

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

1-1-1924

### The Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament

Arthur E. Neitzel

*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

Neitzel, Arthur E., "The Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament" (1924). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 580.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/580>

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](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE DOCTRINE  
of  
THE RESURRECTION  
IN  
THE OLD TESTAMENT

Arthur E. Neitzel

Submitted to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri  
as part requirement for the degree of MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY. 1924

24



To destroy a plant we must pluck it up by the roots, and to annihilate an institution we must take from it the ground upon which it rests. Realizing the truth of this principle the foes of Christianity have attacked its fundamental doctrines. They have, however, always been conscious of the fact that the foundation upon which all Christian doctrine rests is the doctrine of universal redemption by which man is promised an eternal life. Being unable to wrench this doctrine itself, the heart of Divine Revelation, out of the Sacred Writings, they have endeavored to render it void and meaningless by denying a life beyond the grave. For if this doctrine is a mere empty shell holding in it not a grain of truth, if this doctrine is a mere invention of orthodox theologians, ungrounded and unfounded in Scriptures, then there is no need for a savior, a deliverer from a future transsepulchral life of damnation and abomination to a future life of bliss. The doctrine of a future life is indeed an article "stantis et cadentis ecclesiae"; for if it falls to the ground then Christianity is a lost cause. It is and always will remain true what St. Paul says: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable", (1Cor. 15, 19). Therefore from the earliest times this Christian hope has been the butt of attack. St. Augustine already said: "No doctrine of the Christian faith is so vehemently and so obstinately opposed as the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh." <sup>1</sup>

There are chiefly two tendencies, which call forth such antagonism against this doctrine, that of the "Diesseits-Religion" and that of Evolution. The attacks of the "Diesseits-Religion" <sup>2</sup> are as old as the history of Christian Dogma. They were already made by the Sadducees,

---

1. In Ps. lxxxviii, sermo ii n.5.

2. A religion which teaches heaven on earth, and which provides for man only up to the grave.



whose theology was a religion within the limits of sensation, and who were essentially rationalists, denying the existence of angels, spirits, and immortality and hence also the resurrection of the body to a future life. Their rationalism is very clear from Mt. 22,23-28. The Epicureans and Stoics took exception to the doctrine of resurrection as preached by Paul (Acts 17,18.32). There must have been such even in the congregation at Corinth, who denied a resurrection (1Cor.15,12). And ever since there has been an unbroken line of opponents to this cardinal Christian doctrine. Those who denied the immortality of the soul, naturally had no place for such a teaching; likewise those who, like Plato, regarded the body as the prison of the soul, and death as an escape from the bondage of matter. Others, who on account of their principles have denied this doctrine, were, Gnostics, Manichaeans (who looked upon all matter as sinful) Marcionites, Socinians, Priscillianists, Cathari, Albigenses, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, modern materialists and Pantheists. All of these deny resurrection, and the most of them because they are exponents of a religion of this present world only and guilty of the tendency of the "Diesseits-Religion". Most of them endeavor to do away with the opposition which Scriptures offers them by tearing away the prop upon which the whole doctrine rests, namely the resurrection of Christ and point with pride to the supposed fact that in the Old Testament, which is claimed to be God's Word as well as the New, no trace of a doctrine of a future life is found. Hence it has quite generally become an accepted fact with such people that the Old Testament knows of no life beyond the realms of death.

In their endeavor the exponents of the "Diesseits-Religion" have been powerfully supported by the theory of evolution. Evolution especially has become the watchword of modern scholars. This theory has been applied not only to the physical world, to the universe, to man's physical and mental make-up, but also to man's civilization and culture, his education and institutions. In accordance therewith the evolutionary theory has given a great impetus to a study of comparative religion, which places the



the Christian religion on a par with the rest of them. Thus the Bible<sup>has</sup> has become the object of evolutionary surgery, being viewed both as a piece<sup>f</sup> of literature and a code of religious teachings. It is well known how the ad-<sup>ad-</sup>herents of the source-hypothesis (Quellenhypothese) have torn the Scrip- tures to shreds in order to make them fit the laws of literary evolution. In a like manner also the doctrines are said to have evolved gradually. Religious conceptions are said to have<sup>be</sup>come ever more and more developed as the minds of men grew riper and riper. Thus it is claimed that Israel was at first a nomad tribe<sup>3</sup>, an uncivilized band of herdsmen given like the rest of roving tribes to polytheism, and that by and by it came to the higher developed stage of a monotheistic religion.<sup>4</sup> The polytheism in Is- rael should have had the crass form of animism, fetishism and totemism.<sup>5</sup>

---

3. "The nomad theory rests on the critics' own assumptions, and is of no force against the indications of the history itself. Moses was not a nomad,<sup>nomad,</sup> but is figured as "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians". Joseph and his family were not nomads, and the position of the Hebrew in Egypt under Joseph's regime must have been one of great honor and influence." Orr: The Problem of the Old Testament, p.79.

4. But this does not hold good with any religion. The change in religion is always one of deterioration. In every case monotheism precedes poly- theism. Least of all does this apply to the Christian religion of which all other religions are deviations.

5. "Bei derartigen Annahmen schaezt man uebrigens die Denkkraft des fruerehen Menschen so niedrig ein, dasz diese Einschaeztung im schroffen Widerspruch zu den Tatsachen der Kulturgeschichte steht." Koenig: Theologie<sup>-ogit.</sup> des Alten Test., p.32 (cf. also parag. 11-13).



Holding this view naturally affects the view held on every other Scriptural teaching. As Dr. Charles says: "On this conception hinges ultimately every other religious conception of the nation. <sup>6</sup> And since this view affects every doctrine of the Old Testament, every doctrine of the Old Testament must be made to fit this new. It is claimed therefore by critics, that all the doctrinal elements of the Old Testament harmonize with this evolutionary hypothesis; and again they point with a note of triumph to the doctrine of a future life. Here, they say, we have a clear example of evolutionary development.<sup>7</sup> If the conception of a resurrection is found at <sup>all</sup>, it is found only in the very latest writings, and there only in its germs.

But before proceeding to let Scriptures speak for themselves, we must define our own point of view. We totally reject the claims that there is <sup>no</sup> ~~no~~

6. Dr. R.H. Charles: A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, <sup>p.2.</sup>

7. "How comes it that in the second century B.C. the conception of the <sup>after-</sup> world is mainly moral and retributive, whereas from the fourth century <sup>back</sup> to Moses' time it is non-moral, being in fact a piece of pure Semitic heathenism. This change of conception is mainly due to monotheism." Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, pp.2-3.

The ideas about the future life which prevailed in the earliest times and were current indeed in some degree down to the second century B.C. <sup>were</sup> were in many respects common to Israel and to some other Semitic nations. They were not the outcome of any revelation. They were survivals. With these antique elements advancing thought was at strife centuries before it succeeded in completely expelling them and in furnishing in their stead a <sup>doctr-</sup> doctrine of the future life in harmony with its own character. Such a <sup>doctrine</sup> doctrine though foreshadowed in the earlier literature was not definitely taught <sup>till</sup> till the fourth century B.C.--Encyclopaedia Biblica. Sub. Eschatology.



resurrection taught in the Old Testament. Likewise we deny that this doctrine came into existence by an evolutionary process, due to the advancing civilization and mental growth of the Israelitic race. Nevertheless we admit and adhere to the statement that revelation was progressive. But even this statement cannot be admitted without a limiting definition. Revelation was progressive only as far as clearness of religious conceptions is concerned. The essential conceptions themselves, we contend, were there from the very beginning. And even then the progress in clearness is not <sup>as</sup> great as might seem from the reading of the Old Testament. In the divine books as they lie before us there is indeed a very marked progress in clearness of doctrine but much of this progress is due not to new religious <sup>ideas</sup> ideas which God gave to his people, but to the fact that it became necessary, the further man got away from the period in the Garden of Eden, to write these things down for the coming generations. The patriarchs of old had their knowledge of theology and taught this theology. And if this patriarchal theology had been written at the time in its completeness we would most probably have a much clearer light on what the early children of God believed. Then too we must bear in mind that the nature of many of <sup>the</sup> the Old Testament writings brings with it that the doctrinal elements are not so much in the foreground. Many, yes most of the Old Testament writings are <sup>of</sup> of historical nature and not in the form of doctrinal treatises. Thus e.g. we have in the account of the creation an historical account. It was not the intent and purpose of Moses to begin in Gen. 1,1: "In the beginning God was already in existence. He is an eternal God. He is a God of such and such description." Neither was it necessary for the sacred writer to do this, for these things were known and accepted by his readers, who had been instructed orally by their forefathers. Nevertheless this doctrine of God <sup>is</sup> is found in the account of creation. It necessarily lies in the background <sup>and</sup> and the historical account of God's creative acts of necessity shows forth the nature and grandeur of God, his omnipotence, eternity, wisdom, etc. And so



it is that in most cases doctrinal elements are brought forth in the Old Testament writings as they are linked inseparably with the course of history.

Therefore, turning to the doctrine of resurrection, we hold that the doctrine was essentially a part of the faith of the patriarchs of old, <sup>that</sup> that although there is progress of revelation in the clearness of this doctrine, the true conception of a future life is nevertheless a part of the teaching of the Old Testament, that the doctrine itself is to be found in the Old Testament and not merely the germs. Now someone might say: "You are becoming guilty of the same thing of which you are accusing your opponents. You are led by a tendency as well as they who hold the opposite view." <sup>That</sup> That might be true to a certain extent. But our tendency is justified while <sup>that</sup> that of the opponents is absolutely unfounded. We believe that there is such a doctrine in the Old Testament, in the first place, because the New Testament <sup>—ment</sup> treats this fact as self-evident. This doctrine must be found in the Old Testament theology, because of the whole purpose of Scriptures. Speaking of the Old Testament Scriptures, Paul says to Timothy, that they are able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 3, 15). If the Old Testament had this importance for Timothy, it certainly had the same for the believers in Old Testament times. Also they could come to <sup>find</sup> faith in Christ Jesus and through him gain salvation. From the testimony of <sup>Script-</sup> Scriptures we know that the saints under the Old Dispensation have been saved <sup>by</sup> the same faith as that by which we have to be in the New Covenant (Rom. 4, 2-3; Gal. 3, 6-7; John 8, 56; Jas. 2, 23). The salvation of which Paul speaks to Timothy is the glorious life beyond the shadows of death. And also the patriarchs must have seen eternal life as the goal of their faith or else it would apply to them what Paul says 1 Cor. 15, 19: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." That this was the case is effectively argued in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, vv. 8-19. But not <sup>only</sup> only does the New Testament presuppose such a doctrine in the Old Testament. It <sup>of</sup> states in just so many words that there is such a conception under the Old



Dispensation. Christ our Lord himself argues this point with the Sadducees Mt. 22,29-32, (Mk.12,26-27; Lk.20,37-38) and in his argument he adduces proof from the earliest Old Testament writings.

These are just the main instances in which the New Testament points to a doctrine of resurrection in the Old Testament. To bring them all would involve a lengthy discussion (cf. also John 11,24; Mt. 13,43; Lk.14,14; Mt.11,7; Lk.18,31.33; 24,26.27; Mt.12,39-40; Acts 13,33-37; 3,27-28; Rev.<sup>21</sup> 21, 4; John 5,39). Those adduced show sufficiently that there is a resurrection of the dead taught in the Old Testament. In view of this fact we are justified in going to the Old Testament not only with a tendency but with the firm and well founded hope of finding there the doctrine of a future life.

Viewing the Old Testament as a whole we must conclude that the doctrine of a future life is an essential element of it. Biblical theology is a well formed and indivisible unit. No single doctrine can be taken from it without doing injury to the rest of the teachings. If therefore the doctrine of the resurrection is wrenched from the Old Testament this cannot remain without effect upon other doctrines. This the critics fully realize and that is just what they want. Therefore they unreasonably argue backward. Since, they say, this doctrine of the resurrection is not found in the early writings and since it came into existence by a slow evolutionary process, this must be true also of all other religious conceptions. Thus they deny the facts and conclude that the doctrine of God must have undergone the same evolutionary process beginning with the most primitive conceptions of polytheism. This is, however, in reality a denying of facts. The fact is that

---

8. Kant goes so far as to say: "Da nun ohne Glaube an ein kuenftiges Leben gar keine Religion gedacht werden kann so enthaelt das Judentum gar keinen Religionsglauben."--Rel. der Vernunft, p. 177-178.



the radical criticism seeks to eliminate the most characteristic feature in Israel's religion, that while all the surrounding tribes were wallowing in the mires of polytheism, Israel worshiped the one true God, the great three in one.<sup>9</sup> The first chapter of Genesis presents the God of Israel as the triune God, the maker of heaven and earth, by whose almighty hand all things were made, besides whom there is no other God (cf. also the first commandment). This fact must remain and we are forced to begin our argument at this point. With the true conception of God the true conception of a life beyond the grave goes hand in hand.

The Pentateuch. This must be born in mind especially in considering the

Pentateuch, although it applies to the entire Scriptures.

For we must admit that there is no little obscurity <sup>of this doctrine</sup> in the Pentateuch. <sup>There</sup> is, in fact, no distinct, explicit teaching of eschatology in the Pentateuch. <sup>-teuch.</sup>

The reason for this is hard to state. Nevertheless it proves so much, that if Israel's religion had developed alongside of the heathen religions, we would find in it the so-called Egyptian resurrection. But Moses evidently steers clear of this wrong and heathenish conception. The so-called Egyptian doctrine of resurrection, was not a doctrine of resurrection at all,

but a doctrine of resuscitation <sup>10.</sup> for which there was absolutely no room in scriptural writings. Then too, as said before, the nature of the Pentateuch <sup>-teuch</sup> brings with it that this doctrine has no great emphasis on it. It is chief- <sup>chief-</sup>ly an historical account relating the events which occurred to God's <sup>people,</sup> people, placing the idea of the God chosen race into the foreground and the conception of the individual more (though not entirely) into the background. <sup>nev-</sup> Nev-

ertheless, although this doctrine is obscure, it has not been omitted entire- <sup>-entire-</sup>ly. It is connected inseparably with the doctrine of God. The power of God <sup>God</sup> and His loving kindness to man bring with them that He is a God, who raises the dead.<sup>11</sup> This is precisely the line of argument followed by Christ in

9. Cf. Theo. Quart., Vol. viii, 25: Was Jehovah in Prophetic Days a Tribal Deity <sup>Deity</sup>

10. Kyle: Moses and the Monuments, pp. 198 ff.

11. Cf. Hengstenberg: Beitrage zur Einl. ins A. T. III, 571-572.



refutation of the Sadducees (Mt.22,23-32; Mk.12,18 ff; Lk.20,27 ff). The Sadducees, who denied a resurrection, endeavored to show the irrationality of a resurrection by bringing forth a hypothetical case. They try to show that this doctrine is out of harmony with the Levirate law of Moses, according to which the brother of a man, who has died and left his wife without children, should marry the widow "and raise up seed unto his brother". They cite a hypothetical case in which the woman was thus the wife of seven brothers. And then they ask, in order to make the doctrine of the resurrection ridiculous: "In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her." Christ thereupon points out to them that they err both in denying that there is a resurrection and in the conception of the manner of resurrection. The first only is of value to us here. Their error was due not to a neglect of Scriptures ( i.e. the Old Testament) to teach this doctrine, but to their ignorance of Scriptural doctrine. And this ignorance is not an ignorance of the minor details but of the outstanding features of Old Testament teaching, the doctrine de Deo. "Ye do err," says He, "not knowing the Scriptures and the power of God." Their study of Scriptures, specifically of the Pentateuch, which they had cited, should surely have given them this conviction that God has power over the realms of death. For this is stated Dt.32,39: "See now that I, even I, am he and there is no God with me; I kill and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." Likewise they could have made the same deductions from the narrative of Isaac's offering by Abraham (Gen.22,1-10) which the writer of Hebrews makes, namely, that "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: <sup>the</sup> accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead," (Hebr.11,17-19). This much they must then admit, that the Old Testament, specifically the Pentateuch, teaches <sup>of</sup> God in whose power it is to raise the dead. The Lord



then proceeds to show that this doctrine is not out of harmony with the Levirate law of marriage, since there are no marriages in heaven (v.30). But not only does the Pentateuch teach the ability of God to raise the dead. It also presents Him as a God of love, as one who is willing to perform this act. Jesus proceeds: "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" (vv.31-32). Christ here points to a number of parallel Old Testament passages of which he selects specifically the episode of Moses at the burning bush (Exod.3,6)<sup>12</sup>. These words of God were spoken long after the three patriarchs had been assembled to their fathers. They were dead as far as the rest of mankind was concerned. But that they should be dead forever is incompatible with God's statement. He cannot be a God of the dead. Hence, if he calls himself the God of the departed, they must still be living. For communion of the believer with God is an essential teaching of the Old Testament, and this bond is indissoluble, even death cannot sever it. These men live as far as their soul is concerned and shall finally be raised again. Their death is but a state of sleep. God expresses his willingness, yes His intent and purpose to raise them by calling Himself their God.<sup>13</sup> Hence all those passages where God calls Himself the God of mortal man are clear Old Testament proof for the doctrine of a resurrection. That Christ here proves only immortality of the soul from the Old Testament is out of the question on account of the

---

12. Dr. F. Pieper: Christliche Dogmatik III, p.601.

13. Incidentally we have here a clear case where God deals with individuals very specifically and not with the nation as a whole.



repeated use of the word "resurrection" (ἡ ἀνάστασις).<sup>14</sup>

This argument of Christ should suffice to prove the resurrection from the Pentateuch. And it was sufficient to silence Christ's opponents. This doctrine was their stronghold and if they were versed in anything, they were versed in arguments for their contentions. Nevertheless Christ "had put the Sadducees to silence". He needed no further proof, although there was yet much at His disposal. For as the doctrine of resurrection is indivisibly connected with the doctrine concerning God, so it was also necessarily <sup>part</sup> a part

14. The New International Ency. underestimates the argument of Jesus (sub. Resurrection, p.67). "The attitude of Jesus in this question cannot be determined with certainty.....Jesus evidently rejects the view of the Sadducees on the ground that they do not understand Scripture and fail to appreciate the power of God. On the other hand, he clearly does not accept the current Pharisaic doctrine of a resurrection on the last day since he bases his argument for the fact that the dead are raised on the words of Yahweh to Moses in which he speaks of himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The point of the argument is that according to the Scriptures these patriarchs are addressed as living several centuries after their death, and therefore must have been raised from the dead; and the natural inference is that Jesus believed in a spiritual resurrection by which those to whom God stands in relation as their God are immediately after death raised into life in his presence." But Christ did teach a resurrection which takes place on the last day. John 6,39.40.44.54. The International Standard Bible Ency. correctly states:"their (i.e. the Sadducees) error lay in the low idea of God. For the Scriptures teach a God whose ability and willingness to care for his creatures are so unlimited that the destiny he has prepared for them is a caricature if conceived in any terms but the absolutely highest." (Sub.-Resurrection). Note:It surely is not accidental that the God with whom Moses deals Ex.3 is called both Elohim, the God of power, and Jehovah, God of the <sup>the</sup> covenant who keeps his covenant with man.



of the Messianic hope held forth to the believers already in the early chapters of Genesis (3,15). As soon as sin had brought with it death as its well deserved wages, then the promise of redemption from it was given to the first parents, for what else is the contents of Gen.3,15, if not just this.<sup>15</sup> The undeniable facts of the case in point are these. God had created man in his own image a blameless creature worthy of and destined to an eternal life. Remaining in the state in which he was, he would never have made the acquaintance of the king of terrors. The divine command prohibiting the eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil had established the possibility by which man could chose death as his lot: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (  $\int \int \int \int$  ), (Gen.2,17). Death, nothing more, yet nothing less, death, total death, temporal and eternal, was the dire consequence and due punishment of sin. By his own act of disobedience man had taken the pernicious step and become a mortal being. As sinful mortal he now stood before his offended God awaiting the outburst of divine wrath, the lash of divine chastisement. But before God pronounces the judgment upon man he turns to the

---

15. The New International Ency. absolutely ignores this verse. "The third chapter of Genesis no doubt reflects the attitude of a large circle in Israel; if man had been allowed to remain in the garden of Eden he might have continued his existence indefinitely by the magic virtue of the life-giving fruit. But as he was driven out of the garden, he returns to dust and is no more."



serpent, the seducer of man,<sup>16</sup> and curses it (v.14). And this curse goes over into a blessing for fallen man in v.15, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." To gain the full meaning of this verse we must study it a little closer. Literally translated it reads: "And enmity I will put between thee and between the woman and between thy seed and between her seed, he will crush thee as to the head, and thou shalt crush him as to the heel." The verse quite plainly speaks of two parties, the one the serpent, the other the woman, between whom God establishes bitter antagonism ( $\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\eta}$  enmity, continuing enmity, not a mere outburst of anger, num.35,21). Both parties are supplemented by a seed, on the one side the seed of the serpent, on the other, the woman's seed. The enmity between these two parties is not <sup>one</sup> of inactive hatred, but of active antagonism. This is clear from the

---

16. The serpent is no one else but Satan himself. This is positively <sup>de-</sup>duced from the following facts:

- a.) The serpent, otherwise an irrational being, is described as possessing intellect and power of speech.
- b.) The serpent, considered as a common reptile, was a creature of God and created good (Gen.1,31). Consequently not an enemy of God in itself.
- c.) This is the interpretation of Wisd. 2,24.
- d.) The N.T. speaks of the devil as of the serpent (Rev.19,2;20,2).<sup>2)</sup> And viewing 2 Cor.11,3.14 in the light of Rom.16,20, we find that Paul identifies Satan and the serpent. (Note the use of the word  $\delta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\psi\epsilon\lambda$  in Rom.16,20 which clearly alludes to Gen.3,15).
- e.) Satan was the one who brought death into the world (Joh.8,44), and sinned from the beginning (1 John 3,8).

This remark is pertinent here because this identification of the <sup>ser-</sup>pent with satan is denied by many. So Driver: "It (the serpent) appears



use of the word  $\eta/\psi$ , which means to scrape, to rub; then to injure by rubbing, to bruise, crush, break or dash in pieces (cf. John 19, 17; Psa. 139, 11) and denotes the action of both parties toward one another. Each party assails the other with the dire purpose of destruction. The active conflict, however, is plainly not taken up by all members of both sides, but only by the champions of each side, the woman's seed (expressed by the pronoun  $\lambda' / \eta$ ) and the serpent (expressed by the pronoun  $\eta \eta \underline{\lambda}$ ). These two champions fight the battle to a finish. The outcome of the conflict is stated in no uncertain terms.<sup>18</sup> For although the serpent crushes the heel of the woman's seed

---

here as the representative power of temptation. The serpent is not, however, in the narrative identified with the Evil One."--The Book of Gen. p.44. 17. The Vulgate translates correctly "conterere". The meaning to <sup>swat</sup> aim at, aim at, make for, is incorrect. (Dillmann). Even Driver admits this: "It seems better, on the whole, to retain bruise, supposing it to be used improperly of the serpent in the clause before." The Book of Genesis, p.48. So also Keil, Hengstenberg, Koenig, Delitzsch, Strack, Gunkel. The only reason on account of which this meaning is rejected is that "crush" does <sup>not</sup> properly suit the clause in which it is used of the serpent. But, as <sup>Koenig</sup> says, we have here a Zeugma, (Die Genesis). If the meaning to <sup>swat</sup> aim at would be retained, there would be no progress in thought.  $\eta/\psi$  would <sup>merely</sup> repeat what has been said with  $\eta \underline{\lambda}$ .

18. Driver maintains: "No victory" of the woman's seed is promised, but only a perpetual "antagonism" in which each side, using the weapons which it is natural to employ, will seek to obtain the mastery of the other." -- The Book of Genesis, p.48.

Koenig says: "Das Licht der goettlichen Gnade erglaenzet.....in der Vertheiszung des Sieges ueber die Schlange."



(2 P. <sup>y</sup> acc. of limitation) this is but a comparatively slight wound compared<sup>-ed</sup> to the result of the attack of the woman's seed upon the serpent. He, the woman's seed, will crush the serpent's head (U'X') again acc. of limitation). The woman's seed afflicts a death dealing blow and thus obtains the victory. The victory is gained by a man, the woman's seed, for man. Accordingly through this battle man has gained something. What now is this gain? What is that for which the conflict was? What brought on the enmity which prompted the conflict? Was it not because Satan had seduced man into sin and thus brought upon him mortality, the punishment for disobedience (Gen. 2, 17) that God's wrath was so indignantly kindled against him? Was not this the reason which prompted God to put enmity between the serpent and the woman? Was it not this that called forth the bitter conflict between the serpent and the seed of the woman? Was it not to wrest man from the power of death that God promised the victory over the prince of death, who has the power over death, to man through the woman's seed! What is gained if not that is undone which Satan has done? And what did Satan do here besides<sup>-ed</sup> making man a prey of death?

Beyond the shadow of a doubt this passage contains some hope for fallen man. This is admitted even by Dillmann and Driver.<sup>19</sup> And this hope can impossibly be any other than the restoration to the previous state in which man is free from death.<sup>20</sup> This is still more certain when we remember that

---

19. Driver quoting Otley: "History of the Hebrews", p. 11, says: "The passage thus 'strikes at the outset of redemptive history the note of promise and of hope'." - Book of Genesis, p. 48.

20. Luther pertinently remarks: "Dieser Spruch fasst zugleich in sich die Erlöschung vom Gesetz, Sünde und Tod und zeigt eine klare und gewisse Hoffnung der Auferstehung und Erneuerung im andern Leben nach diesem. Denn so der Schlange Kopf soll zertreten werden, so muss ja auch der Tod aufgehoben und getilgt werden." (St. Louis ed. I, 240). (Cf. also St. L. ed. III, 84f and 650 ff).



this promised victorious woman's seed is not the descendents of man in general, but a distinct individual, no one less than the coming Messiah.<sup>21</sup>

---

So also Dr. Pieper: "Soll der Weibessame der Schlange den Kopf zertreten, also des Teufels Herrschaft und Werke zerstören, so ist damit so gewisz auch die Aufhebung des Loos verheissen, so gewisz der Tod lediglich eine Folge der Sünde ist, die durch die Verführung des Teufels in die Welt kam."--Christl. Dogmatik III, 601.

21. To argue in detail here the Messianic interpretation of this passage would lead too far, but that no other interpretation is possible is established by the following points:

a.) The term <sup>יְהוָה</sup> can be and is used of an individual (Gen.4,25; 1 Sam.1,11<sup>11</sup>) Thus this interpretation is here possible.

b.) The context here does not demand generalization but individualization<sup>- Tim</sup> of the term, since "seed of the woman" is not contrasted to the "seed of the serpent" but rather to the serpent himself.

c.) The woman's seed is referred to with the masculine singular pronoun<sup>הוא</sup>

d.) The parallelism of this passage to Gen. 22,18 which is explained Gal.3 16 as referring to an individual, which is Christ.

e.) Eve understood it as a messianic prophecy as is clear from Gen. 4,1, which the A.V. renders incorrectly, the correct translation being: "I have begotten a man, the Lord." (וְיְהוָה is sign of the acc. not to be translated here with "with". In the context before and after it is used as nota accusativi. If Eve wanted to designate that she had born this son by the help of Jehovah, this would have been made plain by the use of a different preposition to avoid confusion ((cf. Ineol quart. 24,144; L. und W.34,115; 60,337)) ). The Targum of Jesus has: I have received a man, the angel of Jehovah.

f.) That the term "woman's seed" and not Adam's or man's seed is used, points to the Messianic interpretation because the Messiah is in a peculiar<sup>- in</sup> sense the Woman's seed, not having a human father.---Cf. Syn. Ber. Iowa Dist. 25, p.14; Mittl. Dist. 1883; F. Pieper, Dogmatik III, 250.



And faith in a Messiah is meaningless if not joined with a faith in a resurrection to life (1 Cor.15,19), a bodily resurrection to life; for a spiritual resurrection would be no resurrection at all. Man is essentially <sup>all</sup> body and soul. Man's body was created first and then he became a living soul. If man is delivered from death by the Woman's-seed, also his body must be wrested from the state of death.

Thus Moses expresses here what Paul expresses 1 Cor.15,22: "As in <sup>Adam</sup> Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive", and thus man had already here the promise of a future resurrection. ~~That~~ man comprehended this promise is clear from his action immediately after the curse pronounced upon him by the Lord. For after man had heard the words of God, which announced to him the hardships of his coming life and had listened to the words: "For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return", he <sup>does</sup> does not in his grief and sorrow name his wife  $\eta \cdot \rho$ , death, because she was the mother of all the dying, of all those that are born to die, which <sup>would</sup> would have been a fitting appellation in view of the curse, but clinging to that wonderful promise he joyfully and hopefully calls here Eve,  $\eta \cdot \tau \cdot \eta$ , life; "because she was the mother of all the living", (Gen.3,20).

Again it is evident that this hope was apprehended by the first believer from the surviving of religion beyond that most tragic event, the murder of pious Abel by his godless brother Cain. What consolation would the first parents have had at the death of their beloved son if they had not believed a resurrection. Without looking forward to a resurrection of Abel it would have appeared as if God favored the wicked above the good. The devout man had met with death while the evil Cain still remained <sup>alive</sup> alive, yes, God even protected his life by the mark upon his head (Gen.4,15). If here the believers had not entertained a hope for a future blissful life for Abel, they would immediately have cast all religion to the winds. <sup>that</sup> that there was a place which God had reserved for the pious they soon experienced <sup>-indeed</sup> in the translation of the godly Enoch (Gen.5,24). And as the hope of a



resurrection was brought into being with the first Messianic promise so it was always brought to mind by every prophecy of the coming Redeemer. Abraham and Isaac were reminded of this hope and Jacob dies upon it saying: "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord." It was in view of this hope that Balaam cried out: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!"

Now someone might say that although this shows the hope of a resurrection for the believers, yet the conception of the state of the wicked after death is that of annihilation with death. This accusation is not true. Although we have here no vivid description of the future of the wicked, yet there is for them a punishment beyond the grave. The idea was not spun out in its details, because it is throughout a scriptural teaching, that for the wicked death ends all. Even the New Testament speaks in this way, terming the state of the wicked beyond death a state of eternal death, beyond the grave there is for the wicked a life which is a death. But that this death is not a ceasing of existence is clear from a study of the term  $\text{שִׁאוֹל}$ . This word is essentially the Hebrew designation for hell. To determine from those passages, which will not permit of this rendering, that this meaning is wrong is a hasty judgment. Indeed Scriptures occasionally employ the term "sheol" to designate the state of death (e.g. Gen. 37,35; 42,38, etc.). But there is a well known connection between death and damnation, between grave and hell. Both are punishments of God for <sup>sin</sup> sin, hell is the second death, the eternal continuation of temporal death. The designation of the grave by the use of the word "sheol" is a borrowed one. "Sheol" in the first sense is hell.<sup>22</sup> It is a place where God metes out punishment to evildoers. God assigned the godless rebel band of Korah to "sheol" (Num.16,30). Those who are idolatrous and vain are threatened <sup>with</sup> with

---

22. Space will not permit to enlarge upon this subject. For complete <sup>proof</sup> proof of this matter see sheol. Quart. 10,22 ff; Syn. Bericht, III., 86,59-67; L. und W. 17, 362.



the fires of "sheol", Deut. 32,22: "A fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell (sheol)." Of course from this no resurrection can be proven and in so far this paragraph is beside the point. Nevertheless it is here clearly shown that the conception of the Pentateuch regarding the future of the dead evildoers is not one of opposition to the New Testament. A resurrection is not denied or annihilation <sup>taught.</sup>

Viewing now the whole Pentateuch we firmly believe that it knows of a resurrection after death. On the ground of what has been said we are justified in our belief. The Pentateuch surely holds out to its readers the doctrine of a future resurrection of the flesh and clearly leads the way to life everlasting. Already in the third chapter of Genesis those who deny any traces of a resurrection in the early Biblical writings are contradicted.<sup>23</sup> Likewise the theory of such who hold that for the conception of a future life the early believers were dependent on ancestor worship falls to the ground.<sup>24</sup> For what connection can there be between the crass and ludicrous ideas of a heathenish worship and the sublime thoughts of the Pentateuch in regard to a future life. The conception of

---

23. "It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew writings. It is not found in the Pentateuch." McClintock and Strong.---"In early Hebrew thought there is no trace of this conception, it is unknown alike to prophets, legislators, and poets." The New International Ency.

24. Thus Dr. Charles says: "Early Yahwism had no eschatology of the individual and concerned itself with the existence of the nation. Thus the individual was left to his hereditary heathen beliefs and these can be best interpreted as part and parcel of Ancestor Worship." A Crit. Hist. of the Doct. of a Future Life, pp. 19-20.



the Pentateuch is clearly a God-given one and distinctly separate of any connection with any heathen religion, whether this be ancestor worship or Egyptian resuscitation. That the idea of the resurrection should have been borrowed from the Persians is absolutely untenable since we find <sup>this</sup> this development among the Persians much later.<sup>25</sup>

Having arrived at this conclusion in regard to the Pentateuch, we could close our investigation here, since the proof of the doctrine of the resurrection from the Pentateuch, the very earliest sacred writings, is sufficient proof for the presence of this doctrine in the rest of the Scriptures. However, we have in the remaining portions of the Old Testament such vivid and pronounced mention of this doctrine that we cannot afford to overlook them.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Psalms. In more direct words we find this doctrine in the Book of the Psalms. The same thing that has been said of the Pentateuch, namely that this doctrine is necessarily a part of the doctrine of God and of the Messianic hope, may also be said of the psalms, and that in a still more pronounced degree; for these doctrines certainly hold a prominent position in the theology of the Psalms. So even Briggs says: "The doctrine of God is especially rich in the attributes. The kindness, goodness, and love of God stand out more distinctly in the Psalter than in any other part of the Old Testament.....The doctrine of redemption is richly unfolded, especially in its experimental side, in the personal deliverance of the individual from sin and evil."<sup>26</sup> One especially stressed

---

25. v. Hoffmann says correctly: Nichts kann irriger sein, als die Meinung, die Todtenauferstehung sei eine spaet erst durch menschliches Nachdenken angekommene Idee, deren erste Spuren ~~aus~~, wenn sie nicht gar erst von den Persen an die Juden gekommen ist, <sup>wir</sup> bei Jesaija und Ezechiel, vielleicht schon <sup>schon</sup> in den Psalmen Davids begegnen sollen.--Schriftbeweis III, 496.

Cf. Hengstenberg, Beitrage zur Einl. ins A.T., III, 566-567.

26. The International Critical Commentary. Psalms, I, p.xcvi.



point in the Psalms, of the utmost importance for the doctrine of resurrection, is the promised resurrection of the Messiah, which (according to 1 Cor.15,12ff) is the prop upon which the hope of resurrection rests.

(Cf. Psa.16,9.11, quoted by Peter in Acts 2,26-28 and also by Paul, Acts 13,35 as treating of the resurrection). This point is also seen by Briggs:

"In the Psalter the Messianic ideal is in some respects richer than in the Prophets. The royal Messiah, the son of David, appear in most vivid, dramatic situations in Pss. 2 and 110, which find their only realization in

the resurrection, enthronement, and reign of Jesus Christ."<sup>27</sup> But we are in

the Psalms not solely dependent upon the presupposition of the doctrine of resurrection. This doctrine is taught here in no uncertain terms. Briggs,

who is far removed from being a positive Bible student, goes so far as to say:"The future life of man in a state of redemption after death is more

clearly depicted in Pss. 16,49, 73 than anywhere else in the O.T."<sup>28</sup> Not only<sup>29</sup> <sup>only</sup>

is that criticism, which denies any trace of the doctrine of resurrection ignorant of or wilfully blinded to the facts, but also that view, held by

<sup>30</sup> Delitzsch, which contends that the psalms do not express a faith in a

---

27. Inter. Crit. Comment. Psalms I, p.xcvii.

28. But Psa. 16 is clearly Messianic and speaks primarily of the resurrection of the Messiah (Acts 2,26-28), upon which however the future hope of the believer rests. -Lm

29. Int. Crit. Comment. Psalms I, p.xcvii.

30. Delitzsch says of the Psalms:"ueberall liegt da kein gemeingueltiger Glaubenssatz vor, sondern wir sehen, wie sich der Glaube an ein jenseitiges Leben zunaechsts als nur individuelle conclusio aus erfahrungsgewissen Praemissen des Glaubensbewusstseins loszuringen bemueht ist, und weit entfernt, das Grab und Hades durch ein explizites Wissen um ein besseres Jenseits depotenziert waeren, sind sie vielmehr nur momentan fuer das darueber sich hinaussetzende Hochgefuehl des Lebens aus Gott wie verschwunden und also <sup>noch</sup> nicht faktisch und dauernd ueberwunden." (Delitzsch: Commentar zu den Psalmen, pp.60-61).



resurrection, but only show that there was within writers some dim and hazy notion, a beautiful yet unfounded hope of a future life of an unknown description, is utterly untenable in view of such clear passages as Ps.17,15 and Ps.49,15-16. We must devote some attention to these passages.

In Ps. 17,15 David sings: "In righteousness I shall behold thy face. I shall be satisfied in awaking (my awakening,  $\text{וַיִּשְׁכַּח}$  is intransitive) with thy image." In the preceding verses he had spoken of the wicked, who live in security and make life miserable for him just because he is a believer. Nevertheless the advantage is not on their side as might seem to be the case. They have their portion in this life and when death comes they must leave their hoarded treasures to their posterity. What a contrast this is to his own end.  $\text{לִי}$  stands here with emphasis, "as for me", on the other hand, considering my case, it is not as hopeless as this. For "I will behold thy face." The words are addressed to God (v.13), to Jehovah, the God of grace. Him he expects to see face to face. That this beholding God is not a re-experiencing of divine grace in this life is evident from its contrast to the end of his enemies and by the addition of the word  $\text{בְּיָשׁוּר}$ , "in righteousness." He is speaking of a physical seeing of God, which cannot be a pleasure but a terror to a sinful man (Ex.23,20). It will, however, be a pleasure to him since he will then be "in righteousness". The righteousness here spoken of is not a mere righteousness of life, but the imputed righteousness of the Messiah. (We see again how inseparably the thought of resurrection is connected with the Messianic hope). This righteousness in which he will then be confirmed, this consummated righteousness, is in itself an unspeakable joy which he awaits. At the time of which the Psalmist sings this righteousness will receive its righteous reward, a seeing of the gracious face of God. He clearly speaks of the bliss of heaven, which consists in the beatific vision of God. That such a vision is here spoken of is also proved by the parallel second part of the verse: "I shall be satisfied <sup>in</sup> with my awakening with thy image." He speaks here of an awakening, in which he



shall be satisfied.  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבֹּר}$  means to be satisfied, satiated, filled, denoting complete satisfaction having the connotation of superabundance.

Such a satisfaction is nowhere found in life, as the Psalmist had experienced. <sup>3/</sup> Besides, that is mentioned wherewith he shall be satisfied and filled, namely "with thy image". The image of God includes all that he has and is. The Septuagint rendering " $\tau\eta\gamma \delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha\gamma \theta\omicron\upsilon$ " gives a good commentary <sup>- Terry</sup> on these words. According to the expressed words of this verse the vision of God cannot be limited in any way. Therefore to hold that the singer here speaks of the awakening to a new satisfied life after dark hours of trial is clearly against the words and their context, to say nothing of the impossible and ludicrous idea according to which these words refer to an awakening out of a physical sleep.

Can we say that the Psalms contain no clear ideas about the after life.

What are the conceptions of David uttered in this verse. They are these:

- 1.) Death is but a mere sleep out of which there will be an awakening; <sup>This</sup> 2.) This must be a bodily awakening, for the soul does not die; <sup>- Tim</sup> 3.) This resurrection will be "in righteousness", to a state of perfect holiness and innocence, <sup>t</sup> to the restored image of God; <sup>3 2</sup> 4.) This resurrection will be one to bliss;

31. The word  $\text{וַיִּשְׂבֹּר}$  which occurs only in the Hiphil is very often used of resurrection out of death. Thus clearly 2 K.4,31, also Job 14,12; Isa.26,19; Dan. 12,2.

32. This is shown by the contrast to the end of the wicked, by the favor <sup>of</sup> God of which the writer is conscious, and by the fact that this resurrection <sup>- Tim</sup> will be "in righteousness".

This view <sup>view</sup> of the passage is also held by Cheyne. But he comes to this view only because he places the psalms into the late Persian age and sees here a clear connection with Zoroastrian religion. (Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, p.269ff.) But it is a proven fact that the Israelites had this <sup>- it's</sup> conception before they came into contact with Persia. Besides the Israeliti <sup>short.</sup> conception is a much higher one than that of Zoroastrianism (cf. Koenig: Theo



5.) This bliss will consist in the beatific vision of God in all his glory. How well justified is the proximity of this Psalm to Psalm 16, where the resurrection of the coming Savior is taught in which all this hope of the Psalmist regarding himself has its assurance.

In a like manner the resurrection is spoken of in Ps.49,15.16. "As a flock to sheol they are put, death pastures them and the upright rule over them (LXX: κατακτείνουσιν) in the morning, and their form (is given) to the consumation (πισῶ Inf. cstr. Piel, causative of) to fall, fall away, waste) of sheol, without a dwelling to it. But God will redeem my soul from the hand of sheol, for he will take me." In this Psalm the proud wicked are spoken of who "trust in their wealth and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches" living in perfect security.

*They are "like the beasts that perish". They must go the way of all flesh.*  
But all this avails them nothing against <sup>death.</sup> And then, "as a flock they are put to sheol". Sheol is here, as often, the state of the dead, the New Testament "Hades". It is viewed here as an uncomfortable enclosure, as a sheep fold. There is for them also a shepherd who pastures them, namely gloomy death. Death is here personified as the king of terrors. In this state of death we also find "the upright" and it might seem as if after death the upright has no advantage over the wicked. But this the writer of Ps. 49 denies: "The upright will have dominion over them in the

---

Theol. des A. T., p.312) and since this was an essential part of Israelitic religion from the very beginning, the origin of the Old Testament doctrine is much older than that of the Persian conception.--Cf. Hengstenberg: Beitrage III, p.567 ff; Haevernik: Daniel, p.509 ff.

33. Some translate  $\Pi 77$  with "tread upon", "trample on". This meaning is questionable.  $\Pi 77$  with  $\Delta$  is standing designation for "ruling"; However, even if the other meaning is retained, it has in it the connotation of a victory, to trample down as a victor.



morning." The words clearly show an advantage of the saints over the wicked after death. Wherein does this advantage consist? Well, in the first place there will be a morning, an awakening, for the morning is symbol of awakening.<sup>34</sup> This morning is for all of them that lie asleep in the arms of sheol, it is not limited in any way. It is predicated also of the wicked, yes, especially of the wicked. We have here a resurrection of the just and of the unjust. On this resurrection morning a very remarkable thing shall occur. The tables will be turned and the upright will have dominion, rule over the wicked. This resurrection will be a victory of <sup>the</sup> the believer and a defeat of the unbeliever. Also the nature of this victory is described. The defeat of the wicked is described thus: "Their form (supply "is assigned") to the consummation of sheol without a dwelling to it." The resurrection of the wicked is, according to this, only a resurrection to a greater punishment and not a relief at all. They awake in order that their form (  $\text{מִצָּלְמָת}$  from  $\text{צָלְמָת}$  according to the Kethib, according to the *Qeri'* from  $\text{צָלְמָת}$  is form, shape, and refers to their whole earthly, bodily make-up; (as Delitzsch expresses it: "Inre Leiblichkeit, ihre ganze diesseitige Aeuszerlichkeit,") their mundane body, which on that day will have been restored to them although it has seen corruption, will be given over to the consummation of hell. Their body will now be given over to the second death, specifically to the consummation of this death to be tortured afresh. That this torture is greater than the first is shown by the change of the mode of expression. While in the first death they were merely placed in the sheol, which causes them to waste away. This second death will also be an eternal death as is seen from v.20, "they shall never see light". Their fate is still further described when it is said of their <sup>the;</sup> their

---

34. Note the article in  $\text{מִצָּלְמָת}$ . The Psalmist speaks of the morning in a matter of fact way, as of a morning well known to all. It must have been a well known fact that there would be such a morning.



body that it has no more a habitation. This stands in contrast to all the wealth, which they had possessed on earth, especially to real estate property (v.11). While on earth they had wonderfully magnificent dwelling places, which to them seemed established forever, they have now not even a spot to call their own. They lead a restless and disturbed existence. Such is the nature of the defeat of the wicked. In marked contrast to <sup>that</sup> that stands the after life of the victor, the believer. The Korahite speaking of himself as of a representative believer, says: "But God will redeem my soul from the hand of sheol, for he will take me." These words need hardly any explanation. The writer is still speaking of what will take place on that morning, on the day of resurrection. <sup>35</sup> Then God, the Almighty, who has power over the realms of death, will redeem his body <sup>36</sup> from the hand (the power) of sheol, death, both temporal and eternal. This is as far as he will go in the realms of death. How the Psalmist pictures this redemp-

---

35. The Psalmist is here clearly speaking of what God will do for him on that great morning, after his death has taken place. He does not express the hope of a bodily translation into the abode of God without seeing temporal death, basing such hope on Enoch's and Elijah's translation, as Delitzsch and many others hold. Such an hope would be an unfounded and unrealized hope and would have no place in inspired Scriptures. Besides, such a thought is foreign to the context. The impossibility of the <sup>-escape</sup> escape from death is a prominent thought in the psalms (Ps.89,48). Neither can Hengstenberg's view be held, which sees here only a redemption from <sup>-ly</sup> earthly perils.

36. <sup>~</sup>וְיִשְׁׁוּׁ] may here mean "myself", "me". But וְיִשְׁׁוּׁ is also used of the <sup>the</sup> corpse (cf. Lev.19,28; Num. 5,2; Hag.2,13).



tion he tells us when he says: "For he (God) will take me." God will <sup>pluck</sup> pluck him out of the clutches of death and claim him for his own, so that the communion which the believer has already in this earthly life with God <sup>will</sup> will not only remain unbroken by death, but will become still closer after <sup>death</sup> death.

We have here then a clear knowledge of a day of resurrection, of an <sup>715</sup> awakening of both just and unjust. This will be a bodily awakening (715), and the wicked will arise to a second eternal death, the just however to a life with God.

There are in the psalms also other passages which allude to the resurrection less clearly, and they must be viewed in the light of these clear passages. Such passages are Psa. 73, 24: "Who shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory"; Ps. 34, 21, 22: "Evil shall slay the wicked, and they that hate the righteous shall be desolate. The Lord redeemeth the soul of his servants; and none of them that trust in him shall be desolate." (Cf. also Ps. 1).

With such clear passages regarding to future life at hand it is a <sup>per-</sup> version of truth to say that the conception of the life beyond the grave is in the least hazy. But does not the argument of <sup>is</sup> Melitzsch hold good when he says that in the Psalms the hopeless darkness of sheol is still a <sup>37</sup> <sup>37</sup> mystery? It certainly does not. In the first place there never was at any time <sup>such</sup> such a hopeless obscurity. And certainly this statement cannot stand up against Ps. 49, 15, 16. The true believer always had before him the hope of an <sup>eternal</sup> eternal life. Indeed there is no little obscurity in regard to the state of death, which obscurity is not even entirely lifted for New Testament believers. Even in the light of the <sup>new</sup> New Testament we know very little about the state of death before resurrection. <sup>38</sup> But this is not and never was a hopeless

---

37. "Das hoffnungslose Dunkel des Schœol bleibt unaufgehoben." Com. ueber die Psalmen, p. 60.

38. F. Pieper: Christl. Dogmatik III, 574-578.



obscurity. The passages cited by Delitzsch as showing hopelessness of the dying (Ps. 6,5; 30,9; 88,10-13) in no wise prove his contentions. All <sup>these</sup> passages may be summarized in the words of Ps. 115,17: "The dead praise <sup>not</sup> the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." These words do not <sup>indi-</sup>cate an ignorance of a future resurrection. What they state is true to this day. Those that go down into the realms of death do not praise the Lord; then for a while their mouth is stopped, for a time they are unable physically to praise God. Then also we must remember that to praise God means to publish his name, to spread his word, to preach the Gospel. And this the departed are no more capable of because it would be useless. <sup>this</sup> This is what is meant in all those passages cited by Delitzsch. In each case the psalmist is wrestling with God in prayer for the sustenance of his <sup>life</sup> and he argues with God advancing this point, that if God permits him to <sup>die</sup> he will be depriving himself of a willing publisher of his word. So in Ps.6,5-6: "O save me for thy mercies' sake. For in death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?" Ps.30,10: "Wilt Thou show wonders to the dead (wilt thou wait with thy aid until I have died)? Shall the dead arise (come back to live in this world) and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" In the state of death there is no preaching of God's grace; for there it would be in vain. In all these passages the question of a final resurrection is not regarded, the Psalmist having in mind only the deliverance from his present tribulations.

\*\*\*\*\*

Proverbs. We will now direct our attention to those sacred writings <sup>which</sup> stand on the height of Hebrew literature. The occasion in <sup>which</sup> Solomon in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes alludes to the life beyond the grave are so scanty that we would pass these books up were it not that the <sup>critics</sup> critics



find in them a denial of the immortality and therewith also of the resurrection. This cannot be held on the ground that sheol, "has no moral significance"<sup>39</sup>; since it clearly has such significance in at least five of the nine passages in which the term occurs in Proverbs (5,5;7,27;9,18;15,24;23,14<sup>41</sup>). Since sheol is a place of judgment and punishment for harlots (Prov.5,5; 7,27; 9,18) it cannot be said that "there is no judgment after death"<sup>40</sup> taught in Proverbs. On the other hand the book of Proverbs speaks in New Testament terms when it ascribes to the wicked eternal death (19,16;21,16) and to the righteous eternal life (10,25; 12,28). The state of punishment and the state of bliss are contrasted Prov.15,24:"The way of life is <sup>above</sup> above to the wise, that he may depart (escape) from hell (sheol) beneath." Thus Proverbs does not deny immortality and therewith also not the resurrection.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ecclesiastes. But what of the book of Ecclesiastes? Is it not true that "Ecclesiastes denies any immortality categorically,"<sup>41</sup> and therewith also a resurrection to a future life? Does not criticism therefore rightfully accuse the Preacher of Materialism and Sadduceism?<sup>42</sup> Certainly <sup>-ly</sup> not. All these accusations are groundless and rest upon a wrong conception of the entire book. The book does not teach that it is the best one can do <sup>-do</sup> to make the most of this present, since there is nothing in store for man beyond the grave. Solomon speaks here of the vanity of life in this world, not of life altogether. He shows the vanity of man who tries to gain satisfaction in this life by his own strength, in wealth and honor, in pleasure and authority, in wisdom and learning, for all these mundane things are accompanied by labor, care, and sorrow and in death he must part with all his

---

39. Toy in The Int. Crit. Com. Proverbs, p.xvi.

40. ibid.

41. International Standard Bible Ency. under "Resurrection".

42. P. Haupt, Koenig, etc.



gains. There are nevertheless real glimpses of joy in this world, which are, however, granted by God alone (2,24-26;3,13;5,1.18;11,9)<sup>43</sup>. Yet the greatest good, the summum bonum is not found in this life. Therefore in view of a final judgment, the Preacher earnestly advises an adherence to the commands of God.

But what of those passages in which he speaks of man's death? Does he not say of the sons of men, that they are like beasts as regards their end? "That which befalleth the sons of men", says he, "befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea they have all one breath; so that man hath no preeminence above a beast", (3,19)<sup>44</sup>. But is it not true what he says? Is not man, so far as we see his life, on a par with the beast? Surely, as the <sup>beast,</sup> beast, so man is born to die, man's life is but a pilgrimage to the grave. <sup>this</sup> This thought brings sadness to the Preacher, that man, who was at the beginning <sup>-ing</sup> not subject to the grave, has become mortal. In mere outward respect <sup>man</sup> man and beast both breathe and live and die alike. "All go unto one place (to sheol, the realm of death); all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again" (cf.Gen.3,19)<sup>45</sup>. But although there is not any animal preeminence of man over the beast, yet there is a vast difference between the two. This the Preacher states 3,21: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward?" <sup>46</sup> Though in

---

43. Eccl. does not teach: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."<sup>17)</sup>

44. Note in the first place that Solomon says: "I said in mine heart" (3,17).

45. Note that the creation story and the story of the fall of man are the basis of this whole discussion.

46. Delitzsch contends that this translation is wrong and says the words must be translated: "Wer weisz hinsichtlich des Geistes der Menschenkinder, <sup>-kinder,</sup> ob er aufwaerts steige, und hinsichtlich des Geistes des Tieres, ob er hinabfahre niederwaerts zur Erde?" But his arguments <sup>over</sup> against



physical death, in the outward act of expiring man and beast are alike, yet there is a difference which is not observed by human eyes. Man has an immortal soul which was given him at creation (12,7). Thus the <sup>Preach-</sup>er clearly upholds immortality. The question in v.22 (chap.3): "Who shall bring him (man) to see what shall be after him?" does not concern the <sup>life</sup> in the afterworld. The Preacher asks: "Who shall bring man to see what <sup>hap-</sup> happens on earth after his death?" This is a thought running through the whole book that man does not know and cannot control what will happen on earth after he has left it (6,12; 10,14; 2,18.19).

But what will we say to Chap.9,5.6: "But the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun." The key to this passage lies in the words "under the sun". It <sup>says</sup> nothing of the state beyond the grave save that it speaks of the relation of the departed to this world. As far as this world is concerned "the dead know not anything", (Isa.63,16) "neither have they any more a <sup>-ward</sup> reward" of their worldly labor, and that because on earth "the memory of them is forgotten". Also the love, hatred, and envy which during their mundane life they cherished over against others in this world is now perished <sup>and</sup> and exercises no influence upon the world. And forever they have no more a portion in anything that occurs on earth. They have absolutely no share

---

Hengstenberg and others who take the  $\text{לֵב} \text{לֵב} \text{לֵב}$  and  $\text{לֵב} \text{לֵב} \text{לֵב}$  as the <sup>-ick</sup> article are not convincing. So much is certain, Solomon does not ask for himself <sup>self-</sup> information as to whether the spirit of man goeth upward, and that of the beast downward to the earth. He knows that the spirit of man goeth upward to God who gave it (12,7). And he is here bringing this knowledge <sup>of</sup> of his for the information of his readers.



in all things done under the sun. So then also here there is no denial of a life beyond death.

Again, when we read in 9,10b: "For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave (sheol) wither thou goest" this can impossibly be made to teach an annihilation. Here we have merely a description of the state of death as compared to the activities on earth (cf.9,10a).

The sum of the teachings of Ecclesiastes then is: In view of the fact that earthly life is vanity and man of his own efforts cannot make it otherwise, man should obey the commandments of God (12,13). Although this very often seems to bring no advantage over the wicked (7,15;9,23), yes, the disadvantage (8,14) in this life, and although both, the just as well as the unjust, go into the same death, nevertheless death does not end all; for when man dies he goes to his eternal home(12,5

to the home of his eternity), he has an eternal existence in accordance with his very nature, since God has given him the eternity into his heart (3,11).<sup>47</sup> And beyond death there is a judgment in which righteousness shall prevail (3,17; 11,9; 12,14; 8,12).

Thus the claim that Ecclesiastes denies immortality and therewith the Resurrection, falls to the ground. And although the Preacher does not teach a resurrection expressis verbis, it is nevertheless implied.

\*\*\*\*\*

Job. To this period which marks the height of Old Testament literature <sup>-ture</sup> undoubtedly belongs the composition of the Book of Job. Perhaps it too was written by Solomon. Therefore also this book comes in for consideration here. And in no other book of the Old Testament have we clearer testimony to the resurrection of the body than in Job 19,25-27.

---

47. Eccl. 3,11b       $\text{הַיְדוּשׁוֹת הַיְדוּשׁוֹת הַיְדוּשׁוֹת}$       The A.V. mis-translates "world" for "eternity".



In order to understand this passage in all its importance, it is necessary to view the whole context in which it stands. Job, living in the land of Uz in or near Mesopotamia, and most probably a contemporary of the patriarchs, is a man after the heart of God (1,1; 2,3). Although he is a true believer, he has his shortcomings (38,2; 39,32; 40,3; 41,1). God showers upon him innumerable blessings. He gives him wealth (1,3) and blesses him with children (1,4). Being a dear child of God, he is the object of Satan's snares and attacks. Job has evidently resisted him steadfastly. Satan seeing his attacks upon Job as limited by God too weak, one day appears in the assembly of God's angels before God (1,6-12) to speak with God concerning Job. God expresses his joy over Job's conduct (1,8). Thereupon Satan questions Job's piety. He claims that the steadfastness of Job is not remarkable at all considering all the blessings Job receives from God. Job does not fear God in vain. If God should take from Job his possessions, his piety would soon turn into godlessness (1,10-11). God thereupon permits Satan to take all Job's possessions from him, but commands him to spare his body. Hopefully Satan now takes from Job his wealth and children (1,13-19). Job is indeed very sorrowful, but contrary to Satan's expectations, he does not sin (1,20-22). Thereupon Satan gets from God the permission to attack Job in his body, but he must spare Job's life. Satan making full use of this permission, strikes Job with a frightful affliction (2,7-8), with the most terrible form of leprosy, so that Job's living body begins to decay. Not even this is enough. Satan turns from Job his own wife and uses her to tempt him from faith. But in all this Job remains steadfast (2,10). But his sickness is prolonged, there is no relief. His three best friends come to comfort him (2,11) but they only aggravate his suffering (2,12). Job's suffering is almost unbearable and brings him finally to such agony that he curses the day of his birth (3). In this misstep of Job, the friends mean to have found the cause of Job's suffering, it is his sin. Eliphaz the Temanite begins to reprimand Job for his sin, bringing Job to that stage



where he wishes death upon himself (6,9). Nevertheless Job maintains his innocence, knowing that God forgives sin (7,20-21). Bildad then calls Job vindication arrogance (8,2), saying that God does not punish without cause (8,3), that he does not punish the just (8,20), and that Job's defense is hypocrisy (8,13). Over against him Job maintains his innocence (9-10). Zophar the Naamathite confirms Bildad's accusation of hypocrisy against Job (11). Job again defends himself (12-14), expressing his confidence in God even beyond death (13,15,16) and denying only a coming back to life on this earth (14,10-14). But his friends are not yet satisfied. Eliphaz again speaks on Job's iniquity (15,5). Job becoming very indignant over this repetition of his ungrounded accusation (16,3-4) still maintaining his innocence (16,17), and since all his friends fail him, puts his whole trust in his heavenly Witness (16,19-20). Bildad thereupon classes Job with the most wicked of men (18,4). This causes Job to burst forth in lamentation of his terrible plight. God has taken all from him, his honor, <sup>wealth</sup> wealth and family, he has afflicted him with a frightful disease (v.20), his <sup>friends</sup> friends and his kinsfolk, yes, even his servants abhor him. And not only that, <sup>even</sup> even God, whom he has served, acts as his enemy (v.11). And now his last <sup>friends</sup> friends stand before him and unjustly reprimand him. He urgently pleads for pity. On earth there is nothing left for him, no comfort and no consolation. All he has is his life and that is, to all indications, even to depart from <sup>him</sup> him. And now in this dark night of tribulation and despair, when all earthly hope is gone, he sees a shining light. His soul in faith breaks through the enshrouding gloom as his mouth utters those remarkably hopeful words in 19,25-27. And in order to give these words every emphasis, to make them stand forth as a beacon over the surging waves, against which the strongest breakers cannot prevail, he introduces them with the words: "Oh that my words would be written; Oh that they would be recorded in a book with iron pen and lead eternally graven in the rock." (19,23-24). Job now looks away from all his trouble. He wishes now to give utterance to words, which he would like to have preserved eternally. Therefore he wishes that they



were recorded in a book, or, better still, that they were hewn in a rock and the excavated cavities filled with lead, that they might stand forth boldly as a testimony for him to the world after his death. In spite of the fact that he experiences nothing but misfortune, that on earth there is no comfort and hope for him, that there is on earth apparently nothing in store for him but impending death, yet the world should know that he does not depart in despair, that as he lived a child of God, so also will he die. Then too the words which he is about to utter are worthy of being preserved eternally. He places them on a par with God's words, he knows that he speaks inspired words of the greatest importance. The words to which he refers are vv. 25-27: "But I, I know, my redeemer lives and as the dust upon the dust he will arise and behind my skin which they have thus destroyed ( lit.-smitten in pieces) and from my flesh I shall see God, whom I will see for myself, and my eyes behold and not another; my veins famish in my bosom."

In spite of the fact that Job can expect no comfort and no help from man and that death is according to all indications inevitably near, he yet is fully conscious of one on whom he can rely, who is still on his side. The  $\text{ב}$  is most probably adversative, "but".  $\text{יָדָע}$  stands at the beginning evidently with emphasis and in marked contrast to his friends. While his friends claim that his cause is hopeless, nevertheless he knows otherwise. "But as for me, I know, my redeemer is living," says he. He comforts himself with a  $\text{שֹׁדֵד}$   $\text{שֹׁדֵד}$  is *qal* of the verb  $\text{שָׁדַד}$ , used as a noun.  $\text{שֹׁדֵד}$  means to redeem, to ransom, and so a  $\text{שֹׁדֵד}$  is a redeemer, one who ransoms another. The question of paramount importance is: "Who is this redeemer, this  $\text{שֹׁדֵד}$  of whom Job speaks." Many wish to interpret it of a mere man, a kinsman of Job. They point for the substantiation of this interpretation to Lev. 25,25 where this verb is used to designate the obligation which evolved upon the nearest relative, namely the obligation to redeem the property which his relative had been compelled to sell for debt. This is one meaning which this word has (Num. 5,8; 1 K. 16,11) it can mean "nearest kinsman."



It was also one of the prime duties of this kinsman to avenge the death of his murdered relative; in case anyone's nearest relative was murdered, he became the official executioner of the murderer. But this interpretation does not fit here at all. Job despairs of all human participation in his trouble. His best friends, his closest relatives turn their backs upon him, they abhor him. Besides Job could not expect his kinsman to restore his property, neither did he, for the loss of the property was the least of his vexation. Could he then be looking forward to the time when his kinsman would avenge his death? Certainly not, for he did not expect a violent death at the hands of a murderer, in which case only the nearest kinsman could avenge his death. Even if Job had a kinsman, who had not turned from him, what could such an one do for him? This interpretation then is impossible. No man is meant. But  $\text{שׂוֹׁלֵט}$  has in the O. T. a very peculiar meaning. It is often applied to God (Prov. 23,10.11; Jer.50,34; Ps.19,14; 78,35; 103,4; Isa.41,14; 43,14; 44,6.24; ~~6,24~~; 47,4; 48,17; 49,7.26; 54,5; ~~5,8~~; 60,16; 63,16). The verb is used of God as early as Exod. 6,6; 15,13. The closest thought then to link up with  $\text{שׂוֹׁלֵט}$  is that of God, and it is God to whom Job here refers.<sup>48</sup> The  $\text{שׂוֹׁלֵט}$  here is the same person he has mentioned 16,19. There he called him his witness ( $\text{עֵד}$ ) and says of him that he is in heaven ( $\text{בְּשָׁמַיִם}$ ). But not God considered as the Trinity is meant here, but God the Son, the second person of the Trinity. The term is used in that way of the Son of God in Ps. 72,14: "He will redeem their soul from oppression and violence, and precious will be their blood in his sight," and beyond the shadow of a doubt Isa. 59,20: "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." Job here speaks in terms peculiar to the patriarchs, at whose time he most probably lived. For Jacob uses the verb  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  when he says in the well known blessing

---

48. This even Driver and Gray admit (The Intl. Crit. Comm.): "none other than the living God." *Gessius: God himself (help + English version sub שׂוֹׁלֵט).*



(Gen.48,16): "The angel of the Lord which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Accordingly, the Angel  $\kappa\upsilon\tau' \ \epsilon\epsilon \ \omicron\chi\eta\eta$ , the often mentioned and well known angel of the Lord, the second person of Trinity, is the redeemer, the  $\text{שׂוֹמֵר}$ . In this sense then the  $\text{שׂוֹמֵר}$  is Job's true kinsman, he is his true brother. Job calls this redeemer a living redeemer, ( $\text{חַי}$ )<sup>50</sup> Job sees before him nothing but death, his own life is failing, but his redeemer lives. And in view of the fact that this redeemer is God we understand that this  $\text{חַי}$  means much more than merely possessing life. God is the living God (deut.5,26; Ps. 42,3; 43,8; 84,2; etc.) and that because he himself lives eternally, living through all adversity, death has no power over him. But he is also the living God because he is the fountain of life, the giver of life. The life of God is communicative (Gen.2,7; Deut.32,39)<sup>57</sup> This point especially is of the utmost importance to Job, that he has a living redeemer, the who apparently is at the door of death. This point he stresses emphatically. Knowing that this redeemer has redeemed him and is living for him, he calls him  $\text{שׂוֹמֵר}$ , "my redeemer", confident of this very fact that he will also grant him life; not in this world, not a mere restitution of health, for he is sure of impending death (16,5; 17,1; 19,10). And of all this, of the fact that he has a living redeemer, and of all that this implies he is

---

49. He is distinguished from the Father in Gen.48,15. The N.T. designation of the Son of God as the Redeemer is well known (Rom.3,24; Gal.3,13;etc.). The book of Job also speaks of this angel. Elihu speaks of an angel who is mediator between God and man, who brings reconciliation and obtains grace, who is the Lord (33,23.24).

50. Whether  $\text{חַי}$  is adj. or Qual. Perf. is immaterial and cannot be decided. It matters nothing if we translate: "my redeemer lives" or "is living".

51. Note again how the doctrine of resurrection links up with the doctrine concerning God and the Messiah.



certain. He says of it <sup>2</sup>יָדַעַתִּי (I know). <sup>2</sup>יָדַעַתִּי means to perceive, to come to know. This was with Job a deep seated knowledge, a firm conviction. He had come to know and expresses here his passing opinion. "Here he gives us no guesses, no surmises, no opinions half clouded with doubt, but the unalterable conviction of a suffering soul, uttered in the face of death, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.'<sup>52</sup>" It is a knowledge of faith (Rom.8,38; 2 Tim.1,12) gained out of the word of God (Gen. 3,15; etc.). In spite of what his <sup>friends</sup> friends say, in spite of the fact that things seem to indicate the contrary, he believes in a living Redeemer.

That we have not put too much in the word <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים is evident not only from the fact that a <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים means nothing to Job, who is at the portals of death if he will not resurrect him, but also from that which he predicates of him in all the following words. He says <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים, <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים from <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים with the adj. ending <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים means "hinder", "hindmost", "latter" (Gen.33,2), then "after", "later", "following", then "the last", "latest". It has the meaning of "last" in our passage. Many take it here in the sense of "afterman" (so Gesenius) (Hintermann, nachträglichlicher Verteidiger) in the sense of future vindicator. This interpretation springs from the intentions of the commentators to uphold the parallelism with <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים which they interpret as speaking of a mere human vindicator. But 1.) they have given the wrong meaning to <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים, 2.) we would expect in a strict parallelism not <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים but <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים אֲחֵרִים to correspond to <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים, 3.) and there is no parallel to substantiate the rendering of <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים with "afterman".<sup>53</sup> It could be translated, as Delitzsch says, with posterus, but used of a divine Person it always has the

---

52. The Biblical Review, VII, Oct. 1922, p. 545.

53. As Delitzsch says: "Man hat dem <sup>2</sup>אָחֵרִים die Bedd. Nachmann im Sinne von vindex (Hirz. Öw.) oder Hintermann im Sinne von secundant (Hahn) gegeben---- das Wort bedeutet nichts dergleichen, es bed. posterus und postrenus, hier letzteres im Sinne von Jes. 44,6; 48,12. Vergl. 41,4.



meaning "last". In this manner it is used where God is spoken of as "the first and the last",<sup>sy</sup> (Is. 41,4; 44,6; 48,12). These parallels also show that it is best not to take it as an adverb but rather as a noun, although in meaning it remains the same whether we translate "at last", "on the last day" (A.V.), or "as the last". This word then predicates eternity of the  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$ . When all else shall have passed away, he will remain. And what then? Will this  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  then also die? On the contrary then above all he will begin to act most energetically. As the last (note that the adj. precedes the verb for emphasis' sake. Gesenius Gram. Parag. 118<sup>m</sup>) he will arise, <sup>make</sup> ready for action, he will arise in Job's interest ( $\text{דִּן}$  cf. Dt.19,15; Ps.12,6<sup>6</sup>). And as  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  denotes the time when this shall occur, namely at the end of days, so  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  designates the place upon which it will take place. The words  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  have been variously interpreted. It is indeed true that  $\text{דִּן}$  <sup>con-</sup> construed with  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  often means "to arise up against" (Jud. 9,18; Isa. 32,2; 2 Sam. 18,32; Psa.86,14). And so some would take it to indicate that the Redeemer would arise against the dust, i.e. the dust of Job's accusers. But in the first place such a thought is foreign to the context, and then it is very improbable that individual persons, although they are dust and ashes, should be designated with the general conception "dust". Therefore many refer  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  to death and the grave. This idea would fit into the context. But  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  is not the same as "death" except when the context demands it (20<sup>11</sup>). Others again translate: "He will arise over the dust", and interpret it of the resurrection of Christ. Then however  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  would not receive its due and  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  would virtually again have the meaning of "death". And so it is best to take  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  in its local sense "upon".  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$  is the dust of the grave into which Job's body has crumbled. If we ask: "For what purpose will Job's living Redeemer arise", there is only one correct answer. He will arise to snatch Job, whom he has redeemed from sin, and also from death, from the

---

54. Isa. 48,12:  $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$   $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$   $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$   $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$   $\text{בְּאַחֵר}$



jaws of the king of terrors. Job's hope is none other than the hope of resurrection. That this is what he means to indicate is clear from the following words, which describe the manner of his resurrection. Job proceeds:

אחרי כן יצאני אלהים וישבני ארבעה רגלי ארץ וישבני ארבעה רגלי ארץ  
These words give the result of the arising of Job's Redeemer upon the dust. אחר can be either preposition, adverb or conjunction. It is improbable that it should be conjunction since we would then expect אחר כן . אחר is sometimes omitted, but then

is closely connected with the verb. Nor does this verb seem to be used adverbially here. Also the adv. אחר as a rule stands in close proximity to the verb. אחר is here separated from יצאני to indicate that it is a preposition. As a preposition אחר means "behind" (local) or "after" (temporal).

אחר is temporal only when it refers to an action. It is local when it refers to an object, so here. אחר modifies יצאני and these two words belong together as אחר יצאני as also the punctuation indicates. יצאני is the word used for the hide of animals (Gen.5,21; Ex.29,14) (Jer.41,16), but it is also used of human skin (Ex.22,16; Lev.18,2; Job 7,5; 10,11; 30,30; 19,20). The phrase thus means, "behind my skin". The following words

אחרי כן יצאני are rather difficult. יצאני the form itself could be Niphal or Piel of יצאני. The Niphal is here impossible as is readily seen.<sup>57</sup> So we have here the Piel of יצאני. Now there are two verbs יצאני, the one meaning "to move in a circle", "to encircle", "to encompass", the other "to strike", "to cut", "to smite in pieces", "destroy". The verb here used cannot mean "to encircle", since יצאני ought then to be in the Hiphil (Job 19,6). The Piel of the verb cannot be proved to have the meaning "to encircle". But even if it had that meaning this interpretation would bring יצאני and אחר together, the translation being: "thereafter they will surround me with my skin".

---

55. The plural form can only be accounted for by the extremely forced suggestion that its subject is in the singular form אחר used collectively of the parts of the body.



But  $\text{לִי}$  is masculine while  $\text{לְךָ}$  is feminine, and the two cannot be brought together. Then too, the vast separation of noun and pronoun would be an unpermitted hardness. Above all the object (me) would have to be supplied, and this is not even as much as suggested in the foregoing. Again,  $\text{וְיָרֵם}$  is not construed with the double accusative as this would require, but it is construed with the accusative or with  $\text{לִי}$ , or if both person and thing are mentioned, with the accusative of the thing and  $\text{לִי}$  of the person (19,6).

On the other hand the meaning "to smite in pieces", "to destroy" for the Piel of  $\text{וְיָרֵם}$  is undeniably certain, being testified to by such passages as Isa. 10,34; 17,6. The third person plural is to be taken impersonal. It is so used with reference to a human agent (Gesenius Gram., parag. 144) to give expression to the passive. We have here an appositional relative clause (Delitzsch) in which the relative pronoun is omitted.<sup>56</sup> Thus we translate, "Which has been destroyed", (German: Welches man zerschlagen hat). This rendering is supported by the punctuation  $\text{וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם}$  belonging together as do  $\text{וְיָרֵם וְיָרֵם}$ . Accordingly, Job does not only refer to his death, but he expresses its total corruption (26a). The word  $\text{וְיָרֵם}$  still presents some difficulty, but the same difficulty, besides many others, remains in all other suggested renderings. It modifies the verb  $\text{וְיָרֵם}$  as the *maggi* indicates, and has no connection with  $\text{לִי}$  whatever. It is best taken as accompanied by a gesture to the body (Dillmann) in the sense of  $\text{δοκιμασως}$  or as adverbial modifier of  $\text{וְיָרֵם}$  meaning "so", "in this wise", "thus".

The following words we translate "and from my flesh I shall see God" in spite of the fact that most commentators (and among them such people as Delitzsch, Volk, Profs. Reu and Stelhorn) translate "and without my flesh". The preposition  $\text{מִן}$  can be either negative "without"; or, in the local meaning which it has, it can mean "proceeding from" equal to the Greek  $\text{ἐκ}$  and the Latin *ex*. It occurs very frequently in the local meaning and less

---

<sup>56</sup>. This is nothing unusual; cf. Gesenius Gram., parag. 155.



frequently in the other, negative meaning. Our translation is then possible.<sup>57</sup> Besides, the context absolutely demands our translation.<sup>58</sup> Job is not merely speaking of immortality but of bodily resurrection.<sup>59</sup> He has described his living Redeemer as standing above the dust on the last day ready to manifest his power on the dust, to resurrect it, to show himself as Redeemer of Job's dust. Then the next verse (27) shows that Job wishes to see <sup>God</sup> God with his eyes. Could we picture to ourselves Job beholding God with his bodily eyes and without his body! Thus we must translate, "and from my <sup>flesh</sup> flesh I shall see God". Job sees a resurrection of the body for himself beyond the grave.<sup>60</sup> ) Indeed denotes separation here, but it is not a separation

---

57. This also the Int. Crit. Com. admits: "Either away from my flesh or from my flesh is, so far as the phrase itself is concerned, equally possible." It admits also that the former meaning is "rare but by no means unusual".

58. It is upheld by the Vulgate, Budell, Rosenmueller, Kosegarten, Umbreit.

59. It is not peculiar that critics find themselves forced here to admit an immortality, but deny a resurrection. But it is surprising that they will <sup>ad-</sup> admit so much that Job speaks of a life beyond the grave. Driver says: "But from his friends he (Job) can expect nothing; and so with the wish that the protestation of his innocence might be inscribed in imperishable letters <sup>upon</sup> upon the rock, there passes from his lips the sublime utterance of his faith, <sup>his</sup> his conviction that his Vindicator liveth, and that though even his human frame succumb to his disease, He will reveal himself to him after death, and manifest his right." Introd. to the Literature of the Old Testament, p.418.

60. "Umibb<sup>2</sup> sari should suggest first of all the natural significance of <sup>17</sup> 17, the place from which or the condition in which and forth from which or <sup>-ed</sup> through which something occurs. The other views are interpretations <sup>-late</sup> strained apart from his natural meaning: and therefore the English version translates simply and directly "from my flesh". The Luth. Church Rev<sup>ew</sup>, 1906, p.574.



of Job from his flesh, but rather that his look goes forth out of his body toward God.

And in this state, after his body has been destroyed, in his resurrected body he shall see God. Job had a clear vision of a future life in the presence of God, knowing that there is no more perfect happiness than in the beatific vision of God. He emphatically stresses this point, repeating it over and over to leave no doubt, he is convinced of what he says. He means everything those words say. "From my flesh I shall see God, whom I will see for myself (Dat. Com. "in my interest") and my eyes behold and not another." In all these words he lays great emphasis on the fact that this vision of God he will experience in his physical body. He knows that this selfsame body shall be raised. He expresses his earnest longing for this resurrection, saying: "my reins are consumed within me."

He who can yet deny that Job in this passage comforts himself with the hope of a bodily resurrection, with the hope of an eternal life, being within his body in the presence of God, and that he bases such hope upon his heavenly living Redeemer, the Messiah is not open to conviction and willfully perverts the text. Although the words are difficult, their sense is not unintelligible. They clearly teach a resurrection of the body equal to that taught in 1 Cor. 15; Phil. 3, 20ff; 1 John 3, 2.

61. <sup>וְאֵנִי</sup> with emphasis, which is still more stressed by <sup>אֲנִי</sup>, I myself as I stand before you. The idea to which Job gives prominence is that he will see God not by proxy, but with his own body.

62. His very eyes, his bodily, physical eyes.

63. <sup>וְאֵנִי</sup> is taken by some as apposition to the acc. "God". "I will see God not as a stranger, not as an enemy. But <sup>וְאֵנִי</sup> does not mean enemy. It is better taken as apposition to the nom. ( <sup>אֲנִי</sup> ). Neither is the contrast between Job and his friends. Job says: "I will behold God as myself, in this body and not another, a different being."



The Prophets

Since, therefore the conception of a bodily resurrection is part and parcel of the belief of God's children from the earliest days we are not surprised to find the prophets dealing with it as <sup>o</sup>self-evident and generally known and accepted fact. We find in their writings a more detailed eschatology. The doctrine of the final judgment which is already so prominent in the Psalms (Ps. 94, 1-3; 144, 5-7; 98, 4-9; 97, 2-6; 76, 8, 9; 29; 102, 25-27; 96, 13; 11, 6; 140, 10; 2; 110, 5, 6; 72, 4.) is especially elaborate in the prophetic writings. The "day of the Lord", i. e. judgment day, is great and very terrible (Joel 2, 11.), a day of destruction for the physical world (Isa. 2, 12-20; 13, 9-11; 13, 13; 24, 18-20; Zeph. 1, 14-18.). On this day the Lord, the Messiah, The Son of Man (Dan. 7, 13) (of also Ps. 2 and 110) will visit dire punishment upon the wicked (Joel 4, 13; Amos 5, 18, 19; Isa. 2, 10). But this day of the destruction of the world need not be feared by the faithful children of God; for "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Joel 2, 32.), and "the Lord will be the hope of His people" (Joel 3, 16; cf. also Obadiah 17; Isa. 25, 9; Zech. 14, 3-5; 9, 14; 10, 6; 12, 7; etc.) It is therefore impossible that the day of the Lord should be looked upon as a day of total annihilation of all things. For then the fate of the just and the unjust would be alike. Since, however, the Lord will on that day give to the righteous the victory over the wicked in that he will exalt

---

64. With what great self-confidence these facts are denied is seen from this statement of McClintock and Strong (under the head: Resurrection): It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew Scriptures. It is not to be found in the Pentateuch, in the historical books, or in the Psalms; for Psa. xlix, 15 does not relate to the subject, neither does Psa. civ, 29, 30 although so cited by Theodoret and others. The celebrated passage Job xix, 25 sq. has indeed been strongly insisted upon in proof of the early belief in this doctrine; but the most learned commentators are agreed, and scarcely anyone at the present disputes that such a view arises either from mistranslation or misapprehension, and that Job means no more than to express a confident conviction that his then diseased and dreadfully corrupted body should be restored to its former soundness; that he should rise from the depressed state in which he lay to his former prosperity; and that God would manifestly appear (as was the case) to vindicate his uprightness.



His people and punish His enemies, reward and punishment must reach beyond the end of time into eternity. Accordingly the prophets of old comforted their fellows with the assurance of an eternal bliss, speaking to them of an "everlasting kindness and mercy (Isa. 54,8.) and an "everlasting salvation" which shall last "world without end" (Isa.45,17.). The new covenant which Jehovah establishes with His people is an eternal one (Isa.55,3; Ezech.37,26.) and the Messiah's kingdom which is made up of His people is without end (Isa.9,7.). Therefore God's people "are not consumed" (Mal.3,6.) and "will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever" (Micah 4,5.). Such promises, as well as the threats which God makes to His enemies, would be very vague and indefinite, if not utterly unintelligible, without the background of the knowledge of a future life beyond the destruction of that great and terrible day. And since God through His prophets made those predictions and promises, not only to those who live to witness that day, but to those very people which the prophets had before them and to that very generation to whom their messages were originally addressed and which was even then sinking into the grave, it necessarily follows that a belief in the resurrection must be presupposed. Hence the prophets also tell in what sense such statements concerning the "day of the Lord" are to be understood by speaking in direct terms of the resurrection of the body which shall take place on that day.

We turn first to Hosea 13,14.<sup>65</sup> which is a beautiful and clear prediction of the resurrection on the last day. We read: "From Sheol's hand (i.e. power) I will ransom them (set them free), from death I will redeem them; where (are) thy plagues, O Death? Where thy destruction, O Sheol? Repentance is hid (Ni. Fut.) from my eyes." This passage clearly contains comfort for the true children of God among the apostate Israelites, who are appointed to destruction on account of the hardness of their hearts. The words are simple and plain. Difficulties have only been made by those who seek to eliminate from the Old Testament Scriptures every reference to the future re-

---

65. Hosea 6,2. does not refer to the resurrection.

66. The translations of those who suggest that this passage should be a question: "Shall I ransom them etc.?" meaning as much as: "Do you expect me to ransom them from the grave?" with a negative answer implied, is surely without warrant. To make the sentence conditional: "I would ransom etc." and to supply "if they will repent" or some such phrase



resurrection. Taking the words as they read you cannot do justice to them by limiting their meaning to the deliverance out of the danger of death or to the preservation from death. To <sup>redeem</sup> ~~redeem~~ from the hand (i.e. from the grasp, the power) of sheol, of the region of death, that means not merely to preserve from death, to prevent becoming the prey of death, but actually to wrest from death its prey, to restore those who have fallen into the dread power of death again to life, in short to resurrect the dead. This meaning of the parallelism is made imperative by the double exclamatory question: "Where are thy plagues, O Death? Where thy destruction, O Sheol?" <sup>68</sup> The answer is, of course, "They are not". The power of death is broken. While the physical fact of death remains, its plagues, its destructiveness, its essential horror and hideousness is removed because death cannot hold its prey. There is a resurrection and in view of this resurrection death has become divested and shorn of its destructiveness. To perform this resurrection is the positive, unalterable decision of God. To remove every doubt as to its reality He adds: "Repentance ( a feeling sorry for what one has done or said or promised, hence a change of mind) is hid from my eyes."

in order to make the passage to mean that God would avert the threatened punishment (vv.7-13) if Israel would see the errors of its ways and turn to God, is clearly forced. The supplement is purely arbitrary and nowhere suggested or indicated. And so too all other renderings which are only brought because men oppose the resurrection in the Old Testament, are too ludicrous for serious consideration. The passage itself presents no difficulty to a fair mind.

67.  $\text{קָטַעַ$  properly means to cut, to cut in two, to cut loose to sever; hence to ransom, REdeem, literally to buy back; with  $\text{קָטַעַ$  to set free (that which is already held fast).

68. St. Paul's reference to this passage in Hosea (1. Cor. 15, 55.) is a beautiful commentary on these words and especially gives an adequate explanation of the full import of the words  $\text{אֵיךְ תִּשָּׂא$  and  $\text{אֵיךְ תִּשָּׂא}$ . Paul says: "Where, O Death, is thy sting? Where, O Death, is thy victory?"  $\text{Ποῦ σου, ὄλεθρον, τὸ κέντρον;}$   
 $\text{Ποῦ σου, ἄδην, τὸ ῥῆκος;}$



With just such precise and unmistakable language Isaiah, the greatest of the prophets, speaks of the resurrection of the body. In the eighth verse of the twenty fifth chapter of his book he writes: "He (i.e. the Lord of hosts) will swallow up (consume, destroy) the death forever; and wipe away will the Lord Jehovah tears from off all faces, and the reproach of His people will He take away from upon all the earth, for Jehovah hath spoken." The prophet's words need no explanation. The Lord of Hosts will ultimately put a complete end to the King of Terrors by annihilating him altogether, so that death will be destroyed eternally. And the children of God, forever freed from death's fell power, will thereby also be removed from all that goes with death, from all the precursors, companions, and associates of death; for the Lord will wipe away all tears from their eyes, i.e. He will remove all causes of tears as sorrow, trouble, distress, anguish, suffering sickness, and misfortune of every description; He will dry up tears' fountain. In other words they will be raised from death, their body will be resurrected to enter into an eternal, uninterrupted state of bliss. There all reproach and reviling which they endured for their faith's sake while living as mortals on earth will have come to an end. All this is definitely sure and certain because it is Jehovah, the God of the covenant, the God of grace and truth, who makes this promise to His children. These words of the prophet are spoken with New testament clearness. No wonder St. Paul uses ~~them in His~~ them in his jubilant, triumphant exclamation: "Death is swallowed up in victory!" (1. Cor. 15, 54.). The fact ~~fact~~ of the resurrection could not be more positively stated. (Cf. also the language of the New Testament in Rev. 7, 13-17.)

In the following chapter (ch. 26.) in the nineteenth verse the congregation of the redeemed, confidently lifting up her eyes to her God, is made to declare: "Live will Thy dead", i.e. God's own dead, those dead that belong to God by virtue of their faith. These whom God has during the period of their earthly life acknowledged as His own, as His children, though they have sunken into the grave and crumbled into the dust of corruption, these shall live again. The use of the pronoun "Thy" shows what unwavering confidence the prophet



and the Church for whom he is spokesman have in the fact that God will raise again to life the dead bodies of His Children. These dead are His, belong to Him, He is their God; should He then leave they become the unretrieved prey of death? "God is not the God of the dead but of the living". Isaiah continues to speak in the name of the Church: "Arise will my corpses"<sup>69</sup> The terseness of these exclamations shows the positiveness with which they are uttered. In the definite certainty of the resurrection of the believers the Church calls out over the graves of her dead: "Awake and rejoice, ye dwellers of the dust (ye that lie in the dust)! For dew of lights is Thy dew, and the earth shall bring forth shades." With longing expectation the Church awaits the consummation of her glorious hope in the resurrection of her dead. With nervous impatience, as it were, she looks forward to that day of jubilant resurrection. It is only a matter of time that the children of God will "awake and rejoice". The resurrection is just as certain as is the glory, the majesty, and the power of God, in fact it is based on the power of God. For as in the realm of nature the morning dew has the property of refreshing and revivifying the plants, which have been wilted by the sun's burning rays of the previous day, and opens again the flowers, which have folded in their petals for the sleep of the night, so, in a much higher, more perfect sense, will the dew, the power, of the omnipotent God light upon the earth, that vast grave of mortal men, on the resurrection morn with its life-giving qualities, so that by its workings the earth will be fructified, as it were, to yield forth, to bear her dead, the shades and shadows, the corrupted bodies of men. And as nature's sparkling dew reflects the glories of the sun, so will this act of God's omnipotence reflect the divine glory of the "Father of Lights", and all the more so because these resurrected bodies will be in a glorified, transfigured state.

---

69. קָמְוּ is a word without a plural. It is here used in a collective sense.

Cf. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar #122 s. The Church is here speaking of her dead body, i.e. of her dead members. The expression is very adequate. For the individual members of the church form one body and this union is not affected, severed even by death.



In these passages the prophet speaks of the resurrection of the righteous; however, he also indicates that the bodies of the wicked will be restored to life. This he does especially in the 24th verse of the 66th chapter. "And they (i.e. the worshipers of Jehovah, v.23) go forth and look upon the bodies of the men, the apostates from me (those that have broken with me), for their worm shall not die and their fire shall not go out, and they shall be an abhorrence (an object of horror) unto all flesh! The prophet is here speaking of the punishment of those that have rebelled against, transgressed against Jehovah. In the terms of Christ and the New Testament Gospels He describes the state of everlasting damnation, using the same picture which is the background of the term Gehenna. Going out of Jerusalem to the south the inhabitants came upon the Valley of Hinnom, a deep narrow glen in which at certain high places the apostate people of Isaiah's time were accustomed to sacrifice and to burn their sons and daughters as offerings to Molech (2.Kings 23,10;2.Chron,28,3.). Thus this valley presented an abhorring sight with its ever-burning and corrupting carcasses and refuse. It is for the prophet a picture of the place of eternal punishment. (Cf also Isa. 30,33.) He sees the company of the Redeemed going forth from the new Jerusalem and looking upon the bodies of the enemies of God and His Church, writhing in the agony of unending corruption and undying fire. He views this punishment as a living death. Yet if these enemies of God will suffer in body as well as in soul, if they will undergo an unceasing torment it follows that their bodies must be raised. And therefore their resurrection is here implied.

It is with such a clear understanding of the doctrine of physical resurrection prevalent among the people that the prophet Ezechiel is able to relate his vision of the valley of dead bones without the least fear of being misunderstood. This is the vision (recorded Ezechiel 37,1-10.): "There was upon me the hand of Jehovah, and bore me out in the spirit Jehovah and set me down in the midst of the valley; it was full of bones. And he caused me to pass over them round about, and behold very many upon the face of the valley, and behold very dry. And he said: Son of man, will these bones live? And I said: Lord Jehovah Thou knowest. And He said to me



Prophe~~s~~y over these these bones and say to them? Ye dry bones,hear the Word of Jehovah. Thus saith the Lord Jehovah to these bones: Behold I (emphatic) ~~am~~ causing breath to come into you, and ye shall live. I will give sinews upon you and will cause flesh to come upon you and will cover you with skin and give breath in you and you shall live, and you shall know that I am Jehovah. And I prophesied as I was <sup>-ed:</sup> commanded. And there was a voice (a sound) as I prophesied and behold, a tumult (a shaking, a rattling) and the bones came together, bone to his bone. And I saw and behold, upon them sinews and <sup>not</sup> Flesh grew up and skin covered them over the top, but breath was not in them. And He said to me: Prophe~~s~~y to the breath, prophe~~s~~y, son of man, and say to <sup>the</sup> the breath: Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: From the four winds come, O breath, and breathe upon these slain and they will live. And I prophesied as I was commanded and there came into them the breath and they lived and stood up upon their feet, a very, very great army."

Regardless of the interpretation of this vision, it presupposes a <sup>-ledge</sup> knowledge of the doctrine of the resurrection. Ezechiel himself is acquainted with this doctrine and knows that the power to revivify these dead bones lies in God's omnipotence. When he is asked v. 3: Will these bones live, He answers: Lord Jehovah, Thou knowest. Whether these dead bones shall live again is only a matter of God's will. He is persuaded from what he knows of God's almighty power and from what he knows about the fact of the universal resurrection on the last day that God can bring these dry bones, devoid of skin, flesh and sinews, back to life if he so<sup>d</sup> desires. And the fact that he thus brings the vision to the attention of his people ~~without~~ any explanatory introduction shows that he is not telling them something unheard of, but <sup>that</sup> that he takes the same knowledge for granted with them.

But the explanation and interpretation of this vision is a most cogent argument for the belief in a future resurrection. The Lord Himself explains the vision to the prophet in this wise: "And He said unto me: Son of man, these bones are <sup>the</sup> th

---

70. Surely it is a unfounded claim when The New International Encyclopaedia says (under the head: Resurrection): "The valley of bones in Ezechiel xxxviii. does not suggest, but rather precludes, familiarity with the doctrine of a resurrection."



whole house of Israel. They, behold, they are saying: Our bones are dried, and our hope is perished, we are cut off to us. Therefore prophesy and say unto them: Thus saith the Lord Jehovah: Behold I (emphatic) will open your graves and I will cause you to come up out of your graves, My people, and I will bring you to the land of Israel. And you shall know that I am Jehovah in my opening your graves and in My bringing you up out of your graves, My people. And I will give My Spirit in you and you shall live, and I will place you in your land, and ye shall know that I Jehovah, have said it and do it, - the saying of Jehovah."

The vision is herewith applied to "the whole house of Israel!" From this statement in verse 11, most commentators have concluded that the prophetic vision applies only to the national restoration of the exiled Israel. However such a restricted interpretation cannot do full justice to the Lord's own explanation of the vision, especially not to the unmodified declaration in verse 12: "I will open your graves and cause you to come forth out of your graves." There can be little doubt that we have here a case of prophetic, perspective description. <sup>71</sup> The Prophet is here given a revelation of the immediate and the far distant future in one vision. Time has no place in the picture. With one glimpse he sees revealed to him the events which are soon to take place, the return of his people into their own country and their restoration as a nation, and together with these the occurrences of which they are a picture and type, the final resurrection of the spiritual Israel, the people of God of all times, and their entrance into their own promised land, the New Jerusalem. Thus type and antitype, both lying in the future, flow together in the picture. This interpretation is also demanded by the context. Thus, and only thus, can we find in this chapter the necessary progress of thought, the continuation of the preceding prophecy in chapter 36, which describes the period of the New Testament.

---

71. Cf. for example Matthew 24, Christ's prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the end of the world. Type and antitype are spoken of in the same breath, as it were.



One of the strongest proofs for the presence of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in the Old Testament is the last one which is found recorded Daniel 12,2. "And many of the sleeping in the dust of the earth shall arise; these to life eternal, and those to reproach (shame), ~~and~~ to everlasting abhorrence."

This passage has suffered very much from false interpretation and has been made to say very much which it clearly does not say. Attempts have been made to show that here we have the very first trace of the knowledge of the resurrection doctrine and that even here there is no definiteness, that this passage speaks only of a partial resurrection. Such a claim rests upon the faulty assumption that the rest of the Old Testament contains no reference to this doctrine and upon a misunderstanding of the purpose of this text and an ignoring of its context.

The context is perhaps best given in the words of Keil: "In ch.xi. 33,35, the angel had already said, that of 'those that understand' many shall fall by the sword and by flame, etc. When the tribulation at the time of the end increases to an unparalleled extent (ch.xii.1), a yet greater number shall perish, so that when salvation comes, only a remnant of the people shall then be in life. To this surviving remnant of the people salvation is promised: but the promise is limited yet further by the addition: "every one that is found written in the book" ~~of life~~; not all ~~that are~~ then living, but only those whose names are recorded in the book of life shall be partakers of the deliverance, i.e. of the Messianic salvation. But many (p. 270) of those that sleep, who died in the time of tribulation, shall awake out of sleep, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame. As with the living, so also with the dead, not all attain salvation. Also among those that arise there shall be a distinction, in which the reward of the faithful and of the unfaithful shall be made known. The word "many" is accordingly used only with reference to the small number of those who shall then be living, and not with reference either to the universality of the resurrection of the dead or to a portion only of the dead, but merely to add to the multitude of the dead, who shall then have part with the living, the small number of those who shall experience in the flesh the conclusion of the matter." ● 72.



That the passage speaks of the resurrection is definitely clear and that it speaks of a resurrection of both, the just and the unjust, is also an undeniable fact. With the claim that this is the first trace of this doctrine in the Old Testament we need not concern ourselves since it has been conclusively shown that there are many others. But the declaration that Daniel 12,2. teaches a partial resurrection merits our attention. This claim is based on the expression *רַבִּינָם*. The *רַבִּי* in itself presents no difficulty. We must bear in mind the fact which Keil expresses in the words: "The angel has it not in view to give a general statement regarding the resurrection of the dead, but only disclosure on this point, that the final salvation of the people shall not be limited to those still living at the end of the tribulation, but shall include also those who have lost their lives during the period of the tribulation." "Many" does not necessarily mean only some. The angel says "many", but has no intention to say how many. The rest of the Scripture tells us how many. Christ with clear reference to this passage says how many when He declares (John 5, 28) : "all (*πάντες*) shall hear His voice and shall come forth." But there is a difficulty in *רַבִּינָם*. The only meaning which *רַבִּי* can have is the partitive meaning, so we are told, and therefore it means "from among the sleepers." *רַבִּי*, of course, does denote separation, but here it evidently refers to the separation from the terminus a quo. The reference here is clearly not to the individual sleepers, but rather to the state in which they find themselves. The separation indicated here is not one among the sleepers, dividing them into two classes, those that arise and those that continue to sleep on and remain in death. It is the separation on the sleepers from the place and state in which they find themselves.

73. Ibid., p.481.

74. This <sup>is</sup> by no means something uncommon in Hebrew and in the hebraic way of thinking. The plural of certain words often denote a state. For example: The plural of *רַבִּי* (young man) both masculine and feminine often means "the state in which a young man is", "youth"; *קַטְוֵי* virgin - *קַטְוֵי* virginity; and so a number of others. Cf. Gesenius Hebrew Grammar #124 d.



Thus the assertion that the passage in Daniel teaches a resurrection for some only cannot be upheld. Besides such a doctrine would be absurd and would have no foundation anywhere else. While this text does not stress the universality of the resurrection of the body, yet this doctrine is implied. And thus must the passage be understood in the clear light of other passages from the Old Testament and especially in view of the Savior's plain explanation (John 5, 28, 29). To say that Daniel or rather some other unknown author of Daniel borrowed the idea from the Persians is surely expressing an untenable view. This doctrine was present in Israelitic theology before ever the Jews came into contact with the Persians and with Parseism. The religious conceptions of the Persians are also too crude to bear comparison with the teachings of the Old Testament Scripture, and where Parseism does rise to a higher plane there its nobler thoughts bear all the marks of being copied from the religion of the Old Testament.

#### In Conclusion.

Considering the incontrovertible proof furnished by the passages adduced for the presence of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in the Old Testament, only a biased and prejudiced person can entertain the thought of a gradual evolution of this doctrine. It is an essential part of Old Testament theology. Without it all Israelitic religion would be meaningless. Not <sup>only</sup> is the doctrine itself taught expressis verbis but also its ground and foundation is spoken of in Isa. 53, 10 and Psa. 16, 10, where the Messiah's resurrection is predicted. Moreover the possibility and the probability of the resurrection was demonstrated before the very eyes of the Israelites when they witnessed the miracles which the prophets in God's name performed upon the dead. Elijah raised the son of the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings 17.17-24.), and Elisha raised the son of the Shunammite (2 Kings 4.18-37.). The same thing was evidenced by the event recorded 2 Kings 13. 20-21 where we have the account in which we are told of the dead man who was revived by coming into contact with the bones of the prophet Elisha. Furthermore, there was for every Israelite the assurance that there was such a thing as a future life in the body in the fact of Enoch's translation (Gen. 5, 24.) and of Elijah's assumption (2 Kings 2, 11.). All in all there is very clear testimony to the doctrine of the resurrection in the Old Testament, and



Abraham, as well as the other believers of the Old Testament era, believed in the "God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were." (Romans 4,17.). Only a blinded spiritual eye will fail to see this truth, and difficulties are only made by those who search the Old Testament in the hostile effort to destroy its influence and to undermine its divine origin. This doctrine has nothing to fear from a candid and fair investigation. All we ask is: "Whoso readeth, let him understand."



Bibliography.

- Bennet : The Theology of the Old Testament.
- Dillmann: Handbuch der Alttestamentlichen Theologie.
- Duff: Old Testament Theology.
- Koenig: Die Theologie des Alten Testaments.
- Barton: The Religion of Israel.
- v. Hofman: Der Schriftbeweis.
- Lilienthal, Theo. Ch.: Die Gute Sache der Gotlichen Offenbarung.
- Hengstenberg, E. W.: Beitrage zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament.
- Christologie des Alten Testaments.
- Eckhardt, E. Reallexikon.
- Pieper, F.: Christliche Dogmatic.
- Synodal Bericht: California and Nevada 1907; Nebraska 1914; Middle 1886.
- Zoeckler: Handbuch des Theologischen Wissens.
- Biblical Review. Vol. VII, 1922.
- Lutheran Church Review: Vol. 25.
- Biblical World; 1903.
- Journal of Religion: Vol. 1.
- Willkomm: Ueber die Luther Bibel.
- Theologische Zeitlaetter: Vol 26, 1907.
- Klostermann: Untersuchungen zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie.
- Staehelin: Zur Paulinischen Eschatologie.
- Sampey: The Heart of the Old Testament.
- Huffman, J.A., D.D.: The Progressive Unfolding of the Messianic Hope.
- Old Testament Messages of Christ.
- Davidson, A.B.: Discourses on Prophecy.
- Theology of the Old Testament.
- Knudson : The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament.
- Neu-Kirchliche Zeitschrift: 1919, (Sellin: Die Alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und Ewiges Leben.)
- De Wette: Biblische Theologie.
- Ebeling: Der Menschheit Zukunft.



Fair bairn, P.: Prophecy.

Orr, James: The Problem of the Old Testament.

Terry, M.S.: Biblical Hermeneutics.

Smith, W. A.: Old Testament History.

Taylor, Wm.: Elijah the Prophet.

Green, Wm.H.: The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.

Theological Quarterly, Vol 18 and 20.

Princeton Theological Review, Vol. 21, 1923.

Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 38, 1892; Vol. 61, 1918, 1884.

Salmond: The Christian Doctrine of Immortality.

R. H. Charles: A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life.

Haevernick: Vorlesungen Ueber die Theologie des Alten Testaments.

Schwally, Fr.: Leben Nach dem Tode.

Warburton: Divine Legislation of Moses.

De Wette: Biblische Dogmatic Alten und Neuen Testaments.

Vatke: Die Religion des Alten Testaments in der Geschichtlichen Entwicklung Ihrer Prinzipien Dargestellt

Fischer, G.P.: History of Christian Doctrine.

Pierson, Joh.: Exposition of the Creed.

Hengstenberg, E.: Die Fuenf Buecher Mosis und Aegypten.

Eber: Aegypten und Die Fuenf Buecher Mosis.

Cehler: Theology of the Old Testament.

The New International Encyclopedia.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.

Hastings: Bible Dictionary.

Davis Bible Dictionary

Jewish Encyclopedia.

Catholic Encyclopedia.

The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia.

Ellicott, C.J.: An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. Isaiah; Daniel.

Orolli: Minor Prophets.

Cheyne, T.K.: The Prophecies of Isaiah.



Pfeper, Aug.: Jesaias II.

Expositors Bible. Genesis, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel.

Pulpit Commentary. Genesis, Joß, Ezechiel, Psalms.

Nowack: Hand Kommentar zum Alten Testament.

Delitzsch, F.: Neuer Kommentar ueber die Genesis

Keil, C.F.: The Pentateuch.

Delitzsch, F.: Biblischer Kommentar ueber die Psalmen

Biblischer Kommentar ueber Die Poetischen Buecher des Alten Testaments.  
Zweiter Band: Das Buch Iob.

Keil, C.F.: Biblischer Kommentar ueber den Propheten Ezechiel.

Delitzsch, F.: Commentar ueber das Buch Jesaias.

Keil, C.F.: Biblischer Kommentar ueber Die Zwelf Kleinen Propheten.

Keil, C.F.: The Book of the Prophet Daniel.

Driver: The Book of Genesis.

The International Critical Commentary. Genesis, Isaiah, Job, Ezechiel, Psalms,  
Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Proverbs.

Haevernick: Der Prophet Daniel.

Cheyne: Aids to the Decout Study of Criticism.

Kant: Religion der Vernunft.

Kyle, M.: Moses and the Monuments.



Arthur E Neitzel

born January 29, 1901 in Pleasant Valley, Oklahoma; attended the parochial school of St. Luke's Ev. Lutheran Congregation ( Missouri Synod) at Kansas City, Kansas 1906 - 1911, parochial school of Zion Ev. Lutheran Congregation (Missouri Synod) at Summit, Illinois 1912 - 1914, Luther Institute, Chicago, Illinois September 1914 - June 1915, Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin September 1915 - June 1920, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri September 1920 - June 1923, Post Graduate School of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri September 1923- May 1924.