*, eternal torment.

³ See Trench's *Synonymes of New Testament*, and references there.

That the idea of correction¹ is retained in this word in the New Testament, which it had when originally used for pruning trees, is not only excluded by the contrast here but by the use of the word in the only other passage in which it is found, 1 John iv. 18: "Fear hath torment (*κόλασιν*)," and "he that feareth is not made perfect in love."¹

Without reference to the meaning of particular words,² as certain as that seems to be, the tone of the whole representation here is not without its significance in reference to the finality of the judgment passed. After the gathering of all nations come the separation and characterization (sheep and goats, vs. 32); then the words of approval and reward to those on the right hand: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," etc. (vs. 34); and the utter exclusion of the wicked and consignment to punishment with "the devil and his angels" (vs. 41). But this is not enough; the actual certainty of the carrying out of the sentence closes the whole representation: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," etc., (vs. 46). So Professor Lewis speaks of "that dread aspect of finality that appears here, not in single words merely, but in the power and vividness of the language taken as a whole. The parabolic images evidently represent a closing scene. It is the last great act in the drama of human existence."³

The same scene of the judgment of the last great day was presented to the prophetic eye of the apocalyptist (Rev. xx. 11 sq.), but some of the particulars are described in quite different language. "The dead, small and great," casting aside the cerements of the grave, or leaving the ocean depths, stand before God, and are judged according to the record of their lives. The result to those whose names are found in the "Book of Life" is not so distinctly specified in

¹ Both Canon Farrar and Professor Leonard lay much stress upon this idea, without apparent exegetical authority.

² Thus would we rid ourselves of subjection to what Canon Farrar calls "the tyrannous realism of ambiguous words, the asserted infallibility of isolated words" (Eternal Hope, p. 76).

³ Lange's Com. on Eccl. i. 9, p. 48. Gerlach says well: "Two things must be specially marked in the proceedings of the judgment, the division of men

this connection, though plainly enough implied; but "whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and false prophet are," with them to "be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Who these persons were is plainly designated in general in Rev. xxii. 15, and the permanence of the condition is distinctly implied in chap. xxii. 12: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." What can be plainer from all these passages than Alford's conclusion, that "as after that life there is no more death (Rev. xxi. 4), so after that death there is no more life."

The apostle Paul, too, as well as our Saviour and the "beloved disciple," gives us in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians (i. 8 sq.) a vivid picture of the last judgment, when "the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," and give merited punishment (*διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν*), everlasting destruction (*ἄλεθρον αἰώνιον*, vs. 9) to those who "know not God" (the persecutors), and glory with himself to the true believers (*τοῖς ἁγίοις*, and *πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*). The meaning of *ἄλεθρος*, used only by Paul of the New Testament writers, and only four times by him, does not seem to be doubtful, especially when this passage is taken in connection with Matt. xxv. 46, since this *ἄλεθρον αἰώνιον* is equivalent to *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, and as such is a plain contrast to *ζῶην αἰώνιον*.¹

In these last two passages discussed, Rev. xx. 11 sq.; 2 Thess. i. 8 sq., the judgment to the wicked is more distinctly declared than that to the righteous. But no one

into two classes or fellowships, and *that for eternity*; and then the tokens which will be found on those whom the Lord will accept — self-forgetting, humble, brotherly love."

¹ So Olshausen says: "It is not to be disputed that the comparison with the formula *ζῶην αἰώνιος*, does not permit us to interpret the phrase *ἄλεθρος αἰώνιος* otherwise than of everlasting damnation." If Olshausen is right in saying that this is the only passage in Paul's Epistles in which everlasting damnation is openly declared, it is indisputable that in such passages as Rom. ii. 5 sq.; v. 21; vi. 21, 23, and many others, it is plainly implied.

questions that the apostle understands that the happiness of the good will be co-extensive with the misery of the wicked. Is there any more reason to doubt that when in Rom. ii. 5 sq. it is said that God, "who will render to every man according to his deeds, will give to those who seek for glory, honor, and immortality eternal life" that the indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, that await "every soul of man that doeth evil" shall also be eternal? So in Rom. v. 21 is not the meaning plain "that as sin hath reigned unto [eternal] death, even so might grace reign unto eternal life"? And in Rom. vi. 21-23 it seems quite certain that the readers of the Epistle would understand the apostle as implying that the end of the course of the servants of sin is (eternal) death (vs. 21) as really and truly as the reward of the servants of God is eternal life. There does not seem to be any third course.¹ And so in verse 23, the wages (*ἀφώνια*, *pay, fruit, consequences*) of sin is (eternal) death, just as the gift of God is eternal life. In Gal. vi. 8 can there be any just question whether the corruption (*φθορά*, *spiritual death*) is as really eternal (*αἰώνιος*) as the life (*ζωή*)?²

There is a contrasted condition of the righteous and the wicked in the Epistles of Peter (1 Pet. i. 4; 2 Pet. i. 4, 5, and 2 Pet. ii. 12), which, although not brought into direct contact, is none the less certain and convincing. The elect, who have attained the like precious faith with the apostle, are "heirs to an inheritance incorruptible (*ἄφθαρτον*), undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven" for those "who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." So in 2 Pet. i. 4, 5 those who through the promises have become "partakers of the divine nature" (vs. 4), and are zealous in the practice of the Christian virtues (vs. 5) shall receive "an abundant entrance into the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour

¹ Alford says: "The *ends* of the two courses are placed pointedly and antithetically" with this difference, that whilst death is the wages of sin, eternal life is the free gift of God.

² Lange well says: "*φθορά* agreeably to the contrast with *ζωή αἰώνιος* = destruction, ruin, and that eternal ruin = *ἀπώλεια, θάνατος*, not = transitoriness."

Jesus Christ" (vs. 11). In 2 Pet. ii. 12 we have the contrasted picture of the character and fate of the false teachers. "These, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption" (ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται). It should not escape notice that ἀφθαρτον (1 Pet. i. 4) and φθορᾷ and καταφθαρήσονται (2 Pet. ii. 12) are all from the same root, and that the future salvation of the one class is no more certain than the utter perdition of the other.¹

In the Gospel of Mark xvi. 16 we read that "he that believeth (πιστεύσας) shall be saved (σωθήσεται), but he that believeth not (ἀπιστήσας) shall be damned" (κριθήσεται). Here the salvation and the condemnation are sharply contrasted, and it is but natural to suppose the attribute of time is the same in both members of the comparison.

The contrast between the ultimate condition of the believing gentiles (typified by the centurion), the "many" that "shall come from the east and the west" (i.e. without distinction or nationality; see Isa. xlv. 6), with the children of the kingdom, the typical kingdom, which the Jews arrogated to themselves, is plainly expressed in Matt. viii. 11, 12. The former will be admitted to the Messianic feast, that is, as his hearers would understand it, to the blessedness of the kingdom of heaven, whilst the latter will be cast into outer darkness to suffer the horrors indicated by "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The article ὁ used with κλαυθμός denotes that this wretchedness was an acknowledged thing.² Is not the presumption a strong one, here, that the separation will be final, that the doors will no more be opened to those who are excluded? The contrast in Col. iii. 4-7 is no less distinct. "When Christ, who is our life, shall

¹ Lange says: "φθορά is inward, moral corruption, and the spiritual death to which it leads. The verb (καταφθαρ.) denotes outward destruction and future condemnation. Their outward destruction here is still followed by retribution hereafter, the reward of their unrighteousness."

² It indicates "the notoriety or eminence of the suffering," as Lange says, "The well-known wretchedness experienced in hell."

appear [at the last day] then shall ye also appear with him in glory" (vs. 4); but on the "children of disobedience"¹ "the wrath of God cometh" (vs. 6). In Phil. iii. 18 it is declared that the end of the "enemies of the cross of Christ is destruction," but the bodies of the faithful are to be "fashioned like unto the glorious body" of the Lord Jesus Christ. In John v. 29 the resurrection of life for those who have done good is pointedly put over against the resurrection of damnation (condemnation) for those who have done evil. This passage has been previously spoken of in proof of the resurrection of all, and only one or two points require an additional remark. *Κρίσις* is plainly contrasted with *ζωή*, and is equivalent to *θάνατος*, as it is explained to be in verse 24, where it is said that he who heareth and believeth hath everlasting life (*ζωὴν αἰώνιον*), and shall not come into (is not subject to, has no part in) condemnation (*εἰς κρίσιν*), but is passed from death unto life. In Rom. ix. 22 "The vessels of wrath fitted for destruction" are in plain contrast to the "vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory."

There are other passages where the contrasted condition of the righteous and the wicked is brought to view in a more general way, without reference to the resurrection or judgment, but merely as a condition implying permanence. In John iii. 36 (cf. vs. 15): "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life," i.e. the Messianic *ζωή*, which is a present, subjective possession to the believer, already entered upon, but to continue forever. In contrast with this the unbeliever (*ὁ ἀπειθῶν*), the disobedient, "shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth upon him" (*μένει*). This word implies a continuance of the wrath of God. It does not merely come (*ἔρχεται*) upon him, but abides, and plainly, by implication, as long as the life that is the result of belief, which is everlasting (*αἰώνιον*).²

¹ There is some question about the genuineness of the clause "on the children of disobedience," but it is so plainly implied in the context that its omission does not change the meaning of the whole passage.

² Meyer says: "This *μένει* implies that the person who rejects faith is still

In 2 Cor. ii. 15; 16 we have in contrast the saved (*σωζομένοις*) and the lost (*ἀπολλυμένοις*), to the latter of which Paul says, "we are the savor of death unto death," and to the former, "of life unto life." The responsibility of thus dispensing life and death calls forth from the apostle the exclamation: "Who is sufficient for these things!" Here the glorious life of the believer and the appalling death of the unbeliever are parallel, and if one is an endless life can the other be anything less than an endless death? The same contrast in the same words is found also in 1 Cor. i. 18, and with a little variation in 2 Thess. ii. 10: *ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτοῖς.*

In Phil. i. 28, after exhorting the Philippian brethren to faithfulness in life and conversation, the apostle admonishes them to be in nothing terrified by their adversaries, "which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God." The meaning of the words that designate the final result of the course of life to both classes, viz. *ἀπώλεια* and *σωτηρία*, could not have been doubtful to the readers of the Epistle. In chap. iii. 18, 19 the end (*τὸ τέλος*) of those who are "enemies of the cross of Christ" is also significantly designated as destruction (*ἀπώλεια*). It is noticeable that even in this Epistle to the Philippian brethren, "dearly beloved," which is the most pervaded of any of Paul's Epistles with heartfelt and tender love, the simple effusions of affection bursting forth spontaneously,¹ the result of opposition to the truth is so clearly designated.

Some other Passages which imply that there will be no Time of Probation after Death.

There is a large number of passages, and those, too, showing the drift of our Saviour's teaching, which although they do not directly assert the certainty of the endlessness of future punishment yet strongly imply that all will not be in a moral condition which is subject to the divine wrath, a state of subjection to wrath which, instead of being removed by faith, abides upon him through unbelief."

¹ See Meyer's Com., Introduction.

saved. In Luke xiii. 23 the question of one who had been a listener to Christ's warning, as in verse 5, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," "Are there few that be saved?" are the saved few? plainly implies that our Saviour was understood to teach that some will be lost. In the words *οἱ σωζόμενοι* "the implication of final salvation is obvious."—Alford. Point, too, is given to the implication in these words by the exhortation¹ that follows in verse 24: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able," followed by the certainty that the door will be shut (vs. 25), and that utter exclusion will follow (vs. 27, 28).

Matt. x. 28 points specifically to a future retribution, death, destruction, as contrasted with the death of the body by the hand of man: Fear not them who kill the body, but fear him² (God) who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (*ἐν γέεννη*). In Matt. xvi. 26 (Mark viii. 36; Luke ix. 24) Christ contrasts the losing of the soul (life) with the gain of all earthly good, and implies the irreparable and unending loss by asking: "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul [life]?"³ and by the assurance that when Christ comes "in the glory of the Father with his angels" the final reward shall be given to every man according to his works (in this life). Paul speaks of the "everlasting destruction (*ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον*) from the presence of the Lord" which awaits the opposers of the truth in that (last) day (2 Thess. i. 9). St. Peter also designates swift destruction (*ταχινήν ἀπώλειαν*) as certain to come upon false prophets and false teachers (2 Pet. ii. 1), the unjust ones reserved "unto the day of judgment to be punished" (2 Pet. ii. 9).

¹ See a similar exhortation in Matt. vii. 13, 14.

² Some have contended that Satan, and not God, is referred to here; but Alford has settled that matter, and Lange has discarded that interpretation which he formerly accepted. Alford says: "It seems to me at variance with the connection of the discourse, and with the universal tone of Scripture regarding Satan." See also Meyer, Owen, Bengel, and others.

³ "ψυχή in this connection of course does not mean, as in vs. 25, the perishing life of the body but the true eternal life of the soul, which begins in this world by faith in Christ, and will be fully developed in the life to come." See Schaff in Lange's Comm.

The Gospel of John abounds in passages where the doctrine of future endless retribution seems to be implied. Indeed, we can scarcely examine carefully any of the conversations of Christ there recorded, and not find that the final loss of the unbeliever and the opposer of the truth is more or less plainly to be recognized. In John iii. 16 it is said "that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." The same phrase is found in verse 15 with the omission in the best MSS. of "not perish, but," which is so manifestly implied. Here the saving power of Christ is illustrated by that of the brazen serpent.¹ All who were bitten by the fiery serpents and who did not look upon the brazen serpent perished physically; so all who do not believe in Christ must perish spiritually.² The implication that all will not believe, and will thus be subject to eternal death, so plainly implied in all the latter part of this chapter, seems to be made certain by the conclusion of this discourse (vs. 36, spoken of above): "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life," etc.

In John vi. 40 we have several passages that seem to be of no doubtful import, and that give character to the whole discourse. Verse 40, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him ("all which he hath given me") may [should] have eternal life," implies clearly that there are those who do not believe, and cannot attain unto that life everlasting which Christ gives, but must perish. So in verse 47: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life," where the implication is plain in reference to those who do not believe. That these passages can refer only to the life which is consummated after death the clause three times

¹ Numbers xxi. 6 sq.

² See Alford and Lange. Meyer says upon this verse: "The change from the Aor. to the Pres. is to be noted, whereby the being utterly ruined (by banishment to hell in the Messianic judgment) is spoken of as an act in process of accomplishment, while the possession of the Messianic $\omega\eta$ is described as now already existing, commencing with regeneration and abiding forever."

repeated (vs. 39, 40, 54), "and I will raise him up¹ at the last day," plainly shows. In the conclusion of this conversation the emphatic interrogation (vs. 70), "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" is significant. Is there any hope of the restoration of devils after death?

In the eighth chapter, after Christ had told the Jews that his words had no place in them (vs. 37) because they were of their father the devil (vs. 44), who was a murderer and a liar from the beginning, so that they cannot believe his words, he adds, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying he shall never see death" (vs. 51). Can it be doubted that they understood that he consigned them to endless woe? And hence "took they up stones to cast at him" (vs. 59). In John xi. 26 we read that "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me," even if he have died physically (vs. 25), "shall never die," but by implication the unbelieving die forever.

The terrible imagery used in describing the punishment of the wicked would seem to plainly forbid a hope of probation beyond the grave. In Matt. iii. 12 the chaff, the refuse of the floor, is to be burned with unquenchable fire.² So also in Luke iii. 17. In Matt. xxv. 41 those on the left hand are commanded to "Depart into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." In Mark ix. 45, 46 the designation is, "the fire that shall never be quenched," and "that is not quenched" (unquenchable). In Matt. xiii. 41 sq. we are told that at the end of the world the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and gather all the evil-doers, and "shall cast them into a furnace of fire;" where "there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Other like designations, which our pen would refuse to transcribe were they not words of the Holy One, are often found elsewhere in the New Testament (such as Matt. xviii. 8, 9; xxiv. 51; Luke

¹ Alford says: "Ἀναστήσω (I will raise him up) refers to the only resurrection, which is the completion of the man in his glorified state; it does not set aside the ἀνδραπίστειωσις."

² Lange says: "When the fiery judgment begins, it continues without interruption until the unquenchable fire of Gehenna is kindled."

xiii. 28). The command in Matt. xxii. 13, "Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness," does not look much like any subsequent reception into the marriage feast, to which the kingdom of heaven is compared.

The different manner in which Christ speaks of his followers and those who reject him, in respect to the future, is not without significance. His prayer for the former is, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me" (John xvii. 24). To the Pharisees he says, after speaking of his return to the Father, "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me, and where I am thither ye cannot come" (John vii. 34). In John viii. 51 Jesus also says, "I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come," where the plain implication is that if they die in their sins they cannot come where Christ goes to prepare "many mansions" for those for whom he will come again (John xiv. 2, 3).

With all these declarations and intimations in reference to an endless and unchanging existence after death, which must have strongly impressed his hearers, is it not strange that our Saviour and the inspired writers do not, if there is to be another time of probation, give distinct intimation of it, even if we could suppose that he and they would have spoken in such a manner and so often with the certain knowledge that they were making an erroneous impression? Would there not have been far more reason for it than for the declaration in John xiv. 1, 2, "If it were not so I would have told you," in reference to the many mansions in his Father's house? "If there were ages of change coming somewhere in the vast future, in the infinite flow of the *αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων*, the ages of ages when the *ζωή* should cease, or the *κόλασις* be intermitted, should we not expect to hear, 'I would have told you'? He has not told us, and no man should have the audacity to raise the veil which he has so solemnly dropped before the vision of both sense and reason."¹

¹ See Professor Lewis in Lange's Com. on Eccl.

*Examination of some Passages that are claimed as implying
a Future Probation.*

It is quite unnecessary to speak here of many of the texts that are sometimes referred to in proof of the final salvation of all men. They refer, for the most part, to the abundant provision made for the redemption of all, but have no definite or even indefinite reference to the acceptance of it in this life, or to the possibility, if neglected here, of its availability in the life to come. Such passages are John i. 29; iii. 17, 35 (1 John iv. 14); xii. 32; Luke ix. 56; 1 John ii. 2; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus ii. 11; Heb. ii. 14.¹

Meyer well says (Eph. i. 10): "Those passages which speak of the universality of the redemption, and such passages as 1 Pet. iv. 6 and Phil. ii. 10 sq. leave entirely untouched the constant doctrine of the New Testament respecting eternal damnation." Heb. ii. 9, "That he by the grace of God shall taste death for every man" (*ὑπὲρ πάντων γεύσεται θανάτου*), is not only, like the passages above cited, of a general nature, but not improbably refers not to man alone, but to all created things on the earth and in heaven. That Rom. xi. 32 has not the most distant reference to the reception of gracious influences by every individual of the human race seems plain from the whole tenor of the preceding reasoning, which relates to God's plans in reference to the Jews and Gentiles and their relations to one another and to him in the gospel dispensation. The use of the article, *οἱ πάντες*, implies that the apostle had not in mind all the individuals of the human race, but all those among Jews and Gentiles who have been previously indicated; not all the Jews, for some of them were as "branches broken off" (vs. 17, 19); not all of the Gentiles, for they, too, "shall be cast off" if they continue not in the goodness of God (vs. 22). It is not to be denied that gracious influences are extended to all, but the

¹ See *Eternal Hope*, pp. 220 sq. Other similar passages are referred to by others, such as Luke ii. 11, 12, 14; not excepting the *Protevangel*, Ger. iii. 5.

appropriate result in salvation is thwarted by unwillingness on the part of man.¹

Why so much reliance is placed upon Acts iii. 21 by those who advocate the doctrine of the restoration of all is difficult to understand. The return of Christ (vs. 19) at the end of the world after his abode in heaven, to which when the passage was written he had not long before ascended, seems to be plainly referred to. "The times of the restitution of all things" (*χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων*, vs. 21) designates plainly and objectively the "state of order, purity, and happiness" which will be the portion of the righteous at the second coming of Christ,² which is subjectively hinted at in the "times of refreshing" (*καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως*, vs. 19). The exhortation to "repent (*μετανοήσετε*), and be converted [turn]" (*ἐπιστρέψατε*) in order that (*ὅπως ἂν*) "sins may be blotted out," shows the necessity of the preparation for this refreshing, and by implication not only the possibility but the danger of not attaining to it.³

A full discussion of Rom. v. 12 sq. would require a separate article, but it is necessary here to touch only upon some salient points which seem to render it utterly nugatory as an argument for a future probation. In the first place, it should not be forgotten that this Epistle was written to Roman Christians (i. 6-8), "those who are called to be

¹ As Olshausen says: "The words *ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλέησῃ* ought in any case to be understood as signifying the divine *purpose* only, like other passages which declare the universality of grace (1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 John ii. 2), without giving us to suppose that this purpose takes effect in the case of every individual."

² It is not necessary to suppose that a literal, exclusive return to a former state, is designated by *ἀποκατάστασις* here, but more than that, "All that God has spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets shall be restored, and be placed in its original order, and in that condition which God designed and promised." — Lange.

³ For a more full discussion of this passage, see Hackett, DeWette, Olshausen, Meyer, Alford, and other expositors. How it can be said (see Latest Word on Universalism, pp. 232, 233) that "substantially, though naturally guardedly, this idea of universal restoration [of man] is accepted by the latest authorities," it is difficult to see. Even Lechler, to whom reference is made, does not seem to positively claim that universal salvation is here taught.

saints," and who considered themselves as belonging to the Messianic kingdom, and destined to an entirely different future from the heathen and unbelievers around them. In the first part of this chapter Paul brings to view the cause of gratitude that they have for the atonement (reconciliation, *καταλλαγή*) which they have received by faith. In the remainder of the chapter the idea is generalized, with such modifications of thought and expression as would make it applicable to his readers, and the atonement of Christ is compared with the sin of Adam. *Διὰ τοῦτο* (vs. 12) refers directly to the clause *τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν* (vs. 11), which, however, is a suggestive synopsis in brief of the whole discussion from the introduction (i. 17) onward. The conclusion of the comparison (*ὡσπερ*, as) is found in verse 18, although both parts of it are so much anticipated in the intervening explanatory clauses that verse 18 is rather a recapitulation of the preceding verses than a resumption from verse 12.—Meyer. In this 18th verse we have the simple fact that as the sin of one man, Adam, brought condemnation to (*εἰς*) all, so the righteousness of one, Jesus Christ, brought justification of life to (*εἰς*) all. But it is not said that this condemnation took effect upon all individually without their own appropriation of it by actual sin. Indeed, it is plain that it is only by becoming *actual* sinners that this condemnation is brought *upon* all, as it is said in verse 12 it is "because all have sinned" (*ἤμαρτον*), become actual transgressors, and in verse 19 the many, also, become sinners (*ἁμαρτωλοί*). Much less is it implied that justification was appropriated by all since it is expressly stated in verses 1 and 2 of this chapter that this justification is appropriated by faith. And, furthermore, the necessity of this faith in order to the enjoyment of the *δικαίωσιν ζωῆς* is so much dwelt upon in this and the preceding chapters that it would seem, that not only the necessity of it but the danger of not attaining to it, was constantly in the apostle's thoughts. There is also a still farther limitation of the number that shall reign in life, in verse 17, where they are distinctly des-

ignated as "those who receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness." That there is not an intended limitation also in the use of *οἱ πολλοί* instead of *πάντες*, in verses 15 and 19, is by no means certain. Alford says, "In order to make the comparison more strict the *πάντες* who have been made sinners are weakened to the indefinite *οἱ πολλοί*, the *πολλοί* who shall be made righteous are enlarged to the indefinite *οἱ πολλοί*. Thus a common term of quantity is found for both, the one extending to its largest numerical interpretation, the other restricted to its smallest."¹

Much stress is laid by some upon the claim of superiority (*ἐπερίσσευσεν*, vs. 15; *τὴν περισείαν*, vs. 17; *ὑπερεπίσσευσεν*, vs. 20) of the gift of life by Christ over the dominion of death through Adam. But it is plain that it is the power of Christ's atonement and not the numbers affected by it that is designated. It was not only sufficient to counterbalance the consequences of Adam's sin, the fall, but also for the removing of the many offences (*πολλὰ παραπτώματα*) of men, and communicating a new and higher life, not subject to death.

"For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22) is often claimed as proof of universal salvation; but plainly there is no reference here to a life of happiness or misery hereafter, but only to a resurrection from death. The apostle is plainly confuting the Sadducee doctrine, which seems to have crept into the church at Corinth, that there may be no resurrection of the dead (see vs. 12-21). Alford says well: "The antithesis is merely between the bringing in of death by Adam and of life (its opposite) by Christ. No consequence, whether of life or death, is brought into consideration."

It may be asked, How can the resurrection of the body be said to be dependent upon Christ? In the first place, he is the beginning of a series, the first fruits, the leader (*ἀρχηγός*).—Meyer. The resurrection of all, Christ included, is a great fact, and if he had not risen how could others hope for a resurrection? The apostle, however, doubtless had a

¹ See also Tholuck's Com.

deeper thought in the reasonings in this chapter than that Christ's resurrection was a mere example of a resurrection, which showed the possibility in other cases. The fact is made clear that in him (*ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*) "the whole race of man obtains the principle of the resurrection. He, the second Adam, has been implanted in humanity as the destroyer of death." More than this, it seems to be plainly taught that the resurrection as well as the judgment following is to be the work of Christ. He is the destroyer of that last enemy, death (vs. 26). These are his last works before giving up the kingdom to God, even the Father. In John v. 21, 22 we learn that Christ as well as the Father quickeneth whom he will.¹ The ground of this power is based upon, and closely related to, the fact that all judgment is committed to him. "For (*γάρ*, vs. 22) the Father judgeth no man," etc.

Furthermore, Christ himself seems to have settled the question by claiming for himself the power of this resurrection at the last day. "I am," he says, "the resurrection and the life" (John xi. 25). This power which was committed by the Father to the Son he often refers to as an encouragement to his disciples (John vi. 40, 44, 54, et al.). The same power with the same intent is ascribed to Christ by Paul in Phil. iii. 21: "Who shall change our vile body into a likeness of his glorious body by that power which enables him to subdue all things to himself."

That Eph. i. 10 is somewhat difficult of interpretation cannot be questioned. But that there is not in it any warrant for a belief in the final salvation of all seems quite certain. In (in reference to, *εἰς*) the dispensation (*οἰκονομίαν*) of the fulness of times (*τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν*, Gen. of characteristic), i.e. the dispensation or economy which was to be clearly revealed and carried out when the fulness of time had come, God purposed to bring together for himself in one

¹ Lange's Com. on 1 Cor., p. 317.

² Godet says truly: "The power of quickening, or not quickening, is embraced in that of judging." "By his return on the day of his advent, and by his victory over the last enemy, death . . . he will work in the physical domain the universal resurrection." Com. on John v. 21 sq.

(under one head, Christ) (*ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι*) all things (*τὰ πάντα*) both in heaven and upon the earth; not man alone but the whole creation. Thus this passage is of a like general import with Col. i. 20. A reference to a re-instat-ing or restoring to a former state may perhaps be implied in the *ἀνα* in composition, though Alford says the *ἀνα* applies to the gathering of individuals, not to any restoration. The simple reference in the passage is plainly to the final union, at the accomplishment of the mediatorship of Christ, of not only all the nations of the earth and all things in it but of a harmonious union of all these with things in heaven. "This reconciliation through Christ is to the apostle a fact whose effects permeate the universe." The particular manner in which it is to be brought about is not alluded to here, though it is natural to suppose that each according to his own character will be brought into this reconciliation; "the evil as conquered and rejected opponents, the good angels as participating, ministering friends, the redeemed as accepted children, the rest of creation as subordinate companions, as theatre of the honors."¹ The limitation of the realization of this union (*ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*) is plainly indicated throughout the Epistle. These Ephesians, and the apostle himself, obtain an inheritance in it as "chosen" (vs. 4) and predestinated (vs. 5, 11), and through trusting in Christ (vs. 12, 13). Besides, the apostle would not, we must believe, contradict himself in this short Epistle, as he would do in v. 5 if all are to be partakers in this final union of all things in Christ. Meyer, who cannot be accused of "theological bias or of ungrammatical exegesis," is pronounced in the expression of his belief that no hint is here given of the final restoration of all men.²

Phil. ii. 10 is often quoted as implying the salvation of all men. But it seems to us plain that the exposition, for sub-

¹ Bengel on Rom. viii. 19, quoted in Lange's Com.

² See his Com. and Lange's, who quotes at length from him. Ellicott too says: "Any reference to the redemption or restoration of those spirits (Gellius), for whom our Lord himself said *τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον* (Matt. xxv. 41) was prepared, must be fundamentally impossible."

stance, that is stigmatized as "traditional" is the only one that it will bear. It is manifest from verses 7-9 that Christ in his *exaltation*, after he had laid down his life, and finished his mediatorial reign, is here referred to as the object of adoration. "He made himself of no reputation" (vs. 7), and "humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (vs. 8); wherefore (διό, as a compensation and result) God hath highly exalted (ὑπερήνωσε, in contrast with ἐταπεινώσειν, vs. 8)—i.e. in his ascension to the right hand of the Father from his state of humiliation—him, and "given him a name which is above every name;"¹ that (ἵνα, denoting the purpose of the exaltation) in the name of Jesus, i.e. in what is involved in this name as the ground or reason, "every knee shall bow,"—representing plastically (Meyer) the act of adoration; of the heavenly (angels), of the earthly (men and other earthly things), of the subterranean (the dead). The language is the most general possible, referring plainly to the adoration which belongs to the kingship of Christ throughout the whole realm of existence, whether rational or irrational. So far as intelligent beings are concerned this passage is parallel with Rom. xiv. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 25, and other passages. There is little in the language here to suggest that loving adoration which the Christian as such feels in view of the life and death of Christ, although that is of course included, but the language fitly characterizes the general homage which his exaltation must extort from all. In Rom. xiv. 11 the context shows that subjection to the decisions of the last judgment is declared. So in Isa. xlv. 23, upon which both these passages seem to be based, there is much more indication of the exercise of authority on the part of God than of hearty obedience on the part of man.²

¹ "By this exaltation, granted to him that the name 'Jesus Christ' surpasses all names in glory."—Meyer.

² Wiesingen (Olshausen's Comm.) well says: "Jesus is not here acknowledged as Mediator, but as Lord," and that the true interpretation of this passage, as also Rom. xiv. 11 and Isa. xlv. 23, "shows that it is not a willing acknowledgment of Jesus Christ that is here spoken of, but a universal acknowledgment which can only be the final result of the *κυριότης* of Jesus Christ."

Col. i. 19, 20 give a reason in the plan of the Father for the characteristic attributes of Christ sketched in the preceding verses. He it was by and for whom "all things were created" (vs. 16), who "is before all things," and "by him all things consist" (vs. 17). He is also "the head of the body, the church," and "the beginning, the first born from the dead" (vs. 18). For it pleased (εὐδόκησε, he thought well of it) the Father that in him should all fulness (πάν τὸ πλήρωμα) dwell; that is, as is said in ii. 9, "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Thus he was made a fit instrument for the reconciling of all things to God by the blood of his cross. The participial clause, "Having made peace" (εἰρηνοποιήσας, κ.τ.λ.), denotes the manner or means of the reconciliation designated by the verb.

The most important point for consideration in this connection is the meaning of ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα. The import of τὰ πάντα is exemplified in the clauses, τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,¹ and τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and shown to refer to the whole universe, angels, men, and unreasoning and lifeless objects. It is plain that all the creation with which man has to do was, in an important sense, alienated from God by the fall (Rom. viii. 19 sq.), and needed a reconciliation with him. Some of the angels fell, too, but although we have no authority for supposing that the atonement of Christ relates directly to them, since he took not upon himself the nature of angels, still, even they whom God charges with folly *as a whole* will be brought into a reconciliation with God, their normal relation, by the exclusion from their number of those who rebelled and their consignment to their final doom at the judgment. In the strictest sense, too, only the sinful creation can be said to be reconciled, yet "sinless creation, ever at a distance from his unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of him; and is thus reconciled in a very intelligible and allowable sense."²

¹ The earth is placed first here as embracing the more prominent objects of reconciliation.

² "The idea of reconciliation" Meyer says, "is, therefore, in conformity with the manner of popular discourse, and according to the variety of the several ob-

—Alford. It is plain that the consummation of this reconciliation is to be fully effected at the end of the world, when the Son lays down his authority as mediator, and the new heavens and the new earth will be constituted as the dwelling-place of righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) (2 Pet. iii. 13).

That this reconciliation which Christ by his sacrifice procured for the whole universe is not immediately available to his intelligent creatures without action on their part is plain from the verses following: "And you [Colossean Christians]," the apostle says, "who were sometimes alienated and enemies now hath he reconciled (*ἀποκατήλλαξεν*) if ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel," etc. So Meyer says: "Christ's death did not remove the enmity of men against God, but as that which procured their pardon on the part of God it did away with the enmity of God against men, and thereupon the cessation of the enmity of men towards God ensued as the moral consequent brought about by faith." But where do we find any assurance in the Bible that all men will exercise this faith in this life or in that beyond the grave?

The only other passage in which this verb *ἀποκατάλίσσω* (*ἀποκαταλλάξῃ*) is used is in Eph. ii. 16, where it is also implied that whilst all that is "objectively necessary that men might be at peace with God and with each other was effected by the death of Christ," this peace is obtainable only "by faith in him."¹ The simpler form *καταλλάσσω* is used with similar implication in Rom. v. 10 and 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20.

"Who will have (*θέλει*) all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). This verse is added to the exhortations to prayer in the preceding verses as an encouragement. It does not say directly that God wishes to *save* all (*σῶσαι*), but that all should *be saved* (*σωθῆναι*). It is only on this ground that prayer can be made "for all men." In 2 Pet. iii. 9 it is said *jects* included in *τὰ πάντα*, meant partly in an immediate sense (in reference to mankind), partly in a mediate sense (in reference to the *κρίσις* affected by man's sin, Rom. viii., and to the angelic world affected by its partial fall)."

¹ Lange's Comm.

that God is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," and thus avoid perdition. In the same connection (vs. 7) the apostle speaks of the "day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," implying of course that all will not be saved. It is a plain doctrine of the Bible that God would gladly recognize all as heirs of eternal life, but only in his pre-ordained way of repentance and faith, not by compulsion. If the apostle had intended to imply an authoritative *will* he probably would have employed *βούλομαι* and not *θέλω*, just as Homer uses the former when we might expect the latter in relation to the gods. The mere desire of God is here brought to view. The limitations of this desire and the results are left in the background, as dependent upon prayer and its answer.

ARTICLE IV.

EXEGESIS OF MATTHEW I. 1.

THE BOOK OF THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID, THE SON OF ABRAHAM.

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK, CLARIDON, OHIO.

THE opening of the first book of the New Testament strikingly corresponds with the earlier chapters of the first book of the Old. Each is a book of genesis, of origins. The one describes the origin of creation, the other of redemption. This leads us to consider the relation between these two great events.

The doctrine of creation does not arise from a mere observation of the world and the things in it, leading to the speculation as to whether they are self-originated, or have never originated, or whether they have sprung from the fiat of an omnipotent being. Men who have not the sense of God might speculate forever on these points without coming to any conclusion. And through whatever steps the religious consciousness, the consciousness of God, may have unfolded,