

THE
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 16.—October, 1883.

I.

MILTON AND TENNYSON.

“ Blessings be with them and immortal praise,
Who gave us noble lives and nobler cares,
The Poets, who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays.”—WORDSWORTH.

TWO rivers, rising in the same lofty region and fed by kindred springs, are guided by the mountain-slopes of their environment into channels which, though not far apart, are widely different. The one, deeper and stronger from its birth, after a swift and lovely course through fair uplands of peace, is shattered suddenly by the turmoil of a fierce conflict, lifting but one foam-crested wave of warning, is plunged into the secret and tumultuous warfare of a deep cañon, emerging at length with wondrously augmented current, to flow majestically through a land of awful, thunder-riven cliffs, towering peaks, vast forests, and immeasurable plains,—a mighty land, a mighty stream. The other river, from a source less deep, but no less pure and clear, passing with the same gentle current through the same region of sweet seclusion, meets with no mighty obstacle, is torn by no wild cataract in its descent, but with ever-growing force and deepening, widening stream sweeps through a land less majestic, but more beautiful, not void of grandeur, but free from horror,—a land of shadowy vales and gardens; mysterious cities hung in air, and hills crowned with ruined castles,—a stream brimming and bright and large, whose smooth, strong flow often conceals its unsounded depth, and mirrors, not only the fleeting shores, but also the eternal stars, in its bosom.

Such is the figure in which I see the poetry of Milton and of Tennyson flowing through the literature and life of our English race.

III.

STUDIES IN ESCHATOLOGY.

ESCHATOLOGY, or the doctrine of the last things from death to the general judgment, is exciting considerable attention in various churches, and is one of the departments of theology which demands careful reconsideration and adjustment. All profitable dogmatic discussion must proceed on a biblical and historical basis, and all true progress must be made in the line of previous conquests of Christian thought.

The object of this article is historical rather than doctrinal, and is confined to biblical and patristic eschatology. The scholastic, Roman Catholic, and orthodox Protestant eschatology are only incidentally touched, and would require separate articles.

THE JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY.

As the New Testament is based on the Old, the Christian eschatology presupposes the Jewish, but excels it in clearness and fulness as the light of the sun outshines the dawn of the morning. We must distinguish three phases in the development of the ideas of future life before the advent of Christ, the Mosaic, the prophetic, and the post-exilian.

1. The Mosaic writings are almost silent about the future life, and this undeveloped eschatology is no small argument for their antiquity. The silence is all the more remarkable as the Jews came from Egypt, where the belief in immortality and endless migrations after death had a very strong hold on the mind of the people. It pervaded the mythology, and built those wonderful pyramids near Memphis, and the rock sepulchres in Thebes on the borders of the desert, for the preservation of the mummies of kings and queens to the day of the resurrection. The Pentateuch lays great stress on the *temporal* consequences of the observance or non-observance of law. Not a word is said in the Decalogue about eternal reward and punishment. The only promise it contains is, "that thy days may be long upon

the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Warburton derived from this fact an argument for the divine legation of Moses. We must remember the theocratic character of the Mosaic economy. The law had a civil and political as well as a moral aspect. It was a basis of temporal government, and the state as such is concerned only with this world, and with temporal rewards and punishments.

But the silence of the Pentateuch is only relative, and the Sadducees who accepted it were wrong in their denial of the resurrection. It contains not a few significant hints at a future life. It is symbolized in the tree of life in Paradise. It is implied in the mysterious translation of Enoch as a *reward* for his piety; in the prohibition of necromancy; in the patriarchal phrase for dying: "to be gathered to his fathers," or "to his people"; and in the self-designation of Jehovah as "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," for "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." What has an eternal meaning for God, must itself be eternal. This is the profound meaning which our Saviour puts into that passage (Ex. iii. 6, 16), and thereby he silenced the Sadducees out of the book of the law which they themselves recognized as their highest authority (Matt. xxii. 32).

2. In the latter writings of the Old Testament, especially during and after the exile, the doctrine of immortality and resurrection comes out plainly. The wonderful Goël-passage which stands right in the heart of the book of Job, as a flash of lightning which clears up the dark mysteries of providence in this life, teaches the immortality and the future vision of God. The scepticism of the book of Ecclesiastes is subdued by the fear of Jehovah, who "shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil" (xii. 14). Daniel's vision reaches out even to the final resurrection of "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth to everlasting life," and of "some to shame and everlasting contempt," and prophesies that "they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (xii. 2, 3).

But before Christ, who first revealed true life, the Hebrew Sheol, the general receptacle of departing souls, remained, like the Greek Hades, a dark and dreary abode, and is so described in the Old Testament. Cases like Enoch's translation and Elijah's ascent are altogether unique and exceptional, and imply the meaning that death is not necessarily the transition to another life.

3. The Jewish Apocrypha (the Book of Wisdom, and the Second Book of Maccabees), and the later Jewish writings (the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Ezra) show some progress: they distin-

guish between two regions in Sheol: Paradise or Abraham's Bosom for the righteous, and Gehinom or Gehenna for the wicked; they emphasize the resurrection of the body, and the future rewards and punishments.

4. The Talmud adds various fanciful embellishments. It puts Paradise and Gehenna in close proximity, measures their extent, and distinguishes different departments in both, corresponding to the degrees of merit and guilt. Paradise is sixty times as large as the world, and hell sixty times as large as Paradise, for the bad preponderate here and hereafter. According to other Rabbinical testimonies, both are well-nigh boundless. The Talmudic descriptions of Paradise (as those of the Koran) mix sensual and spiritual delights. The righteous enjoy the vision of the Shechina and feast with the patriarchs, and with Moses and David on the flesh of the leviathan, and drink wine from the cup of salvation. Each inhabitant has a house according to his merit. Among the punishments of hell the chief place is assigned to fire, which is renewed every week after the Sabbath. The wicked are boiled like the flesh in the pot, but the bad Israelites are not touched by fire, and are otherwise tormented. The severest punishment is reserved for idolaters, hypocrites, traitors, and apostates. As to the duration of future punishment, the school of Shammai held that it was everlasting; while the school of Hillel inclined to the milder view of a possible redemption after repentance and purification. Some Rabbis taught that hell will cease, and that the sun will burn up and annihilate the wicked. The teaching of the Talmud on this point has recently been called into dispute. Canon Farrar maintains that Gehenna does not necessarily and usually mean hell in our sense, but (1) for Jews, or the majority of Jews, a short punishment, followed by forgiveness and escape; (2) for worse offenders a long but still terminable punishment; (3) for the worst offenders, especially Gentiles—punishment followed by *annihilation*. He quotes several modern Jewish authorities of the rationalistic type, *e. g.*, Dr. Deutsch, who says: "There is not a word in the Talmud that lends any support to the damnable dogma of endless torment." I have consulted Dr. Gottheil, the Rabbi of the Temple in Fifth Avenue, New York, who personally seems to take the liberal view of Deutsch, but admits different interpretations of the Talmud.* Dr.

* The following is the reply of Dr. Gottheil, which he kindly permits me to publish:

"681 MADISON AVE., N. Y. City, July 31, 1883.

"THE REV. DR. SCHAFF.

"*Dear Sir* :—To answer your question concisely, and yet in a manner worthy to be embodied in a scientific treatise, would be a laborious task of several days' work. I don't know whether you ask this of me. All I can say in a general way is this: that voices are not wanting in the Rabb.

Ferdinand Weber, who is good authority, says in his book on the Jewish theology of Palestine (p. 375), that some passages in the Talmud teach total annihilation of the wicked, others teach everlasting punishment, *e. g.* *Pesachim* 54^a: "The fire of Gehenna is never extinguished." Josephus (whose testimony Farrar arbitrarily sets aside as worthless) attests the belief of the Pharisees and Essenes in eternal punishment.* It is true that Rabbi Akiba (about 120) limited the punishment of Gehenna to twelve months; but only for the Jews. The Talmud assigns certain classes to everlasting punishment, especially apostates and those who despise the wisdom of the Rabbis. The chief passage is *Rosh Hoshanah*, f. 16 and 17: "There will be three divisions on the day of judgment, the perfectly righteous, the perfectly wicked, and the intermediate class. The first will be at once inscribed and sealed to life eternal; the second at once to Gehenna (Dan. xii. 2); the third will descend into Gehenna and keep rising and sinking" (Zech. xii. 9). This opinion was indorsed by the two great schools of Shammai and Hillel, but Hillel inclined to a liberal and charitable construction.

The Mohammedans share the Jewish belief, but change the inhabitants; the Koran assigns Paradise to the orthodox Moslems, and Hell to all unbelievers (Jews, Gentiles, and Christians), and to apostates from Islam.

THE HEATHEN ESCHATOLOGY.

Belief in immortality is a universal human instinct, and hence is found among all nations. But the heathen notions are very vague and confused. The Hindoos, Babylonians, and Egyptians had a lively sense of immortality, but mixed with the notion of endless migrations and transformations through various forms of vegetable and animal life. The Buddhists, starting from the idea that existence is want, and want is suffering, make it the chief end of man to escape such migrations, and, by various mortifications, to prepare

writings which affirm the eternity of punishment; but they carry no more weight than a thousand other hagadic fancies, and they, moreover, often admit of a construction by which the dogmatic side appears merely subsidiary to a moral idea or a historical explanation. The ruling idea of the Talmud is, that God has created all beings in the exercise of his attribute of mercy *מדת הרחמים* that none, therefore, can ever fall under the exclusive dominion of *מדת הדין* and thus remain unredeemed forever. Modern Judaism takes its stand altogether on this noble principle, giving it the utmost emphasis in its teachings. Without it the fatherhood of God would be worse than an empty phrase—a mockery.

"Eternal punishment in the christological relation to the so-called fall of Adam is quite unknown to the Talmud.

"Respectfully yours,

G. GOTTHEIL."

* *Ant.*, XVIII., 1, 3; *Bell. Jud.*, II., 8, 11.

for annihilation or absorption in the unconscious dream-life of Nirvana. The popular belief among the ancient Greeks and Romans was that man passes after death into the under world—the Greek *Hades*, the Roman *Orcus*. According to Homer, Hades is a dark abode in the interior of the earth, with an entrance at the western extremity of the ocean, where the rays of the sun do not penetrate. Charon carries the dead over the stream, Acheron, and the three-headed dog, Cerberus, watches the entrance, and allows none to pass out. There the spirits exist in a disembodied state, and lead a shadowy dream-life. A vague distinction was made between two regions in Hades, an Elysium (also “the Islands of the Blessed”) for the good, and Tartarus, for the bad. “Poets and painters,” says Gibbon, “peopled the infernal regions with so many phantoms and monsters, who dispensed their rewards and punishments with so little equity, that a solemn truth, the most congenial to the human heart, was oppressed and disgraced by the absurd mixture of the wildest fictions. The eleventh book of the *Odyssey* gives a very dreary and incoherent account of the infernal shades. Pindar and Virgil have embellished the picture; but even those poets, though more correct than their great model, are guilty of very strange inconsistencies.”

Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch rose highest among the ancient philosophers in their views of the future life, but they reached only to belief in its probability—not in its certainty. Socrates, after he was condemned to death, said to his judges: “Death is either an eternal sleep, or a transition to a new life; but in neither case is it an evil,” and he drank with playful irony the fatal hemlock. Plato, viewing the human soul as a portion of the eternal, infinite, all-pervading deity, believed in its pre-existence before this present life, and thus had a strong ground of hope for its continuance after death. All the souls pass into the spirit-world—the righteous into the abode of bliss, where they live forever in a disembodied state, the wicked into Tartarus, for punishment and purification, and the incorrigibly bad for eternal punishment. His ideas prepared the way for the doctrine of purgatory. Plutarch, the purest and noblest among the Platonists, thought that immortality was inseparably connected with belief in an all-ruling Providence, and looked to the life beyond as promising a higher knowledge of, and closer conformity to, God, but only for those few who are here purified by virtue and piety. In such rare cases departure might be called an ascent to the stars, to heaven, to the gods, rather than a descent to Hades. At the death of his daughter, he comforted her mother with the hope in the blissful state of infants who die in infancy. Cicero reflects in classi-

cal language "the ignorance, the errors, and the uncertainty of the ancient philosophers with regard to the immortality of the soul." Though strongly leaning to a positive view, he yet found it no superfluous task to quiet the fear of death in case the soul should perish with the body. The Stoics believed only in a limited immortality, or denied it altogether, and justified suicide when life became unendurable. The great men of Greece and Rome were not influenced by the idea of a future world as a motive of action. During the debate on the punishment of Catiline and his fellow-conspirators, Julius Cæsar openly declared in the Roman Senate that death dissolves all the ills of mortality, and is the boundary of existence, beyond which there is no more care nor joy, no more punishment for sin, nor any reward for virtue. The younger Cato, the model Stoic, agreed with Cæsar; yet, before he made an end to his life at Utica, he read Plato's *Phædon*. Seneca once dreamed of immortality, and almost approached the Christian hope of the birthday of eternity, if we are to trust his rhetoric; but afterward he awoke from the beautiful dream and committed suicide. The elder Pliny, who found a tragic death under the lava of Vesuvius, speaks of the future life as an invention of man's vanity and selfishness, and thinks that body and soul have no more sensation after death than before birth; death becomes doubly painful if it is only the beginning of another indefinite existence. Tacitus speaks but once of immortality, and then conditionally; and he believed only in the immortality of fame. Marcus Aurelius, in sad resignation, bids nature, "Give what thou wilt, and take back what thou wilt."

These were noble and earnest Romans. What can be expected from the crowd of frivolous men of the world who moved within the limits of matter and sense, and made present pleasure and enjoyment the chief end of life? The surviving wife of an Epicurean philosopher erected a monument to him, with the inscription, "To the eternal sleep." Not a few heathen epitaphs openly profess the doctrine that death ends all; while, in striking contrast with them, the humble Christian inscriptions in the catacombs express the confident hope of future bliss and glory in the uninterrupted communion of the believer with Christ and God.

Yet the scepticism of the educated and half-educated could not extinguish the popular belief in the imperial age. The number of cheerless and hopeless materialistic epitaphs is very small as compared with the many thousands which reveal no such doubt, or express belief in some kind of existence beyond the grave.

Of a resurrection of the body the Greeks and Romans had no con-

ception, except in the form of shades and spectral outlines, which were supposed to surround the disembodied spirits, and to make them, to some degree, recognizable. Heathen philosophers, like Celsus, ridiculed the resurrection of the body as useless, absurd, and impossible.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Christ is the Resurrection and the Life, and has brought immortality to light. The Christian Church is based upon the resurrection of Christ; it could not have been established, nor continued for any length of time, without that fact. After the crucifixion, the apostles were on the brink of despair, and exposed to the ridicule and scorn of the Jewish hierarchy, which, in that dark hour, had apparently achieved a complete victory and buried all their hopes of a Messianic kingdom. But on the morning of the resurrection the tables were turned. The timid, trembling, demoralized disciples became heroes, and boldly proclaimed their faith in the risen and ever-living God before the people and the Sanhedrin, and were willing to undergo all manner of persecution and death itself in the sure hope of a blissful immortality. They succeeded, and the Christian Church stands today stronger than ever, as a living witness of the resurrection.

The teaching of Christ and the apostles effected an entire revolution in the eschatological creed of the world.

In the first place, Christianity gives to the belief in a future state the absolute certainty of divine revelation, sealed by the fact of Christ's resurrection, and thereby imparts to the present life an immeasurable importance, involving endless issues.

In the next place, it connects the resurrection of the body with the immortality of the soul, and thus saves the whole individuality of man from destruction.

Moreover, Christianity views death as the punishment of sin, and therefore as something terrible, from which nature shrinks. But its terror has been broken, and its sting extracted by Christ.

And finally, Christianity qualifies the idea of a future state by the doctrine of sin and redemption, and thus makes it to the believer a state of absolute holiness and happiness, to the impenitent sinner a state of absolute misery. Death and immortality are a blessing to the one, but a terror to the other; the former can hail them with joy; the latter has reason to tremble. The Bible inseparably connects the future life with the general judgment, which determines the ultimate fate of all men according to their works done in this earthly life.

To the Christian, this present life is simply a pilgrimage to a better country, and to a city whose builder and maker is God. Every day he moves his tent nearer his true home. His citizenship is in heaven; his thoughts, his hopes, his aspirations are heavenly. This unworldliness, or heavenly-mindedness, far from disqualifying him for the duties of earth, makes him more faithful and conscientious in his calling; for he remembers that he must render an account for every word and deed at a bar of God's judgment. Yea, in proportion as he is heavenly-minded and follows the example of his Lord and Saviour, he brings heaven down to earth and lifts earth up to heaven, and infuses the purity and happiness of heaven into his home.

Faith unites us to Christ, who is life itself in its truest, fullest conception—life in God, life eternal. United with Christ, we live indeed, shedding round about us the rays of his purity, goodness, love, and peace. Death has lost its terror; it is but a short slumber, from which we shall awake in his likeness, and enjoy what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor ever entered the imagination of man. "Because I live, ye shall live also."

THE ESSENTIAL FAITH OF THE CHURCH, AND PRIVATE SPECULATION.

This is the New Testament eschatology. But we must distinguish between what is essential to faith and what is private opinion and speculation concerning that mysterious world beyond the grave to which every human being travels and from which no traveller returns.

The coming of Christ to judgment with its eternal rewards and punishments is the centre of the eschatological faith of the Church in all its branches—Greek, Latin, and Evangelical. The judgment is preceded by the general resurrection, and followed by life everlasting.

This faith is expressed in the œcumenical creeds.

The Apostles' Creed :

"He shall come to judge the quick and the dead," and "I believe the resurrection of the body and life everlasting."

The Nicene Creed :

"He shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end." "And we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

The Athanasian Creed, so called, adds to these simple statements a damnatory clause at the beginning, middle, and end, and makes salvation depend on belief in the orthodox catholic doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, as therein stated. But that document is of much later origin, and cannot be traced beyond the sixth century.

The liturgies which claim apostolic or post-apostolic origin, give devotional expression to the same essential points in the eucharistic sacrifice.

The Clementine liturgy :

"Being mindful, therefore, of His passion and death, and resurrection from the dead, and return into the heavens, and His future second appearing, wherein He is to come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to recompense to every one according to his works."

The liturgy of James :

"His second glorious and awful appearing, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead, and render to every one according to his works."

The liturgy of Mark :

"His second terrible and dreadful coming, in which He will come to judge righteously the quick and the dead, and to render to each man according to his works."

Beyond this well-defined region of faith and public teaching lies the cloudy domain of private opinion and speculation, and here every church allows, or ought to allow, a large margin of freedom. Wise and good men have differed, and will probably always differ, in this world about such questions as the time of the Second Advent ; the preceding revelation of Antichrist, his character and duration ; the millennium, whether it be literal or figurative, whether it will precede or succeed the Second Advent ; the nature of the millennial reign of Christ, whether it be personal or spiritual ; the condition of the disembodied state between death and resurrection ; the final fate of the heathen and of the countless millions of children dying in infancy ; the proportion of the saved and the lost ; the locality of heaven and hell. These are all open questions in eschatology, on which men cannot help thinking and speculating, but on which it becomes us to be modest and reserved, remembering that we absolutely know nothing certain about the future world but what God has chosen to reveal to us in the Holy Scriptures. That world may be very far from us in the stars or beyond the stars, within the universe or outside of it, if it have boundaries, or it may be very near and round about us. But we do know what is sufficient for faith—that in our Father's house are many mansions, and that Christ has prepared a place for every one of his faithful followers.

THE PATRISTIC ESCHATOLOGY.

I. ON THE STATUS INTERMEDIUS.

Among the darkest points in eschatology is the middle state, or the condition of the soul between death and resurrection. It is difficult to conceive of a disembodied state of happiness or woe without

physical organs for enjoyment and suffering. Justin Martyr held that the souls retain their sensibility after death, otherwise the bad would have the advantage over the good. Origen seems to have assumed some refined, spiritual corporeity which accompanies the soul on its lonely journey, and is the germ of the resurrection body; but the speculative opinions of that profound thinker were looked upon with suspicion, and some of them were ultimately condemned. The idea of the sleep of the soul (*psychopannychia*) had some advocates, but was expressly rejected by Tertullian. It was revived by the Anabaptists in the time of the Reformation, and refuted by Calvin in one of his earliest writings (1534). Others held that the soul died with the body, and was created anew at the resurrection. Eusebius ascribes this notion to some Christians in Arabia. The prevailing view was that the soul continued in a conscious, though disembodied, state, by virtue either of inherent or of communicated immortality. The nature of that state depends upon the moral character formed in this life either for weal or woe, without the possibility of a change except in the same direction. A *second probation* for one and the same individual was not taught by any of the fathers, nor by any other divine of note. Even the Roman purgatory is in no sense a state of *probation*, but simply of continued *purification* of imperfect Christians whose eternal fate is decided in this life, and who will ultimately enter heaven when their sanctification is completed. The only reasonable question is whether those who never had a probation in this life, as the heathen and children dying in infancy, shall have one in the future world; in other words, whether the gospel offer of salvation is confined to the visible church in this world, or extends in some form or other, at some time or other, to all human beings. The former is the old orthodox view; the latter is the prevailing view among modern evangelical divines of Germany, who hold it on the ground of the even justice and boundless mercy of God, who sincerely desires the salvation of all men, and made abundant provision for the salvation of all. As to the last point there can be no doubt; even supra-lapsarian Calvinists maintain that Christ's atonement is *sufficient* for all, though *efficient* only for the elect.

The patristic doctrine of the *status intermedius* was chiefly derived from the Jewish tradition of the Sheol, from the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19, *seq.*), and from the passages of Christ's descent into Hades. The utterances of the ante-Nicene fathers are somewhat vague and confused, but receive light from the more mature statements of the Nicene and post-Nicene fathers, and may be reduced to the following points:

1. The pious who died before Christ, from Abel or Adam down to John the Baptist (with rare exceptions, as Enoch, Moses, and Elijah), were detained in a part of Sheol, waiting for the first Advent, and were released by Christ after the crucifixion and transferred to Paradise. This was the chief aim and result of the *descensus ad inferos*, as understood long before the fourth century, when it became an article of the Apostles' Creed, first in Aquileja (where, however, Rufinus explained it wrongly, as being equivalent to burial), and then in Rome. Hermas of Rome and Clement of Alexandria supposed that the patriarchs and Old Testament saints, before their translation, were baptized by Christ and the apostles. Irenæus repeatedly mentions the descent of Christ to the spirit-world, and regards it as the only means by which the benefits of the redemption could be made known and applied to the pious dead of former ages. The schoolmen of the middle ages gave that part of Sheol or Hades the name *Limbus Patrum*, as distinct from the *Limbus Infantum*. The *Limbus Patrum* was emptied by the descent of Christ, and replaced by *Purgatory*, and this will be emptied at the day of judgment. The *Limbus Infantum* for unbaptized children will continue as a place and state, not of punishment and actual suffering, but of privation of happiness.

2. Christian martyrs and confessors and other eminent saints pass immediately after death into the highest heaven to the blessed vision of God. These, however, are rather exceptional cases, like the translation of Enoch and the ascension of Elijah under the old dispensation.

3. The great majority of Christian believers, being more or less imperfect at the time of their death, enter for an indefinite period into a preparatory state of rest and happiness, usually called Paradise (comp. Luke xxiii. 41) or Abraham's Bosom (Luke xvi. 23). There they are gradually purged of remaining infirmities until they are ripe for heaven, into which nothing is admitted but absolute purity. Origen assumed a constant progression to higher and higher regions of knowledge and bliss. After the fifth or sixth century, certainly since Pope Gregory I., Purgatory was substituted for Paradise, and the idea of penal suffering for preparatory bliss. This was a very important change, which we shall discuss again.

4. The locality of Paradise is uncertain: some imagined it to be a higher region of Hades beneath the earth, yet "afar off" from Gehenna, and separated from it by "a great gulf" (comp. Luke xvi. 23, 26); others transferred it to the lower regions of heaven above the earth, yet clearly distinct from the final home of the blessed. The former seems to have been the idea of Tertullian, the latter that

of Irenæus. The one subsequently prevailed in the Latin, the other in the Greek Church.

5. Impenitent Christians and unbelievers go down to the lower regions of Hades (Gehenna, Tartarus, Hell) into a preparatory state of misery and dreadful expectation of the final judgment. From the fourth century Hades came to be identified with Hell, and this confusion passed into many versions of the Bible, including that of King James, where the two distinct words are indiscriminately rendered hell. This is an unfortunate and misleading blunder. It has been corrected in the Revised Version of the New Testament. It ought to be corrected also in the Apostles' Creed. Christ descended into Hades: this we know from Peter (Acts ii. 31; see the Greek and the Revised Version); and he was in Paradise the very day of his death: this we know from his own lips (Luke xxiii. 43); but it is nowhere stated in the Bible that he descended to Hell or Gehenna. When shall ministers have the courage to correct that objectionable article by substituting Hades (*i. e.*, the spirit-world, the realm of the departed) for Hell (*i. e.*, the place of torment)?

6. The future fate of the heathen and of unbaptized children was left in hopeless darkness, except by Justin and the Alexandrian fathers, who extended the operations of divine grace beyond the limits of the visible church. Justin Martyr must have believed, from his premises, in the salvation of all those heathen who had in this life followed the light of the Divine Logos (that is Christ before his incarnation), and died in a state of unconscious Christianity, or preparedness for Christianity. For, he says, "those who lived with the Logos were Christians, although they were esteemed atheists, as Socrates and Heraclitus, and others like them." The great and good Augustine made an end to this liberal view of the early Greek fathers and framed the fearful dogma of the absolute necessity of *water-baptism* for salvation, and thus excluded even all unbaptized infants forever from heaven. And this remained and is to this day the doctrine of the Latin Church. On this point fortunately Calvin broke loose from the logic of Augustine by giving up the premise, and suspending salvation on eternal election, which may extend far beyond the boundaries of the visible church and sacraments. Zwingli was the first to embrace all children dying in infancy among the elect.

7. There are, in the other world, different degrees of happiness and misery, according to the degrees of merit and guilt. This is reasonable in itself, and supported by many Scripture passages.

8. With the idea of the imperfection of the middle state and the possibility of a progressive amelioration, is connected the commemo-

ration of the departed, and prayer in their behalf. No trace of the custom is found in the New Testament nor in the canonical books of the Old, but an isolated example, which seems to imply habit, occurs in the age of the Maccabees, when Judas Maccabæus and his company offered prayer and sacrifice for those slain in battle, "that they might be delivered from sin" (2 Macc. xii. 39, *seq.*). In old Jewish service-books there are prayers for the blessedness of the dead. The strong sense of the communion of saints unbroken by death easily accounts for the independent rise of a similar custom among the early Christians. Tertullian bears clear testimony to its existence in North Africa at his time (he died about 220 in extreme old age). "We offer," he says, "oblations for the dead on the anniversary of their birth," *i. e.*, their celestial birthday. He gives it as a mark of a Christian widow, that she prays for the soul of her husband, and requests for him refreshment and fellowship in the first resurrection; and she offers sacrifice on the anniversaries of his falling asleep. Eusebius narrates that at the tomb of Constantine a vast crowd of people, in company with the priests of God, with tears and great lamentation offered their prayers to God for the emperor's soul. Augustine calls prayer for the pious dead in the eucharistic sacrifice, "an observance of the universal church, handed down from the fathers." He fully approved of it, and remembered in prayer his godly mother Monnica at her dying request.

This custom is confirmed by the ancient liturgies, which express in substance the devotions of the ante-Nicene age, although they were not committed to writing before the fourth century. The commemoration of the pious dead is an important part in the eucharistic prayers. Take the following from the liturgy of St. James :

"Remember, O Lord God, the spirits of whom we have made mention, and whom we have not made mention, who are of the true faith, from righteous Abel unto this day; do Thou Thyself give them rest there in the land of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the delight of Paradise, in the Bosom of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, our holy fathers; whence pain and grief and lamentation have fled away: there the light of Thy countenance looks upon them, and gives them light for evermore."

The Clementine liturgy, in the eighth book of the "Apostolical Constitutions," has likewise a prayer "for those who rest in faith," in these words :

"We make an offering to Thee for all Thy saints who have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, just men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, elders, deacons, subdeacons, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names Thou Thyself knowest."

9. These views of the middle state in connection with prayers for the dead, show a strong tendency to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, which afterward came to prevail in the West through

the great weight of St. Augustine and Pope Gregory I. But there is, after all, a considerable difference. The ante-Nicene and Nicene idea of the middle state of the pious excludes, or at all events ignores, the idea of *penal suffering*, which is an essential part of the Catholic conception of Purgatory. It represents the condition of all the pious dead as one of *comparative happiness*, inferior only to the perfect happiness after the resurrection. Whatever and wherever Paradise may be, it belongs to the *heavenly* world; while Purgatory is supposed to be a middle region between heaven and hell, and to border rather on the latter. The sepulchral inscriptions in the catacombs have a pre-vaillingly cheerful tone, and represent the departed souls as being "in peace" and "living in Christ," or "in God." The same view is substantially preserved in the Oriental church, which holds that the souls of the departed believers may be aided by the prayers of the living, but are nevertheless in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness.*

Yet alongside with this prevailing belief, we find already before the middle of the third century, traces of the purgatorial idea of suffering, the temporal consequences of sin, and a painful struggle after holiness. Origen, following in the path of Plato, used the term "purgatorial fire," by which the remaining stains of the soul shall be burned away; but he understood this figuratively, and connected it with the consuming fire at the final judgment; while Augustine and Gregory I. transferred it to the middle state. The common people and most of the fathers understood it of a material fire; but this is not a matter of faith, and there are Roman divines who confine the purgatorial sufferings to the mind and the conscience. A material fire would be very useless without a material body.

A still nearer approach to the Roman purgatory was made by Tertullian and Cyprian, who taught that a special satisfaction and penance was required for sins committed after baptism, and that the last farthing must be paid (Matt. v. 20) before the soul can be released from prison and enter into heaven.

It was again St. Augustine, the greatest light of the Latin Church in the fifth century, and the chief architect of catholic orthodoxy, who gave doctrinal and logical shape to this Tertullianic and Cyprianic notion. He strengthened it by a literal interpretation of Paul's passage of salvation "as by fire," *i. e.*, a narrow escape from destruction (1 Cor. iii. 13-15), and by an inference from the passage on the unpardonable sin (Matt. xii. 32). He reasoned thus: If the

* See the Longer Russian Catechism in *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. II., p. 503.

blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is the only sin which cannot be forgiven either in this world nor in that which is to come, it necessarily follows that all *other* sins *may* be forgiven in the future life on condition of repentance,⁴ and before the final judgment.* This became the prevailing doctrine of the Western church (but not in the East, where St. Augustine was scarcely known and exerted no influence whatever). Gregory the Great, the best of the popes, and an ardent admirer of Augustine, gave it additional authority. This doctrine of Purgatory gathered around it many superstitions, masses for the dead, and the pernicious traffic in indulgences for the release of departed relatives and friends, which culminated in the shameful excesses of Tetzels and Samson at the time of the Reformation. Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin revolted with righteous indignation against these abuses; but while they rooted out the mediæval doctrine of Purgatory, they failed to substitute a better theory of the middle state, and left it for our days to reconsider this whole question and to reach positive results. The Protestant creeds almost totally ignore the middle state, and pass from death immediately to the final state after the general judgment, and the old Protestant theologians nearly identify the pre-resurrection state of the righteous and wicked with their post-resurrection state—except that the former is a *disembodied* state of perfect bliss or perfect misery. By this confusion the resurrection and the general judgment are reduced to an empty formality.

II. PATRISTIC DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

The subject of future punishment has been very prominently brought into view recently by the controversy between Canon Farrar and the late Dr. Pusey. Both agree in rejecting Universalism and in holding to the Romanizing theory of "future purification" (instead of probation), which increases the number of the saved by withdrawing vast multitudes of imperfect Christians from the awful doom. Both profess to abhor what they choose to term the popular notion about Hell with all its extravagances. But Farrar goes much further in the attempt to reduce Hell to the smallest possible dimensions of time and space, or to a very narrow pit, and he claims on his side a number of the early fathers; while Dr. Pusey, in the last of his books (1880), tries to show that all the fathers, with the exception of a few who were condemned as heretical, taught the doctrine of everlasting punishment in the strict and proper sense of that term,

* *De Civitate Dei*, xxi. 24.

although without the excesses of certain popular preachers. There is no doubt that a marked change is going on, not only in the Church of England, but also among Dissenters and in the various Churches of America, in favor of milder and more liberal views. Sermons, like that of Jonathan Edwards on the sinner in the hands of an angry God, could not be preached nowadays without emptying the church. Modern theology is controlled by the idea of God's love rather than the idea of his justice. The change of views on the subject of infant salvation in the Calvinistic churches amounts to an actual revolution, as has been shown by Dr. Prentiss in the last number of this REVIEW.

Three theories are possible on the fate of the impenitent or hopelessly wicked after the general judgment: *everlasting punishment, annihilation, restoration* (after remedial punishment and repentance). All these theories had advocates in the patristic age, but the first was predominant, and ultimately prevailed. Let us consider them separately:

I. EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT always was, and always will be, the orthodox doctrine on that dark and terrible subject. It rests on the highest authority, from which there is no appeal. Christ, who knew more than any living being, and who came into this world for the express purpose of saving sinners by the sacrifice of his own spotless life, has furnished the strongest arguments for that doctrine that can be found in the Bible. If we had to deal only with Paul, we might come to the Universalist conclusion by pressing his parallel between the first and second Adam, the universal fall, and the universal redemption, and such passages as, "God shall be all in all" (Rom. v. 12 *seq.*; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 28). But we are forced to understand him and every other apostle in consistency with the teaching of the Master, and it is the Master who speaks of the worm that never dies and the fire that never is quenched (Mark ix. 48), of the unpardonable sin that cannot be forgiven either in the present or the future æon (Matt. xii. 32), of the son of perdition, for whom it would have been better if he had never been born (Matt. xxvi. 24). It is the Master who contrasts eternal life and eternal punishment in a manner that the limitation of the one would imply a limitation of the other (Matt. xxv. 46). Admitting, as every scholar must, that *αἰώνιος* is itself not necessarily unlimited any more than the *αἰών* to which it belongs, the force of the argument lies in the connection and in the contrast: "eternal life" for the righteous, "eternal punishment" for the hopelessly impenitent. And this is the last word on the subject from the mouth of him who shall himself be the Judge and pronounce the final verdict. Here the curtain falls, and all beyond is

hidden from our sight. Fortunately, however, our Lord's infinite mercy, his treatment of little babes, his prayer of pardon for his own murderers, permit us to hope and believe that the overwhelming majority of the human race, for which he shed his precious blood, will ultimately be saved.

But now to the patristic views. Dr. Pusey claims all the Apostolic Fathers,—Clement, Ignatius, Barnabas, and Hermas,—for the doctrine of everlasting punishment; but their views on this and nearly all other subjects are rather vague and indefinite, and cannot be pressed except as tending in that direction. They were not theologians, and their epistles were purely practical, urging the readers to holy living.

Justin Martyr (d. 166) is the first Christian thinker who brought considerable philosophical (especially Platonic) culture into the Church, and applied it to the defence of Christianity against the abuses, slanders, and persecutions of the heathen. His position is disputed. Petavius, Dr. Edward Beecher, and Canon Farrar, claim him for the theory of annihilation of the wicked. It is true that he rejects, with several ante-Nicene fathers, the Platonic theory of the intrinsic or metaphysical immortality of the soul, and holds to a conditional immortality which depends upon the will of God, and which may be forfeited. In the Dialogue with Trypho, he puts into the mouth of the old Christian, by whom he was converted on the sea-shore, the sentence:

“Such as are worthy to see God die no more, but others shall undergo punishment *as long as it shall please Him that they shall exist and be punished.*”*

But in twelve other passages he speaks of the fate of the wicked in a way that is inconsistent with annihilation.

“Briefly,” he says, † “what we look for, and have learned from Christ, and what we teach, is as follows. Plato said to the same effect, that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the wicked when they came to them; we say that the same thing will take place; but that the Judge will be Christ, and that their souls will be united to the same bodies, and will undergo an *eternal* punishment (*αἰώνιον κόλασιν*); *and not*, as Plato said, for a period of only a thousand years (*χιλιονταετῆ περιόδου*).”

In another place ‡: “We believe that all who live wickedly and do not repent, will be punished in eternal fire” (*ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ*).

We cannot on this account charge him with inconsistency. As a philosopher, he could believe either in the mortality or immortality of the soul as he made it depend on the will of the Creator. As a

* *Dial.*, a. s. Comp. the note of Otto, *Justini Op.* II., 26. † *Apol.* I., 8. ‡ *Apol.* I., 21.

believer in the Scriptures, he believed in the immortality of the good and bad, God choosing to reward the one and to punish the other for ever and ever. His psychology *might* have landed him in the annihilation theory, but his theology prevented it.

The same may be said of Irenæus (d. about 200) who has likewise been claimed for annihilation, and even for restoration. Farrar charges him with inconsistent wavering between these two theories. He denies, like Justin Martyr, Tatian, Arnobius, and others the inherent and necessary immortality of the soul, and makes the continuance in life, as well as life itself, a gift of God. He reasons that whatever is created had a beginning, and therefore *may* have an end. Whether it will or not, depends upon man's gratitude or ingratitude to the Creator. He who preserves the gift of life and is grateful to the Giver, shall receive length of days for ever and ever (*accipiet et in saeculum saeculi longitudinem dierum*); but he who casts it away and becomes ungrateful to his Maker, "*deprives himself of perseverance forever*" (*ipse se privat in saeculum saeculi perseverantia*. *Adv. Hær.* II., 34, § 3). From this passage, which exists only in the imperfect Latin version, Dodwell, Beecher, and Farrar infer that Irenæus taught annihilation, and interpret *perseverantia* to mean continued existence; but Massuet (see his note in Stieren's Ed., I., 415) and Pusey (p. 183) explain *perseverantia* of continuance in *real* life in God, or eternal *happiness*. The passage, it must be admitted, is not clear, for *longitudo dierum* and *perseverantia* are not identical, nor is *perseverantia* equivalent to *existentia* or *vita*. In Book iv., 20, 7, Irenæus says that Christ "became the dispenser of the paternal grace for the benefit of man, . . . lest man, falling away from God altogether, should *cease to exist*" (*cessaret esse*); but he adds, "the life of man consists in beholding God" (*vita autem hominis visio Dei*). In the fourth Pfaffian Fragment ascribed to him (Stieren, I., 889), he says that Christ "will come at the end of time to destroy all evil (*εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι πᾶν τὸ κακόν*) and to reconcile all things (*εἰς τὸ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα*, from Col. i. 20), that there may be an end of all impurity." This passage, like 1 Cor. xv. 28, and Col. i. 20, looks toward universal restoration rather than annihilation, but admits, like the Pauline passages, of an interpretation consistent with eternal punishment. (See the long note in Stieren.) We must depend, then, upon such passages in Irenæus which leave no room for doubt as to his real conviction. In paraphrasing the apostolic rule of faith, he mentions eternal punishment, and in another place he accepts as certain truth that "eternal fire is prepared for sinners" because "the Lord openly

affirms, and the other Scriptures prove" it.* Ziegler† comes to the same conclusion, that Irenæus teaches the eternity of punishment in several passages, or presupposes it, and quotes III., 23, 3; IV., 27, 4; 28, 1; IV., 33, 11; 39, 4; 40, 1 and 2.

Hippolytus of Rome, a pupil of Irenæus and the most prominent and fertile writer in the early part of the third century, in his recently discovered *Philosophumena*, or *Refutation of all Heresies*, agrees with Irenæus. He approves the eschatology of the Pharisees as regards the resurrection, the immortality of the soul, the judgment and conflagration, everlasting life, and "everlasting punishment"; and in another place he speaks of "the rayless scenery of gloomy Tartarus, where never shines a beam from the radiating voice of the Word."

According to Tertullian, the future punishment "will continue, not for a long time, but forever." It does credit to his feelings when he says that no innocent man can rejoice in the punishment of the guilty, however just, but will grieve rather.

Cyprian thinks that the fear of hell is the only ground of the fear of death to any one, and that we should have before our eyes the fear of God and eternal punishment much more than the fear of men and brief suffering.

The Latin fathers of the Nicene and post-Nicene ages are almost unanimous on this subject, especially Jerome and Augustine. There is no dispute about their opinion.

2. The final ANNIHILATION of the wicked removes all discord from the universe of God at the expense of the natural immortality of the soul, and on the ground that sin will ultimately destroy the sinner, and thus destroy itself.

This theory is attributed to Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others, who believed only in a conditional immortality which may be forfeited; but, as we have just seen, their utterances in favor of eternal punishment are too clear and strong to justify the inference which they *might* have drawn from their psychology.

Arnobius, however, an apologist of the third century, strongly expressed belief in actual annihilation; for he speaks of certain souls that "are engulfed and burned up, or hurled down, and, having been reduced to nothing, vanish in the frustration of a perpetual destruction."

In recent times Dr. R. Rothe has revived this theory. He holds

* *Adv. Haer.* III., 4, 1; II., 28, 7; see Pusey, pp. 177-181.

† *Irenæus*, p. 312.

that the wicked, after their conversion has become a moral impossibility, will be annihilated.* Nitzsch intimates that they will become a perpetual ruin. In England the annihilation theory has gained currency in connection with the view that immortality is a gift of grace to believers in Christ. It is advocated by Edward White in his *Life in Christ*.

3. The APOKATASTASIS, or final restoration of all rational beings to holiness and happiness. This seems to be the most satisfactory solution of the problem of sin, and secures perfect harmony in the creation, but it does violence to freedom which involves the power to perpetuate resistance, and it ignores the hardening nature of sin and the ever-increasing difficulty of repentance. If conversion and salvation are an ultimate necessity, they lose their moral character and moral aim.

Origen, the great light of the Eastern Church in the middle of the third century, was the first Christian Universalist. He taught from Platonic premises a final restoration of fallen men and angels. He set forth this view with becoming modesty, as a speculation rather than a dogma, in his youthful work, *De Principiis* (written before 231), which was made known in the West by the loose version of Rufinus (398). In his later writings there are only faint traces of it. He seems at least to have modified it, and exempted Satan from final repentance and salvation; but this would leave a discord in the moral universe and defeat the end of the Universalist theory. He also obscured it by his notion of the necessary mutability of free will, and the constant succession of fall and redemption.

Universal salvation (including Satan) was clearly taught by Gregory of Nyssa, a profound thinker of the school of Origen (d. 395), and, from an exegetical stand-point, by the eminent Antiochian divines, Diodorus of Tarsus (d. 394), and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), and many Nestorian bishops. Chrysostom, a pupil and admirer of Diodorus and friend of Theodore, usually employs the popular language of the Church, but explains 1 Cor. xv. 28 in a way that looks toward an apokatastasis as a final possibility. In the West, also, at the time of Augustine (d. 430), there were, as he says, "multitudes who did not believe in eternal punishment." But the view of Origen was rejected by Epiphanius, Jerome, and Augustine, who strongly taught the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Universalism was at last condemned as one of the Origenistic errors under the Emperor Justinian (543). Pusey contends (pp. 125-137) that Origen

* *Dogmatik*, II., 335.

was condemned by the fifth Œcumenical Council, 553; but Hefele conclusively proves that the fifteen anathematisms against Origen were passed by a *local* Synod of Constantinople in 543, under Mennas.* The same view was before advocated by Dupin, Walch, and Döllinger.

Since that time the doctrine of the final salvation of all men has been regarded as a heresy, except by the Universalists, who make it one of their three articles of faith. It is, however, tolerated in some orthodox Protestant Churches (*e. g.*, the Lutheran, Episcopal, and Congregational) as a private speculative opinion or charitable hope.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

* See his *Conciliengesch.*, second ed., Vol. II., 859 *seq.*