

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

1-1-1928

The Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament

William E. Meyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meyer, William E., "The Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament" (1928). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 579.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/579>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A thesis
presented to the faculty of
Concordia Seminary,
St. Louis, Missouri.

by

William E. Meyer

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree

of

Master of Sacred Theology.

School-term 1927-1928.

V
SPF

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I. Introduction.

The importance of the doctrine of the resurrection; it gives Christianity a purpose; Paul's opinion - I Cor. 15, II. Tim. 2, 16-18; human reason opposes it; it is peculiar to Christianity. A presentation of ancient eschatologies, e.g. Hindu, Zoroaster, Egyptian, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, and the Stoic. The early fathers opposed Celsus and Origen. Not only the New Testament but also the Old Testament contains this doctrine. Quotations from scholars upholding this contention - Ottley, Thomasius, Hofman. pg. 1 - 7.

II. Proofs from the Mosaic Writings.

Genesis 3, 15 ; its contextual background; a study of the Hebrew text; the opinion of the "typical school"; the identification of the woman's seed with the Messiah on the basis of Gen. 4, 1; the "enmity"; the bruising of the serpent's head; the deliverance from death to life eternal; quotations from Luther, Gerhard, Pieper, and Fairbairn pg 8-15.

Genesis 5, 24 ; Enoch's translation; quotations from Delitzsch and Luther. pg 15-17.

Genesis 5, 28; Noah; rest from labor; it points to a peaceful life not on earth but in heaven. . pg 17.18.

Genesis 12, 1-3; the blessing; in the seed; not temporal but eternal; so Abraham understood it; quotations from Luther and Hengstenberg pg. 18-20.

The patriarchs were gathered to their people in hope of a resurrection. pg 20.

II.

Genesis 22; Isaac's offering; Abraham had hope of a resurrection of his son; Hebrews 11, 17-19; quotations from Luther.....pg 21.

Exodus 3, 6; God calling himself the God of the fathers is proof of a resurrection; so Jesus interprets it Matt. 22, 31; Moses understood it as such; quotations from Weimar and Luther.....pg 21-25.

Luther finds the doctrine of the resurrection in the First Commandmentpg 25.

III. Proof from Job.

Job lived in the time of the patriarchs; the contextual setting of Job 19, 25-27; a study of the Hebrew text; a study of "min", "al", "basar", and "nakaf"; modern interpretation; this passage clearly teaches a resurrection; quotation from Kretschmann; the whole book is an appropriate setting, giving the reason why the Christian suffers willingly; opinions of the fathers and of Oehler and Delitzsch.....pg 25-37.

IV. Proof from the Psalms.

Psalm 16, 9; Christ's resurrection; basic for man's resurrection as voiced in Psalm 17, 15; refutation of Keil's opinion that this doctrine was based on logical inference; Luther to this passage.....pg 37-39.

Psalm 49, 15; the sons of Korah voiced the hope of a resurrection; the believers arise.....pg 39. 40.

V. Proof from the Prophets.

The Rationalists suppose that the Prophets borrowed this doctrine from the Parsees; Isaiah 25, 6-8;

III.

the feast in the Lord's mountain; the veil of death is taken away—hence a resurrectionpg 40-43.

Isaiah 26,19; Lange's comment; the dead shall live and the sleepers shall arise; the certainty emphasized; chapters 65 and 66 speak of the New Jerusalem...pg 43-47.

Ezekiel 37; the vision of bones; opinions of Pusey, Hengstenberg, Koenig; a study of the context; the dried bones are spiritual Israel and not temporal Israel; Gerhard to this passage.....pg 48-52.

Daniel 12,1: Many shall arise; evidence that many means all here.....pg 53.54.

Hosea 13,14; death lost its sting.....pg 54.55.

VI. Other corroborative proofs.

Proof from the analogy of faith; from the fact that the patriarchs called themselves pilgrims; from the eternity of God's grace.....pg 56.

VII. Conclusion.

This doctrine at the close of the Jewish economy.....pg 57.

Christ himself showed that the Old Testament teaches this doctrine.....pg 57.

Concluding remarks.....pg 58.59.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is fundamental to the Christian faith. It is so closely linked to all articles of our religion that if robbed from its setting our whole system of Christian doctrine would become a purposeless aimless jumble of strange notions. This doctrine permeates the whole Christian conception of the divine plan of salvation, supplying it with a purpose. What Dorner says of Israel that "it has the idea of teleology as a kind of a soul" applies to the Christian religion. The final purpose of every act of God is the salvation of mankind. But since death is the universal shepherd of mankind, death must be done away in order that the final purpose of God may be accomplished.

Solomon realized the importance of this doctrine when he wrote (Proverbs 29,18) "Where there is no vision men perish". But especially St. Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians, chapter fifteen, touches on the heart of this question and in a few masterful strokes shows how the denial of this truth annihilates Christianity. He writes among other things: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen. And if Christ is not risen, then is our preaching vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up if the dead rise not (v.13-15). Ye are yet in your sins (v.17). Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished (v.18). If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable (v.19)". What remains if the doctrine of the resurrection is denied? Christ's life a sham;

his death and resurrection fiction;our faith in such a Christ vanity;we Christians feeding on an empty hope; our preaching hypocrisy;God a liar;we the most miserable wretches fit to be the laughing stock of the whole world.

But thanks be to God:Christ arose and the resurrection of the body is a divine fact attested by living words not only in the New Testament -to which everybody must agree -but also in the Old Testament,which to many seems to contain merely indefinite and uncertain sayings concerning this fundamental doctrine of a bodily resurrection,which nevertheless teaches this doctrine in its divine record from the very gates of Paradise.

Paul likewise warns us to avoid those to whom this doctrine is merely a fable.He writes (II.Tim.2,16-18); "But shun profane and vain babblings;for they will increase unto more ungodliness.And their word will eat as doth a canker:of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus;who concerning the truth have erred saying that the resurrection is past already;and overthrow the faith of some",

Human reason is opposed to the idea of a resurrection.It seems to be foolishness to natural man. Acts 17,32 reads:"And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead some mocked".Festus thought that Paul was beside himself,that much learning hath made him mad, when he spoke of the resurrection(Acts 26,23-24). Reason will counter:How can people eaten or burned be regathered ?The world existed for so long a time and never has a dead person come to life; We may answer : The modern science of chemistry can show many natural

3.

miracles. Furthermore reason knows that there is a God and God's omnipotence demands that reason accept the possibility of a resurrection, even as it accepted the possibility of creating Adam and Eve out of the dust of the ground. Still rational objections will continue to arise and the reason for that is given II. Cor. 2, 14 : "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." Yes, and though reason deny the resurrection a thousand times, we bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (II. Cor. 10, 5) and base our knowledge of the bodily resurrection entirely and solely on the normative basis of all doctrine, on the Bible.

In order to see on how an exceedingly high ethical and spiritual plane the doctrine of the resurrection rests we need but compare it to the eschatology of man-made religions. The doctrine of the resurrection is peculiar to Christianity even as "salvation by grace" is the lone banner of Christianity opposing all religions of works. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is found in practically all religions - as Coleridge says, "its fibres are to be traced to the tap-root of humanity", but the doctrine of a life hereafter for the body is confined to that religion which alone is based on revelation - Christianity.

It might be of interest and tend toward giving us a human reason for the appreciation of the glory of the revealed word, to present a few ancient eschatologies. Hodge (Systematic Theology, III, 785) quoting Mr. Alger, says concerning the teleology of the Hindus :

"Their conception of the universe is an endless series of total growths, decays, and exact reproductions. In the beginning the Supreme Being is one and alone. He thinks to himself 'I will become many'. Then follows a multiform creation - generations flourish - then sink back into the universal source. The same cycle then reoccurs. The purpose of this religion is absorption into the Supreme Being. This may be attained prior to the end of the cycle by a process of complete self-abnegation. By that they attain to a state in which they are lost in the infinite as a drop of rain in the ocean. Now as individuals they can never be reproduced any more than the drops of rain can be recovered from the ocean. By evaporation other drops may form but not containing the very same atoms of the other drop". (Hence there is no analogy to the Christian (of the) resurrection)

According to Hodge the religion of Zoroaster approaches the biblical conception of the resurrection. He says (785ff):

"It teaches: Ormuzd created all things good, sinless, fitted for immortality. Then Ahriman, the personal principle of evil, came and effected the ruin of man for this world and the next. A conflict ensued between good and evil; good triumphed - hence a resurrection of the body, a new heaven and a new earth.

But Hodge's interpretation is not accepted today. Haug in his essays on the Parsees shows that this doctrine of the resurrection, claimed to be presented in the Zend books, rested on a mistranslation. (This is more fully discussed in the preliminary remarks to Isaiah's prophecies)

The Egyptians believed in the transmigration of the soul, namely that the soul in a destined cycle wandered through the bodies of every species of animals, till it returned to a human body; not to the one it had formerly occupied, but to a new one (Heeren, Egyptians, II - quoted by Shedd, D.T. II; 648).

Socrates in the "Phaedrus" and Marcus Aurelius in his "Meditations" believe in the immortality of the soul. The philosophy of the Stoics, similar to that of the Hindus, accepted an endless series of recurrent cycles. This idea of these enormous, revolving, identical cycles -

Day of Brahm, Cycle of the Stoics, the Great Year of Plato-- is a "physical fatalism, an eternal reproduction of sameness".

The early fathers maintained the doctrine of the resurrection against the skeptics, of whom Celsus was the leader. The Alexandrian school adopted a spiritual view of the resurrection. Origen maintained that the belief in the resurrection of the body was not absolutely essential to the profession of Christianity, provided the immortality of the soul were maintained. The leaven of the Alexandrian school is working today. Pusey states: No doctrine of the Christian faith is so vehemently and so obstinately opposed as the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh. He mentions as various opponents that arose during the whole Christian era: The Sadducees, Gnostics, Manicheans, Priscillianists, Cathari, Albigensians, Rationalists, Materialists, Pantheists, etc.

Against this formidable host of opponents the doctrine of the bodily resurrection stands unseathed because it is grounded in God's word. This doctrine is selfevidently found in the New Testament. But the Old Testament also --and that is the contention of this thesis-- teaches clearly and unequivocally this doctrine of the resurrection. Many modern commentators deny that it is an Old Testament doctrine, deny that Adam and Eve and the later patriarchs knew of a life hereafter in which body and soul should be united. Some assert that the Old Dispensation possessed merely expressions of a hazy indefinite longing for a new life, extracted logically from the more selfevident articles of religion which were theirs. Others see a development in the presentation of this

doctrine, being at first very dim and receiving a definite outline only under Isaiah and Daniel. The Old Testament, however, does teach this doctrine from the very beginning. That is its own contention and that is the contention of the New Testament, when St. Paul writes (Acts 26, 22): "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come; ... that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead."

Mention was made above of the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as found in the Old Testament. A few quotations of men upholding this fact (which Luther, Gerhard, Pieper, and nearly all the other orthodox theologians accept) may be presented.

Ottley, Aspects of the Old Testament, p. 55 :

"The Old Testament is to be studied in the first place as a record of the history of redemption. It contains the account of a continuous historical movement of which the originating cause was the grace of God, and the aim the "salvation of the human race".

Thomasius, III, p. 483:

"The hope of a resurrection of the whole man from death is found in the whole Old Testament. It is grounded in the promise Gen. 3, 15 and is continued in Gen. 22; Ps. 73, 23-26; Ps. 49, 16; Hosea 13; Ez. 37."

Hofman, Schriftbeweis. II, p. 461:

"Nothing can be more erroneous than the opinion that the resurrection of the dead is an idea developed through logical inferences whose first trace - if it did not come from the Parsees to the Jews - was found in Isaiah and Ezekiel. It will be evident that those passages, referred to in this connection, do not speak of the hope of the resurrection in the form of a dim premonition, but postulate a certain knowledge of this fact... No time can be imagined where faith can be thought of as void of the hope of a resurrection. This hope of a resurrection took root as soon as the first divine promise - after the sin of Adam and Eve - proclaimed the victory of mankind over its seducer. In this victory death is swallowed up".

The opinion of these three men is based on the direct testimony of the Old Testament. For a more systematic study the various passages attesting to this fundamental doctrine are grouped respectively under the categories of the "Mosaic Writings", "Job", "Psalms", and "Prophetical Writings".

Mosaic Writings.

The basic Scripture passage in the Mosaic Writings, on which the doctrine of the resurrection rests, is the Protevangel—Genesis 3, 15. Before the fall Adam and Eve were in Paradise living in intimate communion with God. They were immortal creatures, destined by virtue of their holiness to an eternal life in Eden. "For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2, 17)—not before that, else it had been an empty threat. The person of our first parents should live forever. Into this economy of an eternal life, which however was subject to man's free will, a mortal poison was injected by Satan, who in the guise of a serpent approached our first parents and caused their fall from God. In the cool of the evening God comes out and summons them to justice. But before he metes out the punishment which he had threatened (Gen. 2, 17) he curses the serpent (Gen. 3, 14). Our first parents now expected to hear the curse of death pronounced upon them. But before God put this punishment into force, here, right in the midst of the severest administration of the law—for by this one decree death passed upon all men (Rom. 5, 12)—suddenly, abruptly the purest ray of God's grace broke from the heart of eternal love and brought light and hope to that darkness of sin, brought an antidote to that poison of sin. The full threat of death (Gen. 2, 17) was never pronounced upon man. Before God had administered punishment

on Adam and Eve the burden of eternal death was shifted from the shoulders of mankind to the "seed of the woman". Never for one moment was Adam without hope in this world. So when God pronounced temporal ^{punishment} to Adam and Eve they were not crushed, since the dawn of a new hope was in their bosom, the hope of a future communion with God - not on this world - that was accursed.

The translation of the Hebrew text reads: "And enmity will I put between you and the woman and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise you on the head and you shall bruise him on the heel".

הַכָּזָב : continual hatred, enmity - not a sudden burst of passion. הַכָּזָב stands prominently at the beginning of this promise. הַיָּהוָה, Vulgate "she" ; LXX; ἡ ὄψις. Since it refers to הַיָּהוָה it must read "he". הַיָּהוָה : according to Psalm 139, 11 and Job 9, 17 it means to destroy, bruise. Some take it as snap, watch; but that meaning is too weak. The Vulgate translates it "contere". That the same word is also used for the destructive work of the serpent's seed is according to the trope "Zeugma",

The basic thought that runs through the whole passage is the enmity of the woman's seed with the serpent's seed. That fact already (according to Dr. Fuerbringer) that the woman should have a seed, children and children's children - is comforting. הַיָּהוָה is the general term for an offspring. Genes, 15, 3 reads : "And Abraham said, Behold to me thou hast given no seed". Gal. 3, 25 : "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed". The common agreement among commentators, especially among those of the rationalistic school, is that the general hatred of mankind to the snakes is foreshadowed here. The typical school interprets it as

the enmity between man and the devil. Christ is merely seen far in the background. But the language itself, the context, and the parallel passages all approve of the interpretation of the old Christian Church that the הַיְצִיט , the woman's seed is the Messiah. In the first place הַיְצִיט is singular and the first conception of a singular noun expresses individuality and not collectivity. The deciding factor, however, is the context. הוּא which refers to הַיְצִיט is singular; also the verb $\text{יָשַׁע$ refers to an individual. הוּא stands in opposition to אַתָּה , thou, the serpent. Eve thought that this prophecy was fulfilled at the birth of a single male child (Gen. 4, 1). So our first parents understood this as referring to an individual person. The parallelism of passages like Gen. 22, 18; Gen. 26, 4 strengthens the interpretation of the individuality of this seed.

It was mentioned above that the typical school rejects the interpretation that the Messiah is directly mentioned in this passage. Adam and Eve, however, understood this as referring to Christ. No mere man was competent to issue as victor in a battle with the devil, whom they recognized under the guise of a serpent. A mere animal was incapable of the actions and words of that "serpent of deception". Then we must credit our first parents with possessing knowledge and understanding such as no man since that time possessed. They knew God's will. Their natural knowledge of divine things was perfect. All this was not suddenly effaced by the fall. Even as at their fall they at once realized the full import of the curse of death, so at the promise their natural acumen of spiritual things served them in grasping the full meaning of the

"woman's seed" and his victory over Satan. God was also present and he saw to it that they understood the significance of this promise.

That Adam and Eve really identified the Messiah with the promised "woman's seed" is evident from Eve's words at the birth of her firstborn son. She exclaimed (Gen. 4, 1), "I have gotten the man, the Lord". The English Bible, in fact nearly all commentators translate $\aleph \text{ ה}$ as the preposition "with", "with the help,". Luther translates it correctly as nota accusativa. $\aleph \text{ ה}$ may have the secondary meaning "with" but it is primarily used as the sign of the accusative. So Delitzsch, Gesenius, gives its first meaning as the determining accusative. According to notes on the LXX - $\aleph \text{ ה}$ was first translated with $\sigma \upsilon \nu$ by Aquila and by the LXX itself. Following are the reasons for adopting Luther's view (according to Prof. Maier's notes). 1) A second accusative with $\aleph \text{ ה}$ that more clearly defines the first accusative is very common. Gen. 5, 10: "Noah begat three sons, $\aleph \text{ ה}$ Shem, Ham, and Japhet. 2) The impression that this was a second accusative was so strong that the Targum Jonathan interpreted "I have gotten a man, namely the angel of the Lord". That was the designation of the Messiah. 3) To render $\aleph \text{ ה}$ as "with, with the help of" is without parallel and analogy. 4) "I have received a man in cooperation with the Lord", an interpretation advanced by Briggs, is entirely foreign to every conception of the Old Testament and is contradicted by the first part of the Verse. 5) This interpretation is natural. The promise is still in their mind of a seed which should destroy the devil; when the first $\aleph \text{ ה}$ appeared they would think that this would be the

Handwritten notes in the left margin, including a signature and the number "719".

promised Redeemer. That she calls it Jehovah is not surprising. We have no reason to believe that the revelation to the first parents was restricted to Genesis 3,15. In addition we may add that Abel knew of a Messiah as his personal Redeemer, which knowledge he received of his parents. Hebrews 11,4 brings this witness: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous". The only faith that could have made Abel righteous was the faith in Christ Jesus. He is the only name of salvation. So Abel must have known of this Messiah.

A lifelong enmity should exist between this Messiah and the serpent. The great majority, except of course the rationalists who deny a personal principle of evil, accept the interpretation that the serpent is identical with the devil. A mere animal was not capable of speaking words, of practising deceit, of warring with the Messiah. A mere serpent is unmoral - strange indeed such an enmity with a woman who is a moral person. The devil alone can be meant by the serpent, this our first parents well knew. It needed no explanation. For us of course the New Testament gives ample evidence (John 8,44; Rom. 16,20; Apoc. 12,9; 20,2).

We see then in this first promise the two chief actors, Christ and Satan. Between them is enmity and hatred. God placed this hatred, not as a passing whim, but in view of the final outcome of the battle. Satan should be conquered and the Messiah emerge as victor. It was God's love and grace that prompted the placing of this enmity (John 3,16) which should finally redound to the salvation of man. The outcome of this enmity is told us:

שׁוֹרֵף הָאֵשׁ; הַיּוֹם ; הַיּוֹם refers to the woman's seed, to the Messiah. The Messiah shall bruise, smash the serpent with regard to the head. שׁוֹרֵף is an accusative of limitation. The enmity is mortal. After the battle is over one is forever defeated, killed. The picture is taken from life. A traveler meets a serpent. At the moment when the serpent wants to strike a mortal wound the traveler crushes her head and so kills her; the serpent was able to inflict only a slight wound. This wound is not mortal. If death would result to the traveler that would invalidate the victory. (From Messianic notes). So too the devil is crushed never again to raise his head. His power is broken by Christ. The wound that the devil was able to inflict on the Messiah was the suffering and death which, however intense, was brief. This ability of wounding the Lord was Satan's only because the Lord willingly assumed man's sins and the consequent punishment.

What comfort did this promise contain? It was promised the woman that enmity should exist between her and the serpent, the devil. She should not remain under the power of Satan, whose friend she had become by succumbing to his wiles. In that first promise she was snatched from his kingdom of sin and death and placed under the standard of him who should conquer Satan. If the devil had reason to rejoice at his success this was soon dispelled, immediately in the Protevangel. Eve was a believer; she was Satan's enemy. Her hope of deliverance was grounded by faith in her seed, the Messiah.

This hope was not a temporal hope. Labor, pain, and sorrow in this world was their punishment (Gen. 3, 16, 17). They bore that with resignation, not with despair, for the

full threat of death, of eternal damnation in hell with Satan was averted. God had not threatened temporal distress for sin, but death (Gen. 2, 17); not annihilation—that would have been a comfort. The real comfort of the promise lay in the fact that God had averted eternal death through him who in our stead emerged as victor.

That is the full import of the bruising of the serpent's head. Satan who brought sin and death into this world should be destroyed. His power with which he holds men in his kingdom of despair and death should be broken. Man had been created for immortality; then Satan came and imprisoned man in his kingdom of death. But the keeper of this prison was vanquished. To the victor belong the spoils. The captives were released from death to a life eternal—those that trusted in the Messiah. Adam and Eve of course saw temporal death. Abel was soon killed by his brother. But they did not confound this with eternal death. Then God would have betrayed his trust to them, for he had promised them relief from the power of the devil. They knew that they would live again, that after death there would be a resurrection of their bodies to an immortal life with God, similar to that of Paradise before the fall. That knowledge alone could comfort them. Anything short of a life similar to that in Eden would not have been a comfort to them.

This battle royal described in Genesis 3, 15 between Christ and Satan was all on account of the human race. God must have thought very highly of mankind to instigate a battle in their behalf. And certainly the warfare of such actors—God himself and Satan—must have far-reaching consequences, not merely temporal but eternal.

But since temporal death comes to all, as our first parents knew, they hoped with a certainty based on God's promise of the victory of the Messiah, that they would be resurrected from death, that their bodies and souls would enjoy eternal bliss with God. This promise was not merely for the immortality of the soul. God gave that promise to Adam and Eve, persons consisting of body and soul. So the comfort promised must also pertain to the whole person of Adam and Eve.

Luther is convinced that Adam and Eve knew of the resurrection of their bodies. He writes I, 233 :

"In this passage Moses no longer speaks of a natural snake, but of the devil whose head is death and sin, as Christ says, John 8, 44, that he is a murderer and a father of lies. Since his power is crushed, namely since sin and death are taken away in Christ, what else can follow but that we as God's children shall be saved. In this manner Adam and Eve understood this text, and they comforted themselves against sin and despair with the hope of the bruising of the serpent's head which Christ was to effect. In the hope of this promise they shall rise at judgment unto life eternal".

Again Luther says I, 242 :

"Even though their body had to die, still they lived in hope of a resurrection and eternal life, because of the prophecy that the Son of God should come and bruise the head of the snake".

To quote Luther once more:

"This promise was made to mankind and to each one individually. What comfort would it have been to know that sin was taken away unless some benefit should accrue to them from that fact? Their hope lay in this that they expected to live again, for sin is the cause of death and if sin is taken away death cannot remain. Adam's and Eve's sure hope that they would arise was as sure as ours is that we shall inherit heaven".

Gerhard in his "Locus" on the resurrection writes to Gen. 3, 15:

"Conterere enim caput serpentis est destruere opera diaboli (Joh, 3, 8) jam vero ad opera diaboli pertinet non solum peccatum, sed etiam peccati stipendium, videlicet mors, temporalis et aeterna (Rom. 6, 23) Quodsi ergo semen mulieris debet destruere caput

serpentis, utique debet destruere mortem (II.Tim.2,10)
 For to bruise the head of the serpent is to destroy the
 work of the devil. Now in truth not only sin but
 also the punishment of sin namely temporal and eter-
 nal death are reckoned to the works of the devil.
 Since therefore the woman's seed should destroy
 the head of the devil he by all means should destroy
 death".

Dr. Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatic*, III, 600 :

"Shall the seed of the woman crush the serpent's head,
 namely destroy the works and dominion of the devil,
 then through that act the destruction of death is
 promised, as surely as death is merely the result
 of sin which came into the world through the deception
 of the devil.

Fairbairn in *Typology of Scripture* remarks to Gen.3,15:

"The primeval promise that the seed of the woman should
 bruise the head of the serpent taught them to live
 in the expectation of time when death should be
 swallowed up in victory; for death being the fruit
 of the serpent's triumph what else could his com-
 plete overthrow be than the reversal of death -
 the resurrection from the dead "?

The great majority of critics will of course deny the
 truth of the above quotations. But taking the words just
 as they stand and in the light of their context, the
 only interpretation which is possible is that Adam and
 Eve are freed from the curse of sin and death through the
 victory of the woman's seed over the devil, resulting in
 a sure hope of a reunion with God after they have tasted
 temporal death here on earth.

The Protevangel was a comfort to Adam and Eve
 especially at the death of their son Abel. While Adam
 was still living God strengthened the hope of a resur-
 rection by a physical fact. Gen.5,24 reads : "And Enoch ...
 walked with God; and he was not; for God took him". אֵנוֹךְ
 he was not . God took Enoch to himself from the presence
 of man because Enoch walked with God. Enoch was a God-
 fearing man having faith in the promised woman's seed

and he lived his life in continual expectation of that day. The expression לֵבְיָהוָה יֵשֵׁב means to live the life of a sincere Christian. So Gen. 6, 9: "Noah was a just man and upright in his generations, and Noah walked with God." Ps. 128, 1: "Blessed is everyone that feareth the Lord; that walketh in his ways." The author of the epistle to the Hebrews comments on Enoch's translation (c. 11, 5): "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death."

Delitzsch answers the question "whither" thus: "To a closer nearness with God, with whom he had hitherto walked." Keil: Not in glorification is Christ the first-fruit according to I Cor. 15, 20. 23, but in the resurrection. Lange - Schaff: By a transformation, a clothing upon Enoch and Elijah were translated into everlasting life with God. Rationalists and some modern critics explain it as a temporary disappearance. But the fact remains that Enoch, his body and soul, were taken into heaven. That was a clear proof, startling and cooperative of Gen. 3, 15 that there was a life beyond death for bodies and souls. Men were to reach this heavenly abode by faith - Enoch in an unusual manner but the general mass of mankind through the gates of death. Because of his faith in the coming Messiah and in the resurrection to an eternal life Enoch was translated into life directly. His translation was a great comfort and a guarantee to his brethren that they too would attain to an eternal life, body and soul, through faith. They knew that temporal death could hold them for their brother Enoch was living with God.

Luther says to this passage (I, 426):

170

"The history of Enoch is important and worth remembering since through it God wished to make that hope of a better life in a world to come absolutely certain to those first people...For it was his purpose to give evident witness of the resurrection of the dead to all nations."

And Gerhard in answer to the question "for what purpose did God take Enoch to heaven" writes:

"Theodoretus, Augustine, and Tertullian say that this happened in order that to men the hope of an eternal life might be asserted and this by the translation of a complete man (totius hominis) into glory."

Enoch's translation strengthened the hope of the first people in a resurrection to a life eternal, the basis of which lies in the promise of the woman's seed and his victory over the devil.

That curse which God pronounced upon mankind - that curse of labor, sorrow, and pain in this present world - was never mitigated. The patriarchs felt it and saw the hopelessness of escaping from its dire consequences. Lamech brings witness to this effect. Sixty-nine years after Enoch was translated into heaven a son was born to Lamech. He called him Noah (נח), for he said: "This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord has cursed" (Gen. 9, 29). Lamech did not expect the work and toil of his hands to cease, for the Lord had cursed the ground and that curse should remain throughout time. God had spoken to Adam: "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life" (Gen. 3, 17). And in that curse Adam was representative of mankind. So Lamech knew that there was no temporal relief for him.

By faith, however, Lamech hoped for a comfort in this his toil. Life's outlook itself was dreary enough but it

assumed a brighter color when he thought of the dawn of a brighter day. He expressed this hope by calling his son "Noah" -comfort -echoing the hope of Eve when Cain was born. And like Eve his hope transcended time and captured eternity. Had Eve's hope been for her temporal welfare Lamech would have shunned to base his hope on that promise which on the basis of historical facts was never realized. But even as Eve had a sure hope of a personal comfort, which, however, never materialized on this world for her and which she knew belonged to her resurrection body, so Lamech also hoped for a personal comfort when the curse of the ground was lifted - after the end of the days of his life, in the country beyond. Keil says: Lamech did not merely feel the burden of labor on this ground cursed by God, but he also in prophetic anticipation felt that this present sorrow and toil would cease, that a change to the better would occur, that a salvation from this curse was sure to come. This anticipation he expressed at the birth of his son giving him the name Noah.

This undercurrent of the "resurrection of the body" was always present in the Hebrew consciousness. After the Deluge God made an everlasting covenant with Noah and his seed (Gen. 9, 8-13). This temporal blessing is the physical prerequisite of the blessing that Abraham received. In Gen. 12, 3 God first promise Abraham great temporal blessings: "I will make of thee a great nation"; then spiritual comfort is promised him, "I will bless thee". Finally this spiritual blessing shall be to all families on earth. The families on earth were scattered by the Lord himself when he came down and confounded the languages of the builders in

Babel (Gen.11,9).All these should be reunited in the blessing of Abraham.This was not possible in this present world but in the one to come.

The real question at issue here is "in what respect shall Abraham be a blessing?" בָּרַךְ, in thee shall the nations of the earth be blessed.But history shows that not all the nation of the world were blessed in Abraham. Parallel passages substitute בָּרַךְ אֶתְּךָ for בָּרַךְ (Gen.22,18). Also Gen.26,4;28,14.Abraham's seed should be a blessing.Again history shows that the Jews were not temporal benefactors to every nation.No בָּרַךְ, בָּרַךְ אֶתְּךָ is singular;one individual should be a blessing to Abraham and his seed.This individual was the Messiah.Abraham knew that from the similar expression in Gen.3,15. The woman's seed is identical with Abraham's seed (Parallelismus realis est argumentativus).

The woman's seed was not to bring temporal blessing,So also this seed of Abraham should bless all nation in a spiritual manner.The curse pronounced Gen.2,17 was "death as the wages of sin".The only blessing that this seed of Abraham could bring was the reversal of the curse of death,the blessing of eternal life.The hope of a life hereafter could alone give meaning to the blessing of Abraham.

But did Abraham really understand it as referring to the resurrection of the dead ?.That was the only possible interpretation to which the author of Hebrews testifies c.11,10:"For he(Abraham)looked for a city which had foundations,whose builder and maker is God".John writes c.8,56:"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,and he saw it and was glad".These two passages show that

Abraham understood this blessing as referring to his heavenly sojourn. Hengstenberg remarks to John 8,56:

"We are furnished by the book of Genesis with a right explanation of what is meant by the "day of Christ", which many have misinterpreted. It is not the time of the first appearing, but, in accordance with the New Testament mode of expression (Phil. 1,10) the time of his glorification. The "day of Christ" is the time when the promise, "in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" shall be fulfilled".

Certainly it is not stated in so many words that God shall raise the dead, but taking these words of blessing in the light of those facts that Abraham knew from previous promises and observation, no other interpretation is possible but that Abraham knew that his body would not remain in the grave. This blessing of a resurrection in Christ was also given to Isaac (Gen. 26,4) and to Jacob (Gen. 28,14).

Luther remarks to Genesis 12,1-3:

"He does not say that the heathen shall be made subject to Abraham's seed, but that they should be blessed, that is receive help and deliverance from death and sin."

The knowledge of the resurrection greatly influenced the conduct and habits of the Old Testament patriarchs. After their upright life the Scriptures say that "they were gathered to their people" (Gen. 25,8; 35,29; 49,33). Not eternal death or annihilation was their final fate, but simply a gathering to their people, to their fathers. This does not refer to the reunion of their bodies in a common burial place. Of Abraham it is said that he was gathered to his fathers. Still he was not buried in the grave of his believing predecessors, but in the cave of Machpelah which he purchased of the sons of Heth (Gen. 25,9.10). This gathering to his people was according

to the promise of the Lord, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace" (Gen. 15, 15). God spoke these words implying that his fathers in God's eyes existed; else how could he go to them and in peace? This "gathering" meant that he should be reunited personally with his fathers, beyond the grave, which is but a sleep in hope. David's comfort of himself as to his child (I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me, II Sam. 12, 23) implies the same belief of a personal reunion. The child was dead and buried. Still David with the surety of faith said that he as a person would go to his child, that the bonds of death could not forever hold their bodies.

That this hope was not a vague notion but a real assurance is evident from the history of Isaac's offering (Gen. 22, 1-15). Abraham had received the strange command from the Lord to offer his son Isaac, the bearer of the divine blessing, Gen. 17, 19: "And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him". Should this promise come to naught? The act of sacrificing his son would seem to imply that. Still Abraham obeyed because he knew - not vaguely - that God could and would restore Isaac to life. Hebrews 11, 17-19 gives us a divine comment on this sacrifice: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promise offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called; Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure".

Luther to Genesis 22. (I,1514):

"By this strange spectacle God wanted to show that death to him was mere child's play, and empty scare of the human race - merely a trial and a test. In the same manner a father playing with his son might take his apple from him, knowing that he will some day make his son his heir.... Thus Abraham believed and with such faith he overcame the terror of death, for he thought in his heart: My son Isaac, whom I am about to kill, is the father of promise and that promise cannot be broken; so my son must live eternally and be the heir; though he die now, still in reality he will not die, but will rise again".

Luther concludes (I.1518):

"Therefore let these two, Abraham and Isaac, be an example to us of this article of the resurrection, which (as he stated shortly before) is found in the whole Old Testament".

After the decease of the patriarchs a great prophet arose - Moses. Relevant to this discussion he received proof direct that there was a resurrection of the body. Exodus 3,6 God speaks: "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Basic to this argument is the "God is" the God of," etc. The Hebrew Bible omits the mention of any particle: $\text{אֲנִי הוּא אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב}$; Matth. 22,31.32; Mark 12,26; Luke 20,37; and Acts 7,32 comment on this passage: $\text{Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ}$. Mark omits the particle εἰμί ; so does Luke and St. Paul. It is not justified to translate "God was the God of thy fathers. The absence of the particle denotes present time. Should past time have been denoted then $\text{אֲנִי הָיִיתִי הוּא}$ would have been used. I "am" the God of thy fathers is the only and the selfevident interpretation which is divinely sanctioned by Matthew. So Christ also interprets it in his argument with the Sadducees.

When Jehovah spoke these words to Moses at the burning bush Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were sleeping in the cave of Machpelah. They had long been dead and their bodies were decayed. But God had not forgotten them. At the burning bush where God emphasizes his unchangeableness he likewise identifies himself as the God of the fathers. Was that a comfort, an encouragement to Moses? Would that create a willingness to serve God if these men were really dead eternally? Would not Moses be inclined to flee from such a God? But Moses understood God. He knew that the people of such a God, though now in their graves, would not remain there forever but would arise. The Living God (Swete says) cannot be in relation with any who have ceased to exist. Pusey: God took no transient care of those who were his; He, the Unchangeable, could not be named from his relation to something so fleeting as man's visible existence here. He, the All-Good, did not enter into a relation to his creatures, only, of his own accord, Himself unforsaken, to and it. Therefore in the fact of the life of Abraham was involved not only a continuance of life after death, but a resurrection from the dead.

That this interpretation is not arbitrary but Scriptural is evident from the New Testament where Christ quotes Gen. 3, 6 as a proof of the resurrection. All three synoptic evangelists give us Christ's refutation of the Sadducees who deny the resurrection of the body (Matth. 22, 31. 32; Mark 12, 26; Luke 20, 37). The Sadducees tempted Jesus with the story of the one woman who outlived seven husbands. They asked the hypocritical question: "Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?" Jesus answers that question and then comes to real point at issue,

the resurrection of the dead. Jesus could simply have said that there was a resurrection of the dead. But the Sadducees denied his divine sonship. Furthermore, the Jewish Church was built on the Old Testament canon. From their own sacred Scriptures Christ wanted to convince them that they erred in denying the resurrection of the dead. Jesus says: "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living." Christ quotes a definite passage and tells the Sadducees that it teaches unmistakably the doctrine of the resurrection. The Sadducees were rationalists and interpreted this passage (Exodus 3,6) in the light of their own reason. Ayles, p.440 also denies that this proves a bodily resurrection. He finds merely immortality of the soul in it. But Christ proved the doctrine of the resurrection from this passage. Christ tells the Sadducees point-blank that they know ^{not} the Scriptures. If the Sadducees could not have read that from Ex.3,6 then Jesus would not have been justified in his criticism. The fact that the other sects believed in the resurrection shows that it was not hidden. On the basis of Christ's interpretation "God, calling himself a God of the fathers" is a divine Old Testament proof of the resurrection.

Moses understood the meaning of God's words. Those words of Jehovah taught him that as clearly as it was believed by the faithful at the time of Christ. That witness Jesus himself gives us. He somewhat changes the wording of Ex.3,6 (and that is his divine privilege) and speaks in Luke c.20,37: "Now that the dead are raised

20.

even Moses showed at the bush when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob - *καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐμνήσθη ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας, ὡς λέγει Κύριος τὸν Θεὸν κεῖ.* According to Ex.3,6 God really spoke these words. Now the Holy Spirit quotes Jesus as saying that Moses showed the resurrection of the dead by calling God the God of his father. So Moses as Jesus witnesses understood this passage as teaching the resurrection of the dead.

The Weimar Bible says:

"I made a covenant of grace with your forefathers, the holy patriarchs, and I promised them that I would be your God, that I would support and protect (you) them sanctify and renew them, impart every good thing unto them, raise them from the dead, and take them into eternal life."

Luther writes to Ex.3,6 (III,731):

"If he is the God of Abraham, Abraham must live; is he the God of Jacob, then Jacob must live. Hence we must believe that everything, that is called Abraham, his soul and body, which Sarah had as a spouse, that this one person remains. Accordingly the man Isaac also must live. These words are important, showing that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall live and rise again, not alone the body but body and soul."

Christ's interpretation lets in a flood of light on the Old Testament. Wherever God is called "thy God", "David's God", "Israel's God" the same truth of a resurrection is taught as Luther explains. Referring to the first commandment as representative of passages of like nature, he writes (I:1517):

"The first commandment contains the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and of faith, for God says: I, the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth, am thy God. That means you shall live in the life in which I live. If God had spoken this to the oxen they too would live eternally. This, however, is told us - and not: you shall eat grass and hay. What he tells us that he is our God means that he will save us from all evil and sorrow, from sin, hell, and death. You will find Christ in the first commandment - also life, victory over death, and the resurrection of the dead unto life eternal."

Throughout the Mosaic writings the doctrine of the resurrection is taught and believed. The Protevangel as the basic passage has as corroborating evidence Enoch's translation; The blessing of the patriarchs "seeing the Day of the Lord"; The burial with the fathers; The sacrifice of Isaac, witnessed by the New Testament as an example of Abraham's hope of the resurrection; The words of God to Moses at the burning bush fundamental in Christ's refutation of the Sadducean error that there is no resurrection of the dead; The New Testament, as we have seen, verifies the fact that the doctrine of the resurrection was known by the patriarchs.

B. JOB

The patriarchs had received the promise of a Savior and of a life hereafter. This knowledge was transplanted to the following generations by word, and since Moses, by his written report. God added to this promise of a Savior already during the time of the patriarchs— Balaam's prophecy, Numbers 24. Later more information was added by God: II Sam. 7 —David's seed as builder of a spiritual house; II Sam. 23 —The last words of David. David's son Solomon became famed not only as a wise ruler, but also as a literary man, especially in the field of proverbial sayings. To this time of Solomon the Book of Job dates. Luther considers Solomon as the author of this book. But the main character of this book lived much earlier, possibly in the time of the patriarchs. In this book we read the words of Job expressing a lively faith in the Redeemer and in the resurrection of the body.

Job was an upright man. He had large possessions. But God suffered the devil to rob him of his possessions, of his sons and daughters, and of his health. It was a sore trial to which the "believer" was subjected. His friends came to comfort him, but small comfort they brought for they accused God of injustice, pointing to the fact that he, a believer, had to suffer while the sinners seemingly were favored in this life. Sometimes Job's patience was taxed to the limit (c. 38, 2; 40, 2.8) but he defends the justice of God. In the darkest hour of trial when his body is filled with sores, when his bone cleaveth to his skin (c. 19, 20. 21); when his wife and his friends have forsaken him (v. 13-19); when he feels as though God himself had forgotten him (v. 6. 22) - in that hour of severest afflictions when the enmity of nature, of friends, and of God reaches its climax - from that depth of misery he rises to the greatest height of faith (v. 25. 27).

The words that he is about to speak are divine words and he is conscious of their great importance. He says v. 23. 24: "Oh that my words were now written. Oh that they were now printed in a book. That they were graven with an iron pen and lead into the rock forever". Job had been defending his innocence; but he despaired of success. All hope for a temporal restoration to fame and character had vanished. So he turns with his little spark of faith to his Redeemer and this spark becomes a divine fire within him. He says v. 25: "But I know, my Redeemer lives". ⁷ 7 1 but I know. Lange takes this 7 as consecutive, and; he understands it to mean that the living Redeemer will see to it that the foregoing wish is fulfilled. The King

James Version translates :For I know.This interpretation would consider Job's wish of v.23 and 24 as already fulfilled.The words of his wish he sees as already inscribed, but that could hardly refer to v.25 - 27,since they had not as yet been spoken.And to refer his wish to previous words which he saw as inscribed would certainly minimize the importance of v.25 - 27.So we translate with "but". Then v.25 - 27 stand as the counterpart to v.1 -22;My wife and friends despise me,my fame is gone,the world considers me a great sinner,doomed to severe punishment and death. But,nevertheless,I know etc.Luther translates "aber". The LXX has $\gamma\alpha\rho$;the Vulgate "enim".

But I know, אֲנִי יָדָע the first person is emphasized throughout. אֲנִי יָדָע itself is the first person.But God mentions expressly אֲנִי יָדָע .Job,himself, the sufferer both according to body and soul is meant. He puts himself in apposition to his friends.Job says $\text{אֲנִי יָדָע אֲנִי יָדָע}$: אֲנִי יָדָע ,to know with the certainty of faith ;a nosse cum affectu et effectu.Ordinarily a $\text{וְ$ would be placed after אֲנִי יָדָע ;I know that my Redeemer lives (c.9,2; 9,28;13,18)But it is also followed by direct speech as in c.30,23 :I know (that)Thou wilt bring me to death. So Job here says,"I know my Redeemer lives".

אֲנִי יָדָע - אֲנִי יָדָע from אֲנִי יָדָע ransom,redeem. A אֲנִי יָדָע was one whose duty it was to redeem property (Lev.25,25;Jer.32,6 -15;Ruth 4,1-6 ;Or to redeem a kinsman if sold into slavery (Lev.25,48.29);it is also used in the sense of "avenger,vindicator" (Num.35,12; Deut 19,16).The Herxheimer Bible gives as its meaning "the future generations,those that shall arise from the

dust in the future". But even the Critical Commentary finds something superhuman in גֹּאֲלִי .

גֹּאֲלִי is used of God as redeeming men. Is. 59, 20 (speaking of sins, he says): "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion". Ex. 13, 15: "In thy mercy hast thou led out the people whom thou hast redeemed". Other references are Hosea 13, 14 and Psalm 19, 14. Job knew concerning this God as a גֹּאֲלִי since he lived in the land of the patriarchs. He knew of the God of Israel as we see from the whole book.

This גֹּאֲלִי was mentioned in the Messianic hope of the patriarchs. Gen. 48, 15, 16: "The angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads". This angel of the Lord is the second person in distinction from the Father. In Mal. 3, 1 it is said that the way shall be prepared for the messenger of the covenant (Jesus). Jacob in the above blessing also thinks of the coming Messiah on the basis of the previous promises (Gen. 3, 15; 12, 1-3). Likewise Job thinks of the coming Redeemer, of this Messiah. Job's Redeemer is in heaven. Job 19, 16. 19: "my witness is in heaven. Elihu also speaks of a Mediator between God and man (Job 33, 23).

Job knows that he will die but his Redeemer lives (וְיָחִי), is living, is alive. The LXX reads: He that is to release me is eternal. He calls him גֹּאֲלִי , my Redeemer. This shows a close personal relation between Job and the Redeemer. It shows Job's faith in the Messiah. Others might ^{forsake} him but not his Redeemer. "Though I die he will be my life". Job's comfort reaches beyond the grave. This fact of a future life is brought out in v. 26.

Th^s Redeemer" shall stand at last upon the grave".

Luther: He shall later raise me from the dead. Luther followed the Vulgate " et in novissimo die de terra resurrecturus sum".

The γ is simply consecutive. $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$, $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ has the meaning of latter, last (in the adverbial sense). It is seldom used as a substantive. So we translate: And at last, in the end of days, on the day (Neh. 8, 18) he shall stand, $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ (not-shall raise, as Luther - then $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ would be demanded). He shall stand upon the dust $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$.

$\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ in its first meaning is local; up, upon. $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ means dust, earth. The omission of the article speaks for indefinite earth, dust. Th^s dust referred to is the $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$, dust of the grave, of death. So Job usually considers $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ in this sense: c. 7, 21: For now I shall sleep in the dust. c. 21, 26: They shall lie down alike in the dust, and the worms shall cover them. Likewise c. 20, 11; 17, 6. So $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ means the dust left by his decayed body. The Redeemer shall stand at last upon this death dust. The comfort that Job finds in these words is that the Redeemer will take this dust from the grave, will make it alive.

Some interpreters translate $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$; in the grave, and thus referring this to Christ's resurrection in the grave. But Job is speaking about his own hope and assurance. Others translate: He shall rise against the dust. Weimar Bible: And at the last he shall proceed inimically against the grave. But that would be putting a strained meaning into the Hebrew words. $\gamma\text{אָרְיָרִיךְ}$ would not be taken in its first meaning of "upon"; and the idea of "enmity" would have to be brought in. The more textual and satisfactory translation is: He shall stand at last

upon the death dust.

That was a comfort to Job. He sees the Redeemer standing upon his dust; the Redeemer has not forgotten him. A קָדוֹשׁ does not merely stand, but he is active, he ransoms. So when Job sees his personal Redeemer standing upon his dust, he knows that his dust will be redeemed, ransomed from the grave. The picture is: A grave; Job's dust is in it; above it stands the Messiah, the Goel. Something wonderful is to happen; the dust shall become flesh and eyes (v. 26, 27). He the resurrected Job shall see God.

Kretschmann says to v. 25 (Lutheran Quart. Review, 1906, page 510):

"In verse 25 we see the triumph of faith over sense. The evidence pointed to the fact that he had no Goel, since his friends turned away from him; but he had a Goel who was then not apparent to their senses. Into that future into which he was going, his Goel would arise and would manifest himself upon earth in his behalf."

Some commentators despair of translating verse 26. They say that the text is too corrupt. King James translates: And though after my skin worms destroy this body (inserting three words). Luther: I shall then be surrounded with this my skin. Following Dr. Fuerbringer's notes we translate; Behind (Nach, hinter) my skin.

אַחַר has three meanings; a) It is used adverbially meaning -afterwards; b) as a conjunction -after, when; c) as a preposition, after, behind. In this case it is hardly used adverbially - then as a rule the verb follows immediately. If it is to be used as a conjunction then אַחַרְכֵּן follows or else the verb immediately. So it is best to take it as a preposition; behind, in back of.

Then this word הִתְחַוֵּה stands parallel to הָלַךְ in the second statement.

After, behind my skin $\text{אֲחֵרֵי עוֹרִי} - \text{הִתְחַוֵּהוּ} ; \text{וְנִסְּוּ}$ a) to surround, b) to cut down. smitz to pieces, destroy. The first meaning "surround" is found c. 19, 6. The advocates of that meaning prove it from a number of Hiphil passages (Job 1, 5; Ps, 22, 17; I Kings 7, 24) But only once is the word found in the Kal (Is. 21, 1 - $\text{וְהָיָה הַחֲגֻלִים} \text{ let the festivals go round}$). But it ^{is} never found in the Piel in the meaning of "surround". That alone would make it somewhat irregular in v. 26. Jerome translates it with "circumdare". The above discussion would at least go to show that that meaning would be strange, namely to translate וְנִסְּוּ with "surround". Then that would hardly fit into the meaning since his body is still surrounded.

The other meaning of הִתְחַוֵּה is to cut down, to smitz in pieces, to destroy, tear in shreds. Is. 10, 34 : "Cut down the thickets, (Destroy)". This meaning fits better into the whole passage. So Job says : and from behind (after) my skin $\text{אֲחֵרֵי עוֹרִי} - \text{הִתְחַוֵּהוּ}$. Job is here speaking in such an elevated strain that he becomes short, concise, uttering exclamations. He gives only the most necessary words to form a train of thought. So we could translate: and from behind my skin, they destroy thus. There can be no mistake as to the meaning of that sentence. Our mind supplies that one word "which", making the $\text{אֲחֵרֵי עוֹרִי} - \text{הִתְחַוֵּהוּ}$ a relative sentence. Then it reads: and from behind my skin which they destroy thus. The English language is full of such parallels: The house he built was ruined; He came from the city we left yesterday

הִתְחַוֵּהוּ is the third person plural. Here in our passage it is best to take it impersonally to express

an indefinite subject (Gen.34,27).See Kautzsch 144,g.In such a case the third plural comes to be equivalent to a passive. Job 7,3:Wearisome nights, לָיְלָיִם , have they allotted to me -- this is equivalent to "were allotted to me".

כִּי can be taken as a demonstrative pronoun "THIS". But as such it is not in harmony with $\text{וְעַל$; כִּי being feminine and וְעַל masculine... כִּי has also an adverbial meaning referring to a) the place (Gen.28,17 ,This here is the house of God;cf Num 13,17;Zech.5,4.3;Ps.104,25); b) to time (I Kings 17,24 $\text{עַתָּה יָדַעְתִּי כִּי אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה אַתָּה$:Now I Know it - $\text{וְעַל$;Ruth 2,7);It is used for emphasis especially in questions (I Kings 21,5;Canticles 3,6) The adverbial meaning fits our place. כִּי emphasizes the verb to which it is closely connected by Makkeph. כִּי is an emphatic adverb and embodies dimly the idea of time and place;hence it points to a condition.So we translate "and from behind my skin which has been thus destroyed. This refers to the death dust,to the state of decay to which his body is subject (v.25).His Body is decayed (v.26);still Job speaks as though he existed body and soul; and this death dust and this decayed body he calls his own, וְעַל .

To this Job adds $\text{וְעַל$.The ו is simply consecutive introducing a parallel to וְעַל .Much has been written about this preposition ו . ו itself may have a partitive meaning,expressing the substance of which something is composed .Cant.3,9:"King Solomon made himself a chariot of wood."It is also used in the phrase,"the God of my flesh".

Most modern commentators translate ו in the sense of separation,privation -"apart from my flesh,"

So Job 21,19, "Their houses are safe from fear"; Job 11,15; "For then shalt thou lift up thy face without fear". So they find in our passage merely the immortality of the soul. They say Paul's phrase (II Cor.12,3.2) concerning his revelation "Whether in the body, or whether out of the body" would approach the significance of the word "without my flesh". But Paul speaks of the separation of the soul in its relation to the body. No such relation is indicated in וְגַם בְּשָׂרִי . The partitive interpretation is against the first meaning of מִן , and against the context, both narrow and wide.

מִן can also be taken locally :out of, from out of. The first meaning of a preposition is always the local meaning. מִן here evidently expresses the place, that is the source from which satisfaction was to be derived. The same phrase וְגַם בְּשָׂרִי occurs in v.22; "and are not satisfied with my flesh". Both the partitive and the privative meaning are out of the question here. The מִן here is used to express the source of satisfaction for his enemies. With this same flesh which is being tormented he shall see God. Verse 27 emphasizes that fact that he shall see God with his eyes, with his physical eyes set in his flesh.

The flesh בְּשָׂרִי is his body; not the body of sin, but simply the physical body which was subject to corruption. It was the body that was being tormented by sickness. It is thus used in v.20: "My bone cleaveth to my skin and to my flesh". So in v.26: וְגַם בְּשָׂרִי and בְּשָׂרִי are synonymous terms for the fleshly body. From out of this fleshly body he shall see God. After his body has become death dust and after his skin has been destroyed. with this very

same flesh and skin he shall see God. Job certainly speaks of the resurrection of the body. So the Vulgate translates: "In my flesh I shall see my God". The Syriac, Lxx, Luther, Standard French (de ma chair), Authorized, Coverdale, Geneva translate this passage so that they advocate the resurrection of the dead. Some modern versions (The American Baptist Publication Society, 1912, and the Jewish translation of 1917) translate "without my flesh".

This view, of accepting "out of my flesh", is corroborated by verse 27: Whom I shall see for myself and my eyes shall behold and not a stranger. וְיֵרָא Job himself shall see him, God. וְיֵרָא may mean "seeing visions", a supernatural seeing such as was given to Balaam (Num. 24). But this seeing comes out of his own flesh, from the eyes of Job. His bodily eyes shall see God in heaven. This refers to the beatific vision of God. His resurrected flesh shall see him " וְיֵרָא " for myself. וְיֵרָא with the suffix is used as marking the person or thing to or for whose advantage or profit something is done or serves (Dativus Commodi or Ethicus).

וְיֵרָא ; and my eyes, which demand a body, וְיֵרָא shall see. This וְיֵרָא is the prophetic perfect. Three times Job mentions that he shall see God: for himself, out of his flesh, with his eyes. There is only one interpretation possible: After his body is decayed the very same body which was despised on earth shall arise and see God.

Finally Job says וְיֵרָא -and no stranger. The Vulgate and the LXX translate, "et non alius",

καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος ; stranger does not refer to God. There is no possibility of being mistaken as to the object of his seeing. וְיֵרָא still more emphasizes וְיֵרָא , which has

been emphasized throughout the whole section. Job and not as stranger, not a different body from the one he possessed here on earth, shall see. For this seeing of God he longs with his inward affections.

The whole book of Job is an appropriate setting for this priceless jewel of c.19,25.26.c.1-3 shows the tragic experiences of a child of God under sore trials; c.4-28 his afflictions and integrity ;arguments from his friends;c.29-31.Job's defense of his righteousness; c.32-41 God sets forth his omnipotence over against the insignificance of man;c.42 Job's humiliation and submission to God;his restoration.Job is brought close to the grave;yet he is confident that he will see his Redeemer (Job 13,15.16;"Though he slay me,yet will I trust him;he also shall be my salvation.Within the book Elihu exhibits very plainly the destruction of the body c.33,21: " His flesh is consumed away,that it cannot be seen",and his bones that were not seen stick out(v.22;34,;5).He also states the principle underlying the resurrection c.33,23-26 ;the Interpreter,Redeemer,shall be gracious, shall ransom him,shall make his flesh fresh,so that he shall see his face with joy.Therc can be no doubt, if we accept the verbal inspiration of the Bible,that Job very emphatically speaks of the resurrection of the body, which as we have seen was also taught in the Mosaic Writings.

The following fathers testify to this interpretation: Clemens Romanus,Justin,Cyprian,Ruffinus,Hieronymus, Augustine,Gregory,Cassiodorus,and the Targums.Modern interpreters not on grammatical grounds,but on the basis of subjective exegesis,deny that the resurrection is

taught here. Delitzsch says that at that time there was no distinct hope of a resurrection of the dead. Likewise Oehler: "The hope which here flashes for a moment like lightning through the darkness of temptation is as yet not mature faith in a happy and eternal life after death and consequently does not furnish a solution to the enigmas which this book tries to solve". These statements cannot be upheld in the light of a textual interpretation of Job 19, 25-27; of what has been said regarding the Mosaic writings; and of what is still to be said concerning the Psalms and the prophets. We cannot close this section more fittingly than with Job's words: "I, yes, I know that my Redeemer lives; and at the last day he shall stand upon the dust of death. And from behind my skin which has been destroyed thus and from out of my flesh I shall see God; whom I shall see for myself and my eyes shall behold and not a stranger".

C. Psalms.

This knowledge of the resurrection, taught and believed by the patriarchs, was incorporated in the Psalms by divine inspiration. In Psalm 16, which is Messianic, the Messiah shows his hope of a resurrection from the grave; v. 9: "Therefore my heart is glad and my glory rejoices; my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption". David voices the hope that the Messiah had of a resurrection; and in whatsoever Christ was victorious David knew that he would follow his Mediator. This Psalm is basic for David's hope of a personal resurrection, as his words Ps. 17, 15 show: "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness". Keil says to this

passage: "To regard the beholding of God's face as an experience of the efficacy of grace, which comes from him who was returned to man because of Christ's work, is not sufficient. The parallel demands a real seeing as in Num. 12, 8; Ex. 30, 20. Here where David speaks of his hope, which is the last purpose, the culmination of every hope of his, no one has the right to limit this "beholding of God". So not awakening from our natural sleep, neither awakening to a new spiritual life is meant - but it must mean "awakening from the sleep of death". Keil denies Hofman's statement that a certain knowledge of the resurrection was found from the very beginning. Keil says that the knowledge of the resurrection entered the consciousness of the Jews at the time of the exile, but that prior to that time faith indeed dared to hope for a resurrection from the dead, but lacked a definite word of promise. So he claims that this statement Ps. 17, 15 teaches a resurrection merely as a logical conclusion. Delitzsch agrees with Keil. He calls this a bold demand of faith and a hope that has struggled forth to freedom out of the comfortless conception of Sheol possessed on that age. He also denies that there was an express word of promise in its favor.

It was shown that the doctrine of the resurrection was known from Paradise. Furthermore this doctrine cannot be a logical demand of faith. Faith is a creature of the Holy Ghost wrought through God's word. For everything that true faith possesses in its consciousness there must be a counterpart in Scripture. Not by reasoning or by logical inference can the contents of faith be increased. The only source is Scripture (I Cor. 2, 6). The Christian doctrine is not systematic in the sense that, given a few

cardinal doctrines, reason will supplement the rest. Every individual doctrine has its source only in Scripture. Now David had a knowledge of the resurrection, as Keil and Delitzsch agree. But David did not have this knowledge on the basis of Reasoning. God's word was a lamp unto his feet and a light unto his path. David could only have knowledge of the resurrection on the basis of revelation.

That the resurrection is referred to is seen from the comparison: David prays for deliverance from his enemies. They have their portion in this life. David was vexed by his enemies in this life. He comforts himself with fact that he shall be satisfied when he awakes in the likeness of the Lord.

Luther says to Ps. 17, 15 (IV, 1037):
"Those that are carnal minded are satisfied with the things of their children, and have their portion in this life. But to me this life is worthless; I hasten to the future life where I shall see God face to face in righteousness and where I shall not be distracted by the riches of this world.... The word he uses for the resurrection gives it a beautiful sense: When I "awake" from the sleep of the death".

The Sons of Korah likewise voiced their hope of a resurrection in Ps. 49, 15: "But God shall Redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me". This whole Psalm shows the final fate of the dead. The author in v. 5 shows that he has no reason to fear the days of evil. The ungodly, though they have riches, cannot ransom the soul of their brother that he should ^{live} forever and not see corruption. Therefore he has reason to fear. But they are not worried since they think that their houses shall continue forever, and that there is no future retribution. Nevertheless, the Psalmist says, both shall die, the godly and the ungodly. In that respect both are alike. Verse 14 "Like sheep they are laid in their graves (שִׁחַדוֹת). All people are assembled in a great fold

in Hades, the realm of death for the righteous and sinners.

27 ¹⁴ ~~18~~ ₇, death shall shepherd them; not the good shepherd (Ps. 23; Jer. 23) whose plains are those of the living. Death here is personified as in Job 18,4: "His confidence shall be rooted out of his tabernacle and it shall bring him to the King of Terrors". But this night of death and terror shall not last forever, A morning breaks not only for the righteous but also for the wicked. The fate of the upright is described as ruling over the wicked when the morning of life comes after the night of death. This description is similar to that of Mal. 4,3: "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts. The fate of the wicked after this resurrection morn is also described; Their strength shall be consumed by the grave which is an habitation for every one of them.

This should make the wicked tremble. The godly, however, rejoice; v. 16: "But God will redeem my soul from the hand of Sheol". While the wicked return to everlasting punishment, God will take the soul of the righteous - his soul meaning his person - from Sheol. On that resurrection morn the power of Death will be broken and the upright will live with God: "for he shall take me" to himself even as he took Enoch (Gen. 5, 24). Psalm 73, 24: "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel and afterward receive me to glory".

These passages show that the doctrine of the resurrection, based on Christ's Resurrection (Psalm 16), was present to the Hebrew consciousness of faith at the time of the writing of the Psalms during the reign of David and Solomon. After the division of the kingdom God instituted the profession

of the "prophets". To this last order of his Old Testament witnesses God also gave revelation of the resurrection. Four prophets are considered here - Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Hosea.

D. The Prophets.

Rhode and some rationalists claim that Isaiah and Daniel borrowed their doctrine of the resurrection from the Parsees. But Haug in his essays on the Parsees shows that the doctrine of the resurrection, claimed to be presented in the Zend books rested on a mistranslation. According to Pusey not even the germ of this doctrine can be found in these Hindu writings. He says: Granting the utmost which can be meant by this passage (which some claim contain the resurrection), it contains manifestly no doctrine whatever of the resurrection.

Isaiah, the evangelist of the Old Testament, testifies to the resurrection in c. 25, 6-8. This whole chapter is a hymn of praise to God for his judgments against the oppressors and the terrible ones (v. 2.5) so that the strong people shall glorify him (v. 3): The Lord also strengthened the poor and succoured the needy. But not only for temporal blessings does Isaiah praise God in this chapter - he especially emphasizes the spiritual gifts. These spiritual gifts he describes in picturesque language. Verse 6: The Lord of hosts shall prepare a feast of spiritual things in this mountain, which is Mount Zion, the mountain of the Lord, the house of the God of Jacob (Is. 2, 2.3). It is the church of the believers to which all nations shall flow. This body of God's people possesses the oracles of God, the word of the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. These are the precious foods which Isaiah calls "a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of

marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. Then one special blessing is singled out which shows the purpose of this feast (v.6.7)

"And he will swallow up in this mountain the face of the covering covered over all nations" (v.7). יִשְׁׁוֹטֵם Kal, swallow. Prov. 1, 13: "Let us swallow them up alive as the grave". Here the Piel -emphatic -swallow, devour; with the accusative: to destroy utterly, to waste completely, to take away. He shall take away, demolish in this mountain the face of the covering, סִוִּי -vail, covering. Is. 62, 2: "Behold darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people". Sin and consequently death hangs like a vail over all people. There is only one place where this can be taken away, swallowed, and that is in the mountain where God has prepared his feast of spiritual foods. Parallel to סִוִּי is the second part of v.7. הַכֶּסֶת הַזֶּה -covering, clothing (Isaiah 23, 18). This is also the object of יִשְׁׁוֹטֵם . This covering of sin and death is universal - "over all nations and all people". This vail shall be done away in the mountain of the Lord's house.

Verse 8! "He will swallow up death in victory!" מָוֶת יִשְׁׁוֹטֵם : death opposed to life. Prov. 11, 19: "As righteousness tendeth to life; so he that pursueth evil pursueth it to his own death. The article $\text{הַ$ makes מָוֶת יִשְׁׁוֹטֵם definite, refers it to the covering cast over all people (v.7). Death is personified here as in Psalm 49, 14: "Death shall shepherd them". Likewise in Job 18, 4 death is called the King of Terrors. This Death he, God will destroy, consume. If Death is defeated then those that were held in his thralldom will be released, restored to life. So Psalm 49 emphasized the release of the godly from the fold of death, from the hand of Sheol,

to a new life. Hosea 13,14 also parallels this passage:

"I will ransom thee from the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy victory!" That was the consummation for which the faithful of the Old Testament hoped. Death came through the fall (Gen. 2,17); but this death shall be swallowed up, shall be taken utterly away in the Messiah, This meant a restoration to the condition in which man was prior to the fall, and that condition was "immortality of the body and soul in the presence of God". Isaiah hoped for this release from death. Then in that new life the same condition would obtain as was in Paradise: "The Lord will wipe away tears from all faces" - not merely as a mother does to a child causing but a temporal state of happiness - no, God will take away the cause of tears and sorrow. That Isaiah emphasizes when he says: "And the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth". This rebuke was the punishment administered by God because of sin. That rebuke is taken away in Christ since He bore the punishment of our sins on the cross. Stoeckhardt says: "God will swallow up death, rob him of his booty, the dead bodies, who shall then live forever". Luther VI, 312: "The fruit and result of the Gospel is a vivification of the dead and the destruction of death". Keil: "The prophet here in his view stands exactly where John stood - on the last page of the Apocalypse".

This hope of a return to life from the grave receives additional support in chapter 26, 19. The great enigma, which is met with again and again in the Old Testament is "what advantage accrues from being a believer and from suffering on account of it? The unjust have advantages in this life to which the just never attain. Then death comes

they really are not dead since God is not the God of the dead but of the living, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Ex. 3, 6). Those that died in the Lord יהוה יהוה, shall live. Death is not the terminus ad quem (Psalm 19, 49; Job 19). After the grave into which many of the small congregation had been placed, comes a life.

יהוה יהוה from יהוה יהוה :corpse, dead body; the singular is also used collectively as a heap of dead bodies; it is construed as masculine (Ges. Kautzsch 123, s). So Deut. 28, 6: "Thy carcase יהוה יהוה shall be meat"—the carcase of the disobedient. Isaiah 5, 25: יהוה יהוה "their carcasses".

In the present passage, "my carcase" shall rise. יהוה יהוה is third person plural masculine and יהוה יהוה is singular feminine. But יהוה יהוה is often taken collectively having a plural meaning —as a heap of corpses.

The subject speaking is the small congregation (v. 1. 12). Her body consisting of the believers and considered as one corpse (since all her members form her body) even as Deut. 28, 26 Israel is viewed collectively as a corpse), this dead body shall arise. The masculine form of יהוה יהוה is explained as the "genus potius". So Isaiah says: "Thy, God's dead shall live". That shall happen when my, the small congregation's corpse, shall arise. This last part stands in apposition to the phrase "Thy dead shall live". These words teach a resurrection from the dead, So Hengstenberg: The saints are raised from the earth. The complete fulfillment which the words "Thy dead shall live" will find in the resurrection of the body affords a guarantee for the fulfillment of the previous stages. Likewise Luther (VI, 326): It is our comfort that we shall live after we have died.

The small congregation accordingly calls to them that dwell in the dust, to the sleepers in the cemetery, to the

וְיָקִימוּם מִתּוֹכָם. Job likewise speaks of his death dust.

These dead shall awake, וְיָקִימוּם - awake from sleep. I Sam. 26, 12:

"No man awaked for they were all asleep". Psalm 3, 5: "I

laid me down and slept; I awaked". So Isaiah here uses

the figure which Christ employed while he lived, calling

death a sleep. Daniel 12, 3. 2 also uses this figure: "They

that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake". The

awakened sleepers from the dead shall then sing for

joy.

Isaiah furthermore describes the process of the

resurrection. וְיָקִימוּם : thy dew, God's dew, which God sends -

as picturing the great multitude (II Sam. 7, 12); furthermore

as showing something wrought by God without human aid

(Micah 5, 6 : And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the

midst of many people as a dew from the Lord). In Isaiah

chapter 26 this dew is explained as the "dew of herbs".

The LXX reads וְיָקִימוּם as "healing". Some explain וְיָקִימוּם

as meaning "lights", referring to Psalm 139, 12. The "dew

of herbs", is possibly the best translation for this passage.

God's dew falls on the earth and this causes the herbs

and the grass to be refreshed, the wilted flowers to

straighten out. Psalm 90 compares man to a flower of the

field which is cut off and withers. The dew of God's

glory falls as a heavenly seed into the earth and the

earth consequently casts forth her dead. Bredencamp says

to this passage: Even as on a bright morning the dew

born from the dawn sparkles in millions of lights on

the various plants, so shall appear like as sparkling

dewdrops the resurrected bodies abounding with life zest,

,and the glory of God as the father of light is reflected in these newly awakened sleepers of the grave. Knobel, however, sees in this passage rather an earnest desire than a certain hope. But the tenor of the whole passage does not express a wish so much as a definite fact.

Verse 20.21 emphasize the certainty of this resurrection. Patience is enjoined to those who shall some day awake. They shall shut themselves in their chambers and hide for a moment until the indignation be overpast. This indignation is God's punishment on the inhabitants of the earth. The righteous dead shall escape and, as mentioned in v.19, shall live, arise, and awake. This hope in a resurrection to life was the only comfort vouchsafed to the small congregation in its sufferings and trials among a wicked and perverse world.

In the last two chapters, which we shall consider, the joy of eternity is pictured to us in attractive colors. The former heaven and earth shall vanish and God will create ($\frac{47}{7}$) a new heaven and a new earth (c.65,17 - 66,20) In it there will be joy and not voices of weeping and crying; all differences of age shall vanish; they will reap the fruit of their labor; their every desire shall be satisfied even that concerning which Augustine says: Thou hast created us unto Thee, O Lord, and our soul finds no rest until it rests in Thee. Like as a mother God will comfort them. All nation of believers shall be gathered into his church of the New Jerusalem. These last two chapters in Isaiah are apocalyptic revealing the joy, not of the millenium, but of the resurrected Christians assembled in the new glorified congregation where the river of peace is a continual flowing stream. This vision of the

New Jerusalem presupposes the resurrection as it is presented in c.25,8 and c.26,19.

Ezekiel is another great prophet who in the majestic picture of the resurrection of the bones foreshadows the bodily resurrection. The outline of the vision is briefly this: Ezekiel was placed by God in a large valley full of dead men's bones. The issue was "can these bones live?" At God's request he prophesied unto those bones that the Lord would cause sinews and flesh to surround them. Startling was the result. There was a noise, a shaking. Bones came together and were covered with flesh and skin. Then at the prophet's command - uttered at the Lord's behest - breath came from the four winds; the corpses lived. They arose and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army. The question is "what is the interpretation of Ezekiel's vision".

Pusey: "It implies the current belief of the resurrection the more because the application is figurative and is made to strengthen the disheartened people". Never, says St. Jerome "would the likeness of the resurrection be used, in order to signify the restoration of the people of Israel, unless the resurrection itself stood firm and was believed to be a fact; for no one confirms things uncertain through things that are not".

Hengstenberg refers this to the temporal restoration of the Israelites, the doctrine of the resurrection, however, lying at the basis of this figure. He argues that the doctrine of the resurrection was current among the people of God at the time of Ezekiel and Isaiah. He says: "It must also be added that the idea expressed by the imagery can only

be fully realized when the event itself occurs from which the imagery is borrowed; and therefore the latter is not only taken from the event but points to the event in return, As truly as God is God so truly must all death be the pathway of life in his kingdom". Likewise the Weimar Bible: The Jews should draw this conclusion; Is it possible, yes, even easy for God to bring our dead bodies back into life, then how much easier must it be for him merely to bring us back out of the Babylonian Captivity?

The previous quotations show that their authors believed in a resurrection of the dead as forming the basis for this vision and hope of a temporal return from Babylon to Canaan. They denied, of course, that the resurrection is taught directly and explicitly in this passage.

Koenig "Old Testament Theology 312" interprets this vision of the resurrection of the bones as a "spiritual reawakening". This cannot be held because "whole Israel" was not spiritually reawakened; many had hearts of stone; this awakening should take place in the future; but many Israelites were already dead; some Israelites did not need a spiritual reawakening; even in Babylon there was a rest, a small congregation. So in the light of "whole Israel" this spiritual view cannot be accepted.

The arguments against a temporal restoration to Canaan will be presented together with the interpretation of a "direct reference to the resurrection" in this vision of dried bones. This vision of verse 1-10 is explained in verse 11 - 14. The bones of the valley are the whole House of Israel בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל . The words taken literally cannot therefore refer to the bodily descendants

of Abraham. All Israel was not dead when Ezekiel spoke these words. There are Israelites living today. That the "graves should be opened" cannot refer to all Israel. Some were still alive at that day. A few even remained in Palestine during the Captivity. The context shows us who is meant by all Israel. In verse 21 the parallel thought to verses 12-14 is expressed thus: God will return Israel to its country. The spirit of God (v. 14) is according to verse 24 "to walk in God's judgments". Then verses 15-25 speak of the same restoration as verses 1-14. But in verses 15-25 no thought of a temporal return can be entertained. But true Israel are all the believers as St. Paul calls them Romans 11, 26. Israel according to verses 15-19 is pictured as the joining of the two sticks Judah and Ephraim (Israel) into one stick. This did not happen to the temporal descendants of Judah and Israel.

The unity of these two people is the unity of faith which ignores tribal and racial differences - it means the true Israel, God's true people, his believers. Verses 21, 22 God says that he will gather the Jews that have been scattered among the nations and make one people of them which did not contain the division of Judah and Israel. But this was never fulfilled with temporal Israel. The ten tribes were lost, were never reassembled in Canaan. How then can God speak of joining Judah and Israel under one king?

After their return Israel shall never defile itself with idols and detestable things any more. But the Israelites did defile themselves later in Canaan and Jerusalem. Furthermore these Israelites shall have one king, David, God's servant. Temporal Israel never had a temporal king

Handwritten notes:
 111-112
 113-114
 115-116
 117-118
 119-120
 121-122
 123-124
 125-126
 127-128
 129-130
 131-132
 133-134
 135-136
 137-138
 139-140
 141-142
 143-144
 145-146
 147-148
 149-150

No.

after the Exile. King David was dead. This King David referred to is without doubt the Messiah. He is also called the shepherd (c. 34, 23; Isaiah 40, 11; Jer. 23, 5; Hosea 3, 5 refers this conclusively to the Messiah). In verse 25 God says: "My servant David shall be their prince forever". The Messiah's true kingship and his function as shepherd extends over -not the dwellers in Palastine - but over the believers, spiritual Israel and reaches into the "lumen gloriæ". God will also make an everlasting covenant of peace with them. Then chapter 36 contains^a similar reasons for interpreting Israel as the believers and this chapter upon closer examination will be found to be parallel to chapter 37, 1-24. Israel, therefore, mentioned in c. 37, 1-14 to whom the vision of bones applies, can only mean spiritual Israel whose king is Christ. This Israel though it die shall live.

Other reasons for assuming this to refer to the bodily resurrection are the following based mainly on Gerhard's presentation: The emphatic description: Hardly in another passage in Scripture is the resurrection described so emphatically; bones shall be joined, flesh shall cover them, and the breath will enter. God calls them "My people" (Ex. 3, 6) and also in Ez. 37. The graves shall be opened and Israel shall come out of them. That in a literal sense means a resurrection, always remembering that spiritual Israel is meant. Isaiah 26, 19 is parallel "They dead shall live, my corpse shall arise" which is spoken by the "small congregation" and it is identical with spiritual Israel.

Into these bones the spirit of life comes from the four winds (v. 8) to breathe upon the slain that they

might live. Gerhard: But the Jews in their return to Canaan were not gathered from the corners of the world, but in the future resurrection the angels shall gather the elect from the four winds (Matth. 24, 31; Mark 13, 37). Then he introduces the argument from "type": The freeing from Egypt is a type of the resurrection even as manna is a type of the spiritual food. So, too, the release from Babylon and the return to Canaan is a type of the final liberation of Israel from all miseries and calamities to a new life. A deliverance from Babylon could not bring firm consolation to the afflicted Jews because many had died in the Exile and many were still to die before Cyrus would issue his decree of return. In Canaan many miseries and sorrows awaited them. Pious minds were not satisfied with bodily comforts, so the Lord reminded them of the final resurrection of all true Israelites through this vision of dry bones. The following interpret this vision as a direct statement of the resurrection.: The rabbis Galatinus and Simai; the fathers Tertullian, Justin, Origen, Cyril, and Augustine.

The Jews in Babylonia were comforted not so much with the promise of their return to Canaan as with the promise of a life to come. Ezekiel's vision of dried bones was intended for that purpose.

The other great prophet of the Exile was still more apocalyptic in his writings. For consolation Daniel referred the sorrowing Jews not to their return to Canaan - little happiness and joy was in store for them there - but he pointed out the judgment day as the only true comfort to the faithful. The image of the man (c. 2) of the four

beasts (c.7), of the Antichrist and his destruction (c.9) destroyed all real hope for a temporal restitution and left them but the one unchangeable comfort of a restitution beyond this present economy. Against this dark background emphasized especially in the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist (c.11, 30-45; and a summary of his time being given c.12, 1: "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was nation even to that same time") through these dark clouds he gives the Israelites one clear glance of the bright sun shining for them on the other side of this world's tempest. He says v.2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake". מִן־הַקְּבֵרִים ; many - used either partitively as usual; then some would remain in the grave - or to emphasize the greatness of the number it sometimes is used synonymously with כָּל־ : all. So in this passage. On judgment day we expect all to arise. Psalm 49, 14 speaks of the events which shall happen to all whom death shepherds. Otherwise the threats and promises of God would be foolishness. The מִן־הַקְּבֵרִים - מִן־הַקְּבֵרִים with their contrary fates implies a complete resurrection. Parallels in the New Testament are Matth. 20, 28: "Christ gave his life as a ransom for many" (all the people); Romans 5, 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one man shall many be made righteous"; John 5, 28 is parallel to Daniel 12, 2. Augustine adds: Abraham is called the father of "many" nations, - then again "all" nations shall be blessed in him. Luther says to this word (VI, 935): On judgment day we shall not all arise, as St. Paul says I Cor. 15, 51: For those who shall be found alive on that day shall not die

and not be raised but shall be changed in a moment.

In Daniel 12,2, however, this rising pertains to the

וְכָל־הַיְּשָׁרִים־שֵׁנִים־בְּאֶרֶץ־חַיִּים. All those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall arise.

וְכָל used partitively; but since here "many" and "sleepers" are identical the real partitive meaning is lost and the descriptive meaning enters in its stead. So וְכָל introduces a descriptive genitive, e.g. the great multitude of soldiers; the great multitude of sleepers. וְכָל־הַיְּשָׁרִים Hiph. of שָׁרַף : awake from a sleep - I Sam. 26, 12; Psalm 3, 6 - "awake from death as from a sleep" : II Kings 4, 31; Job 14, 12 - "they shall not awake nor be raised from their sleep; Isaiah 26, 19 : וְכָל־הַיְּשָׁרִים. Daniel likewise pictures death as a sleep from which the sleepers shall awake and arise. So this passage plainly teaches a resurrection of the dead. The great majority of those that deny a doctrine of the resurrection to the first patriarchs agree that the exilic and the post-exilic Jews have this doctrine.

Hosea in unmistakable language also voices this hope c. 13, 14: "I will ransom them from the grave, I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction". These words of Hosea are similar to the words of Daniel c. 12, 2; of Isaiah c. 25, 8 and c. 26, 19; of Psalm 49, 14, 15. The International Critical Commentary translates Hosea 13, 14: "Shall I deliver them?" a negative answer being implied; So Jehovah calls upon Sheol to do its work."

But in the treatment of the parallel passages and according to I Cor. 15 this can only be referred to the resurrection of the dead. Luther has a long statement to Hosea 13, 14 (VI. 1977): After the prophet has foretold de

destruction to the unbelievers he begins to comfort the
 ungodly, who not merely behold such destruction, but who
 also as customary share in this destruction. For as often
 as punishments are inflicted upon mankind some Christians
 also are afflicted. There is a wonderful comfort found in
 this passage: He does not promise to save them from the bonds
 of the Assyrian king, but he says: you shall also be killed
 or carried away captive by the heathen. Your lot shall not
 be better than that of the unbelievers on whose account
 this destruction comes. This punishment you should suffer
 with patience and should hope for a better salvation than
 the salvation of being saved from the hands of your enemies.
 I shall save you from hell; That is - after your death
 and burial I shall raise you to a better to an eternal life.
 In such a manner I shall recompense your sorrows and
 sufferings that in return you receive an eternal reward.
 The word *צ'ו'* which is commonly used (hell) is a place or
 a grave where human corpses are buried. So the prophet
 wishes to say: When your bodies are buried and you lie
 in a senseless sleep even then you shall be saved. This
 salvation I promise you and ask you to hope for it. How
 shall this happen? The Lord answers: O death, I will be thy
 plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction. Consider first
 the antitheses. Death is our prison and plagues. For who
 ever escaped death? But here the Lord comforts mankind
 that death - now a poison to all mankind - shall some day
 receive his poison and be destroyed. He himself promises
 to be poison to Death and plagues to hell."

Besides this proof for the resurrection from the
 dead which we saw is a fundamental article of faith from

Paradise to the writings of the postexilic Jews, there is other evidence that the Old Testament teaches a doctrine of the resurrection of the Dead. We have the argument from the analogy of faith. The faith of the patriarchs was identical to that of the believers of the New Testament (Acts 15, 11; Romans 4; Abbs 26, 22; Hebrews 11) and the doctrine of the resurrection is a fundamental article of faith (I Tim. 1, 19, 20; II Tim. 2, 18, 19; I Cor. 15). From these passages it is evident that faith must have as one object the knowledge of the resurrection which the patriarchs also had else they would not have been saved. -- Then, the patriarchs called themselves strangers and pilgrims seeking a country (Gen. 23, 4; 47, 9; Lev. 25, 23; I Chr. 29, 15; Psalm 39, 12, 7). If they were strangers and pilgrims here on earth then they looked for a country, a place where their bodies and souls would find eternal peace, and that country can alone be heaven which is reached by believers only through the dark vale of death. -- The argument from the eternity of God's grace is also valid. Comparing the following passages (Psalm 89, 3; Isaiah 54, 8; 45, 17; II Sam. 7, 13; Psalm 72, 7; 110, 4; Isaiah 9, 6; Daniel 7, 14; Isaiah 55, 3; Ezekiel 37, 26) the conclusion follows, "since grace, salvation, and God's Kingdom are eternal, then those partaking of it must live eternally." Cf. Pieper III, 600 ff.

This doctrine was believed at the close of the Jewish economy. Compare the apocryphal books Wisdom 16, 13; 3, 3, 4; 5, 16; II Macc. 12, 43-46; 7; -- then also the biblical writers Acts 23, 8; 26, 5, 8; Mark 6, 14-16; Luke 9, 7, 8, 19; Matth. 22, 24. These passages show that the doctrine of the resurrection was nearly universally believed by the Jews

just prior to the time of Christ's coming and at his entrance in to the world. The Jews gathered this doctrine from the writings which were available to them and these writings were the books of Moses and the Prophets.

In a passage quoted by Warburton (Book VI, sec. 3) from Manasseh Ben-Israel we find the following argument for this doctrine: "God said to Abraham, I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger. But it appears that Abraham and the other patriarchs did not possess that land; therefore it is of necessity that they should be raised up to enjoy the good promises else the promise of God would be vain and false - so that we have here a proof not only of the immortality of the soul but also of the resurrection of the body. The opinion of the Rabbis with regard to Exodus 6, 4 as the Talmud in Gemara states, in reply to the question "Where does the Law teach the resurrection of the dead?" answers: "In that place where it is said, I have established my covenant with thee, to give thee the land of Canaan. For it is not said with you, but with thee."

That the Old Testament teaches a doctrine of the resurrection even Christ himself shows by proving it to the Sadducees (Matth, 22, 31-32) from Exodus 3, 6. Paul teaches no other doctrine than that which the prophets taught (Acts 26, 22) and Paul taught the resurrection (I Cor. 15). The epistle to the Hebrews also confirms this fact that the patriarchs were conversant with this doctrine (c. 11, 13-16).

In the present discussion we saw how the stream of salvation, the source of whose life-giving waters

reaches back to the Protevangel given to Adam and Eve in Paradise, how this river of pure Gospel gradually was increased by new tributaries from new visions and revelations given by God to Moses, to Balaam, to Job, to David, and to the prophets, until its banks became widened and it flowed a smooth crystal stream among the vicissitudes and sins of God's chosen people to the village of Bethlehem in the "fullness of time"; and there it received fresh tributaries from the "fountain of life" and his inspired apostles and is now bound for the shores of the heavenly Jerusalem. The stream began in Paradise, but its course was never altered. From the moment that it issued from God's mouth and entered into the hearts of our first parents the current pointed straight to Jesus and through him to the country beyond, the home in heaven. No tributary changed the course fixed by God and realized by our first parents. And this stream issuing from Paradise was deep enough to carry Adam's bark of salvation, not permitting it to strand on some rocky shoal of this present world. Our first parents never doubted that they would land safely in [the New Jerusalem] for to that place the stream of the Gospel tends. The tributaries merely strengthened and broadened this primal stream but gave it no new direction. Gradually more and more life-giving water was added in order that it might the more readily be seen by mankind whose spiritual vision became more and more clouded as it receded from Paradise. Heaven was its goal from Paradise.

"These (the patriarchs) all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and

were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is an heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." (Hebrews 11, 13-16).

Reference Bibliography.

- Drechsler, Jesaias - Berlin 1851.
- Knobel, Der Propheet Jesaias - Leipzig 1854.
- International Critical Commentary -Scribner's 1905.
- Pulpit Commentary :Exodus (G.Rawlinson)
- Weimar Bible - Fr.Dette 1880.
- Novak Commentary.
- Driver, "Book of Genâsis!"
- Keil Delitzsch, Commentary.
- Strack-Zoeckler, Commentary.
- Lange-Schaaff, Commentary.
- Lange, Theo.-Hom.Bibelwerk - Vehlhagen Klasing 1877.
- Catholic Cyclopaedia.
- McClintock Strong Cyclopaedia.
- Jewish Encyclopaedia.
- Realencyklopaedie fuer Protestantische Theologie und
Kirche (Albert Hauck).
- Hengstenberg, Christology of the O.T. Clark 1872.
- Fairbairn, On Prophecy - Carlton and Porter 1866.
- Orr, The Problem of The O.T. *Scribner's 1926.
- Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture -Otaxton 1867.
- Pusey, Daniel the Prophet -Funk and Wagnalls 1885.
- Koenig, Theologie des Alten Testaments -Stuttgart 1922.
- Koenig, Messianische Weissagungen.
- Delitzsch, Messianische Weissagungen.
- Oehler, Theology of the O.T. Funk and Wagnalls 1883.
- Weidener, Biblical Theology of the O.T.-Revell 1886.
- Davidson, The Theology of the O.T. -Scribner's 1910.
- Hofman, Schriftbewâiss -Noerdlingen 1855.
- Schmidt, Christliche Dogmatik -Bonn 1895.
- Schedd, Dogmatic Theology -Scribner's 1889.

Wodght, Biblical Dogmatics -LBP, Columbia S.C. 1917.
Thomasius, Christi Person and Werk -Erlangen 1863.
Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik -CPH.
Hodge, Systematic Theology.
Clarke, Ten Great Religions & an essay in comparative
Theology.
Clarke, Outline of Christian Theology -Scribner's 1898.
Koenig, Der Christliche Glaube & Stuttgart 1922.
Luthardt, Die Christliche Glaubenslehre -Leipzig 1898.
Luthardt, Compendium der Christ. Dogmatik - Leipzig 1898.
Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, Clark 1893.
Rothe, Dogmatik -Heidelberg 1870.
Seeberg, Christliche Dogmatik -Erlangen 1925.
Expositor (1895), Article by A.B. Davidson.
Expositor (1905), Article by H.B. Ayles.
Edersheim, L. & T. of Jesus the Messiah.
Lehre & Wehre, 1892 -Vol. 38. (Stoeckhardt).
Synodal Bericht, Minn. 1883, pg. 68; - Nebr. 1904;
Mitt. 1886.
Lutheran Quart. Review, 1904, pg. 570. (T. Kretschmar)
The Biblical Review, VII, 1922 ; VIII, 1923 (Raven).
Augustini, De Civitate Dei -Leipzig 1885.
Gerhard, Loci Theologici (Tome 8) Berlin 1870.
Gerhard, Commentarius super Genesisin.