

The arguments outlined have been presented in order to cast a somewhat different light upon the old debate about Scripture and science. Arguments of this type cannot of themselves settle the question as to whether or not Genesis one speaks of twenty-four hour days and a rapid succession of instantaneous mature creations. Only the text of Genesis and of other relevant Scriptures can settle that question. Yet the professional Christian geologist, called upon to apply the teaching of Scripture to his daily labors, is led to wonder whether a doctrine that effectively eliminates the discipline in which he is interested, namely, that of speaking to the earth that it might teach him, is a doctrine that is taught in Scripture after all.

New York University

## REVELATION 20:4-6 AND THE QUESTION OF THE MILLENNIUM

JAMES A. HUGHES

WITH reference to the controversial question of the millennium, the passage of Scripture which seems to be the primary battleground is Revelation 20:4-6.<sup>1</sup> This is understandable, for it alone uses the term "thousand years" with respect to the reign with Christ. And in this connection it should be kept in mind that these verses deal with the thousand-year reign and with it alone. They are not concerned with what happened *before* the thousand-year reign, nor are they concerned with what happens *after* the thousand-year reign. This is shown explicitly in the context. Verses 1-3 mention the binding of Satan for a thousand years as a prelude to verses 4-6,<sup>2</sup> and verses 7-10 mention what happens when the thousand years have ended and Satan is released from his prison. And therefore the intervening verses (4-6) speak of the thousand-year period itself.

It should be noted that during the thousand-year period Satan is bound with regard to one thing only, his deceiving the nations. This is clear from verse 3. Satan was cast into the bottomless pit and was shut up, and a seal was set upon him "that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled." During the thousand-year period Satan is bound in

<sup>1</sup> This passage is in a real sense the *locus classicus* of the millennial controversy.

<sup>2</sup> Loraine Boettner (*The Millennium* [Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1958]), says: "We hold . . . that the binding of Satan is a process continuing through this dispensation as evil is more and more suppressed, as the world is more and more Christianized, and as there is therefore less and less occasion for God to use the Devil as an instrument in the punishing of sinners" (p. 127). But it is clear that the binding of Satan was an act that occurred prior to the thousand-year period. Also it is difficult to see how Boettner's view could be reconciled with the statement in Rev. 20 that at the end of the thousand years Satan goes out to deceive the nations to gather them together to battle.

order not to deceive the nations. What this deception is is shown in verses 7 and 8: "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."<sup>3</sup> So the deception of the nations is with reference to Satan's gathering them together to battle<sup>4</sup> (literally: *the* battle; this is a definite battle). What is the battle to which Satan gathers together the nations? The only reasonable answer is that it is the Battle of Armageddon mentioned in Revelation 16.<sup>5</sup> In Revelation 16 we read that the Apostle John saw "three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet" (verse 13). And "they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. . . . And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon" (verses 14 and 16). It is "the battle of that great day of God Almighty." And it is interesting to note that the evil triad (the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet) are instrumental in gathering "the kings of the earth and of the

<sup>3</sup> Joseph A. Seiss (*The Apocalypse* [New York: Charles C. Cook, 1917], III, 284), contends that if Satan is bound now, "then the inspired Peter was all wrong; for he sent out a general Epistle to all Christians, in which he wrote: 'Your adversary the Devil, as a roaring lion, *walketh about*, seeking whom he may devour.'" But Peter's words do not militate against Satan's being bound now, for he is bound only with reference to his gathering the nations to battle. In this connection, William Hendriksen (*More Than Conquerors* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961], pp. 223-29) expends a number of pages trying to show in what way Satan is bound now; and he concludes with the following words: "But there is *one* thing which—during this period!—he [Satan] cannot do. With respect to this one thing he is definitely and securely bound. He cannot destroy the church as a mighty missionary organization heralding the Gospel to all the nations. He cannot do that until the thousand years are finished." Although we are convinced that Hendriksen is right in his insistence that Satan is bound now, we are just as convinced that he is wrong in his interpretation of the binding, as it is viewed in the context of Rev. 20.

<sup>4</sup> See W. J. Grier, *The Momentous Event* (Belfast: Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), pp. 87-88.

<sup>5</sup> See Hendriksen, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

whole world . . . to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." And obviously the same battle is mentioned in Revelation 19. In verse 19 of Revelation 19 we read that John "saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war [literally: to make or do the battle] against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." And in verse 20 we read that "the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone."

Satan is not mentioned in the passage in Revelation 19, not because he was not present but because he is dealt with in the next chapter. In verse 10 of Revelation 20 we read that "the devil that deceived them [the nations] was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." We are not to infer from this that the beast and the false prophet were cast into the lake of fire before the devil. It should be noted that the copula ("are": εἰσί) is wanting in the original, and that the final verb ("shall be tormented": βασανισθήσονται) is in the plural. Also, the King James Version has not translated the first καί in the relative clause. The verse may be rendered thus: And the devil who deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, whither (were cast) also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. It is obvious that the beast and the false prophet are cast into the lake of fire at the same time as the devil. The beast and the false prophet are not cast into the lake of fire a thousand years before the devil, as the premillennialists contend. For, as we noticed in Revelation 16, all three are instrumental in gathering together the nations to the battle of the great day. It is unthinkable that Satan would gather together the nations to the battle without using the beast and the false prophet. Through whom would he gather the nations if not through the beast and the false prophet?

Now Revelation 12 is a very important chapter to provide a background for a consideration of Revelation 20. In Revelation 12 it is mentioned that Satan "was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him" (verse 9). And John "heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and

strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time" (verses 10-12). Apparently those who overcame Satan by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony and who loved not their lives even to death are those mentioned in Revelation 20, verse 4, who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God. And probably these are also the ones mentioned in Revelation 6, verse 9, who had been slain for the Word of God and for the testimony they held.

Returning to Revelation 12, we notice in the section we quoted above that John "heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the *kingdom* of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye *heavens*, and ye that dwell in them" (italics ours). This indicates that the kingdom is in heaven and not on earth.<sup>6</sup> The context shows, furthermore, that the kingdom

<sup>6</sup> The following chart, giving the parallels found in Rev. 12 and Rev. 20, shows that the reign with Christ is in heaven:

<p>Rev. 12:7-9</p> <p>And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.</p>	<p>(war in heaven, and Satan cast out into the earth)</p>	<p>Rev. 20:1-3</p> <p>And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.</p>
--	---	---

is the reign of Christ with those who overcame Satan by the blood of the Lamb and who loved not their lives even to death (*i.e.*, who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God). Thus the thousand-year reign is in heaven and not on earth.<sup>7</sup>

When is the thousand-year reign? Revelation 12 tells us. We read in verse 12 of Revelation 12 that at the time the heavens rejoice there is woe to the inhabitants of the earth, for the devil

<p>Rev. 12:10-12a</p> <p>And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them.</p>	<p>(in heaven)</p>	<p>Rev. 20:4-6</p> <p>And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and Judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.</p>
---	--------------------	---

<p>Rev. 12:17</p> <p>And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.</p>	<p>(on earth)</p>	<p>Rev. 20:7-9</p> <p>And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them.</p>
--	-------------------	--

For a somewhat similar chart see Hendriksen, *ibid.*, pp. 221, 222.

<sup>7</sup> This militates against both the post- and premillennial views, which contend that the thousand-year reign takes place on earth.

was cast out to the earth. And verse 14 reads: "And to the woman [this obviously refers to the church] were given two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times and half a time, from the face of the serpent." Verse 6, which corresponds to this, mentions "a thousand two hundred and threescore days." So the thousand-year period corresponds to the 1260 days and the time, times, and a half time (3½ years) And these correspond to the 42 months mentioned in Revelation 11. In Revelation 11, verse 2, we read that the court outside the temple was not to be measured, "for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months." Comparing this with Luke 21 we see that it refers to the time from the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24). The context in Luke 21 is as follows: "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (verses 20-24). Thus the passages in Luke 21, Revelation 11, and Revelation 12 show that the thousand-year period (or 1260 days, 3½ years, 42 months) covers the time from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of this dispensation. So the thousand-year reign is going on now,<sup>8</sup> and (from what was said above) it is going on in heaven.

<sup>8</sup> The following chart, giving the time-parallels found in Lk. 21, Rev. 11, Rev. 12, and Rev. 20, shows that the reign with Christ in heaven is going on now:

Lk. 21:20-24	Rev. 11:1-3	Rev. 12:13, 14	Rev. 20:1, 2
And when ye shall see Jerusalem com-	And there was given me a reed like unto a rod:	And when the dragon saw that he was cast	And I saw an angel come down from

These considerations prepare us for a close examination of Revelation 20:4-6. These verses read as follows: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received

Lk. 21:20-24	Rev. 11:1-3	Rev. 12:13, 14	Rev. 20:1, 2
passed with armies then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.	and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months.	unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child. And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.	heaven having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years.

For a somewhat similar chart see Hendriksen, *ibid.*, p. 173.

his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." We note first of all (in verse 4) that John saw thrones. These are obviously judgment-thrones. For we read that judgment was given to those who sat on the thrones. Those who sat on the thrones were invested with authority to judge. And John saw also "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God." This corresponds to the expression "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held" in Revelation 6:9. These expressions clearly refer to disembodied souls.<sup>9</sup> And John saw (the souls of) those who<sup>10</sup> "had not worshipped the beast, neither his

<sup>9</sup> Charles L. Feinberg (*Premillennialism or Amillennialism?* [Wheaton: Van Kampen, 1954], p. 189) states that "the Scriptures speak of a whole person by the word 'soul.'" Of course this is true, but rarely is this the case when ψυχή is followed by the genitive, as we find here. Alford (*The Greek Testament*, [London: Longmans Green, 1898], IV, 719) translates ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων "persons of men," in Rev. 18:13; but it is better to view ψυχὰς with the word σωματῶν which precedes it, as does the French *Version Synodale*: "corps et âmes d'hommes." The term "bodies and souls of men" means simply "men" (for the body and the soul are the two parts of man's nature), viewed in this context as slaves. Williams in *The New Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1949), translates τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πεπελεκισμένων, in Rev. 20:4, thus: "those who had been beheaded," i.e., the persons who had been beheaded, the genitive being construed appositionally. But it should be noted that Williams translates a similar expression τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων, in Rev. 6:9, thus: "the souls of those who had been slaughtered," which is much more natural (for it is clear that disembodied souls are meant; in fact, there is no clearer way to show this). The genitive in both examples is best viewed possessively. In Rom. 2:9 the expression ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου occurs, whereas in verse 6 ἐκάστῳ alone appears and in verse 10 παντί alone is used. It is obvious that the expression (ἐπὶ) πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου (which is a Hebraism for man himself; cf. מִן כָּל בְּשָׂר ודָּם) means "(upon) every man" or "(upon) every person" (the part standing for the whole), the genitive being naturally construed appositionally which is not the case in Rev. 20:4.

<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that the relative ὅστις (of which ὅτινες is the

image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." It is not certain whether there are three groups or only one mentioned in verse 4. Most likely it is only one, for the expression "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus" seems to unite what precedes with what follows. That is, it unites the two correlative concepts of judging and reigning.<sup>11</sup> In fact, judging is an aspect of reigning. Hence John saw sitting on judgment-thrones those who reigned with Christ in their disembodied state. The ones whom John saw had been martyred for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God. Whether John saw three groups or only one, it is to be noted that in this verse (verse 4) there is no mention of bodies, only souls. Hence, although those sitting on thrones are mentioned before the word "souls" occurs, it is clearly implied that they were invested with authority to judge in their disembodied state. And further, it is clearly implied that those who lived and reigned with Christ were in a disembodied state. For obviously there was reigning in the same state as judging.

It is true that the aorist tense in Greek is sometimes construed as an ingressive aorist, in which case the verb ἔζησαν would be translated "they came to life." But it can hardly be so rendered in this verse (verse 4), for (as we stated above) the concepts of judging and reigning appear to be united by the expression "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus." And also, the words "lived" and "reigned" go together, i.e., they "lived" with Christ a thousand years and "reigned" with Christ a thousand years.<sup>12</sup> If they "came to

plural) "differs scarcely at all from the simple relative ὅς" (Thayer, *Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 457). Therefore ὅτινες may be translated "who" and thus refers back to the ones mentioned previously.

<sup>11</sup> We may think of it thus: I saw the souls of those who were invested with authority to judge, who had been beheaded and who had not worshipped the beast; and they (i.e., the souls of those who had been beheaded, the martyrs in their disembodied state) lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

<sup>12</sup> Robertson (*A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* [4th ed., New York, Doran, 1923], p. 833) says that ἔζησαν is probably ingressive . . . but ἐβασίλευσαν is clearly constative." But this breaks the connection between ἔζησαν and ἐβασίλευσαν, and it removes ἔζησαν from any connection with the phrase χίλια ἔτη.

life," they also "began to reign" (for both verbs are in the aorist tense); and if they "came to life," they came to life with Christ a thousand years and began to reign with Christ a thousand years. Thus it is seen that the only plausible rendering is "they lived," the aorist being construed as a constative (or historical) aorist. And to support this, it should be noted that there appear to be only two places in the New Testament where the aorist indicative of the verb ζάω ("live") may properly be construed as an ingressive aorist.<sup>13</sup> Both examples refer to Christ's resurrection. In Revelation 2, verse 8, there is a very clear instance of the use of ζάω as an ingressive aorist: and to the angel of the church in Smyrna write: These things says the first and the last, who *became dead* [ἐγένετο νεκρός]: and *came to life* [ἔζησεν]. And, in the light of this, Romans 14, verse 9, may be translated: For to this end Christ *became dead* [ἀπέθανεν] and *came to life* [ἔζησεν]: that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living. But such is not the case in Revelation 20:4. To say that someone "became dead" and "came to life" is very different from saying that someone saw the *souls* of those who had been beheaded and (of those) who had not worshipped the beast, and *they* came to life. In fact, the latter example indicates that it would be the *souls* that came to life. But this is impossible, for souls do not die like bodies. In the light of these considerations, here the aorist will not take the translation "came to life." So the martyrs lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years in their disembodied state. And this is called the "first resurrection." The first resurrection is the soul's being raised from earth to heaven,<sup>14</sup> the

<sup>13</sup> According to Thayer (*op. cit.*, p. 270), the verb ἔζησεν in Lk. 15:32 is to be construed as an ingressive aorist. But it is doubtful that it is to be so construed. It is opposed to νεκρός ἦν "he was dead"; therefore it seems most natural to construe ἔζησεν as a so-called dramatic aorist: "he is alive" or "he lives." Also, according to Thayer (*ibid.*), ἔζησεν in Rev. 13:14 is an ingressive aorist. But again it appears that the aorist is to be construed as a "dramatic aorist." The beast has ἔχει, not εἶχε "had") the wound from the sword, but it lives. In spite of the wound the beast lives. One of the heads of the beast was "as it were wounded to death" (verse 3). But in spite of the wound from the sword the beast revived, and thus it is stated that the beast has the wound by the sword and lives.

<sup>14</sup> See Hendriksen, *op. cit.*, pp. 231, 232. Or as Berkhof (*Systematic*

effect of which is the living and reigning with Christ a thousand years.<sup>15</sup>

That the term "resurrection"<sup>16</sup> is not confined to the body

*Theology* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1941], p. 727) puts it: "In all probability the expression [the first resurrection] refers to the entrance of the souls of the saints upon the glorious state of life with Christ at death." According to the Puritan divine Thomas Watson (*A Body of Divinity* [London: Rassmore and Alabaster, 1898], p. 215), the "first resurrection" is "rising by repentance out of the grave of sin . . . This is the first resurrection; and if your souls are thus spiritually raised, your bodies shall be gloriously raised . . ." But the context in which the expression the "first resurrection" appears speaks about disembodied souls, not embodied souls; and therefore the "first resurrection" refers to the state of the soul in the next life, not its state in this life. In this connection, Hamilton (*The Basis of Millennial Faith* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952], pp. 121-123) says that "the first resurrection . . . [is] the resurrection of the soul dead in sin to eternal life in Christ. . . ." And he calls this the "new birth" and says that "it continues without interruption on into eternity." And thus he ties together the aspects of time and eternity with reference to the life of the soul, and then concludes with the remark: "If the 'first resurrection' refers to the eternal life of the new-born soul in eternal bliss, reigning with Christ *now*, there is definite point to the contrast with the second death which has no power over such souls reigning with Christ." It is true, as Hamilton shows, that there is a definite connection between the state of the soul in this life and its state in the next life; but, as the context in Rev. 20 indicates, the term "first resurrection" cannot be applied to the state of the soul in this life.

<sup>15</sup> This is an example of metonymy: the "first resurrection" is really the entrance of the soul into a glorified state of life with Christ at physical death, but John uses the term to refer to the soul's living with Christ a thousand years (in heaven).

<sup>16</sup> Feinberg (*op. cit.*, p. 189) states that ἀνάστασις "never occurs in any other sense but the etymological one with the single exception of Luke 2:34." But its etymological sense is that of "a raising up, rising"; and then by extension it means "a rising from the dead" (see Thayer, *op. cit.*, p. 41). And it is gratuitous to infer that "a rising from the dead" can only be with reference to the body (as, e.g., Feinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 189; and C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology* [New York: Scribner, Armstrong, and Co., 1877] III, 772, who says: "That the Scriptures . . . teach a literal resurrection of the body is proved . . . from the meaning of the word. Resurrection signifies a rising again; a rising of that which was buried; or a restoration of life to that which was dead. But the soul, according to the Scriptures, does not die when the body is dissolved. It, therefore, cannot be the subject of a resurrection, except in the sense antithetical to spiritual death . . ."). "A rising from the dead" may be

may be shown by citing a few corroboratory passages. For example, in Luke 20 occurs that account of Jesus' discourse with the Sadducees, who denied that there is a resurrection. The Sadducees said to Jesus: "Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife and raise up seed unto his brother. There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the

viewed either with reference to the body or to the soul. It is the context alone that determines whether the resurrection refers to the body or to the soul. Now "a rising from the dead" with reference to the soul means that at physical death the soul (of the Christian) enters into a glorified state of life with Christ. And "a rising from the dead" with reference to the body means simply a rising from the state or condition of physical death (on the phrase *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, see Thayer, *op. cit.*, pp. 189, 190, 423). It does not mean that some are raised and the rest are not. Nor does it imply that some are raised before the rest. In this connection, Feinberg (*op. cit.*, p. 344) translates the phrase *ἐκ νεκρῶν* "from the dead ones," and he contends that this phrase is never found with reference to the wicked dead. But it appears that the expressions *ἐκ νεκρῶν* "from the dead," and *νεκρῶν*, "of the dead," are used interchangeably. That this is so may be seen from Acts 17:31, 32. Here we read that Paul said that God "hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him [Christ] from the dead [*ἐκ νεκρῶν*]. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead [*νεκρῶν*] some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter." That the expressions in question are not to be translated "in that he hath raised him from the dead ones" and "when they heard of the resurrection of the dead ones" (which is the way they would have to be translated, if Feinberg's contention were right) is obvious, for this would mean that the ones from among whom Christ was raised were also raised. Actually, the expressions are used interchangeably and mean that Christ was raised from the state of death and that the men of Athens heard from Paul's lips that He was indeed raised from death (*cf.* Rom. 1:4, where the expression *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν* means "by the resurrection from the dead," *i.e.*, from the state of death). Since the expressions *ἐκ νεκρῶν* and *νεκρῶν* are used interchangeably, it is irrelevant to contend that *ἐκ νεκρῶν* is never used with reference to the wicked dead. In this connection, it should be noted that *νεκρῶν* is used with reference to the wicked dead in only one passage (although the wicked, as well as the righteous, are doubtless implied in such passages as Acts 23:6 and 24:21), namely, Acts 24:15, where we read that Paul said that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead [*νεκρῶν*], both of the just and unjust." And even here its occurrence is uncertain, for there is a textual question: the *Textus Receptus* has *νεκρῶν*; however, the manuscript evidence favors its omission.

second took her to wife, and he died childless. And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife" (verses 28-33). The important phrase to consider at this time is "in the resurrection" (verse 33). Obviously, in this context it means "in the next life" or "in the next world" or "in heaven." And Jesus' answer to the Sadducees' question corresponds to this. Jesus said to them: "The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him" (verses 34-38). In verse 35, it appears that Jesus equated the two expressions "to obtain that world" and "the resurrection from the dead." Thus, to obtain that world = to be raised from the dead. Hence verse 35 may be translated: But those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *even* the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. There is nothing in the context that indicates that Jesus was talking about a bodily resurrection.<sup>17</sup> In fact, to show that there is a resurrection from the dead Jesus cited a passage from Exodus — that of Moses at the bush. Christ said in substance that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive and that

<sup>17</sup> Feinberg (*ibid.*, p. 183) states concerning Lk. 20:35, "On the very surface of it, if all the dead are to be raised at one time, no one would have to be worthy to obtain a part in the resurrection, for all would have a part in it." Feinberg pleads for two resurrections (or for a "twofold resurrection"; possibly he uses this term to try to make his view correspond to such expressions as "a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust"), but two *bodily* resurrections; and he contends that this verse supports his position. This is a real thrust against those who hold the general-resurrection view, but who construe the resurrection mentioned in Lk. 20 as a bodily one. But what might appear to support his position, we believe really militates against it. For the context will not warrant one's construing this resurrection as a bodily one.

therefore there is a resurrection from the dead. And it is obvious that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive with reference to the soul, not the body. Their bodies will be raised when Christ returns visibly. So Christ would not have mentioned their being alive unless He was referring to their souls.<sup>18</sup> Abra-

<sup>18</sup> Geldenhuis (*Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951], pp. 511-12) says that "real life (in the Biblical sense) is life in soul and in body alike; therefore immortality (in the Biblical sense) includes resurrection (the union of the soul with the glorified, 'spiritual' body)." But, as Lk. 20 shows, real life is also life with reference to the soul alone. There is, to be sure, a resurrection in which the soul is united with the body, as Geldenhuis asserts; but it is not this resurrection that is in the foreground in Lk. 20, although of course the two resurrections (that of the soul and that of the body) are related. It is the total man who is raised, and in a real sense the resurrection is not complete until the body is raised. With reference to Lk. 20, A. A. Hodge (*Outlines of Theology* [New York: Robert Carter, 1862] p. 551) says: "Long after the death of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Jehovah designated himself to Moses as their God. Ex. iii. 6. But, argues Christ against the Sadducee who denied the resurrection of the dead, 'he is the God, not of the dead, but of the living'. This more immediately proves the immortality of their souls, but as God is the covenant God of persons, and as the persons of these patriarchs included alike body and soul, this argument likewise establishes the ultimate immortality of the body also, i.e., of the entire person." From this statement, it might seem as though Hodge is implying that there is a resurrection relating to the soul, as well as to the body. But that such is not the case is shown by the following words of Hodge: "ἀνάστασις signifies etymologically 'a rising or raising up'. It is used in Scripture to designate the future general raising, by the power of God, of the bodies of all men from the sleep of death" (*ibid.*, p. 559). C. Hodge (*op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 771) emphatically denies that "the continued existence of the soul after death" is a resurrection. He says: "By the resurrection is not meant the continued existence of the soul after death. The fact that the Sadducees in the time of Christ, against whom most of the arguments found in the New Testament in favour of the doctrine of the resurrection were directed, denied not only that doctrine, but also that of the continued existence of the soul after death, sufficiently accounts for the sacred writings combining the two subjects." But there is nothing in the context that indicates that anything other than the soul's rising to (or living in) a glorified state of life in heaven is under consideration (at least in an explicit sense) when Christ speaks of a resurrection. No matter how much a bodily resurrection might be implied, to remove the idea of resurrection from any connection with the soul itself is unwarranted by the context. Hodge says that "all that this passage [and he is referring to the parallel passage in Mk. 12] directly proves is that the dead continue alive after

ham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive in heaven in their disembodied state. God is not the God of the dead but of the living. There is a resurrection from the dead.

Another corroboratory section is in I Corinthians 15. This is the chapter that is usually cited with reference to the bodily resurrection of Christ. Surely there is a clear reference to Christ's bodily resurrection in this chapter. If Christ was not raised bodily from the dead, our faith is vain: we are yet in our sins. But Christ was raised. This is a great proof that historic or biblical Christianity is true. And this is the guarantee that the dead are raised. In this chapter Paul was talking about the resurrection as it relates to Christians only. Those outside Christ are not mentioned at all in this chapter. Paul mentioned the resurrection in two aspects: as it relates to the soul and as it relates to the body.<sup>19</sup>

the dissolution of the body. But as this is Christ's answer to a question concerning the resurrection, it has been inferred that the resurrection means nothing more than that the soul does not die with the body, but rises to a new and higher life" (*ibid.*). Of course the word "resurrection" means more than the soul's rising to a glorified state of life, but in this passage this is all that is under direct consideration. Hodge calls Rev. 20:4-6 a "doubtful passage" in "an obscure book" (*ibid.*, pp. 838, 842). And his uncertainty with reference to the interpretation of Rev. 20:4-6 is expressed in the following words: "The only passage which seems to teach there is to be a first and second resurrection of the body, the former being confined to martyrs and more or fewer of the saints, and the latter including 'the rest of the dead', is Revelation xx. 4-6. It must be admitted that that passage, taken by itself, does seem to teach the doctrine founded upon it" (*ibid.*, p. 841). In the light of these remarks, it is understandable (in a way) why Hodge has difficulty viewing the resurrection in Mk. 12 in relation to the soul. But those who are convinced that the first resurrection mentioned in Rev. 20 is with reference to the soul should have no difficulty at all viewing the resurrection in Mk. 12 and Lk. 20 (and Mt. 22) in relation to the soul.

<sup>19</sup> Feinberg (*op. cit.*, p. 187), noting this passage, says: "If there is but one resurrection for all, why would the Apostle Paul contemplate missing it . . . ? This is impossible of explanation to anyone holding to a general resurrection." And he says (*ibid.*, pp. 187-188): "Both Elliott and Lightfoot with many others refer the *eis ten exanastasin ten ek nekron* to the resurrection of the righteous, which is to be selective. The thought in the mind of Paul, then, at the time of his turning to God was, not that he might attain to the general resurrection in which all would participate, but that he might take part in the out-resurrection from among the dead, the resurrection of the just. This passage, there-

Now we read that Paul said in I Corinthians 15: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised:<sup>20</sup> and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (verses 16-19). The thrust of Paul's argument is that if Christ was not raised from the dead, those who have died in Christ have perished (*i.e.*, they are not alive), and that if they have perished, it is in this life only that we have hope in Christ, and that therefore we are of all men most to be pitied. But Christ was raised from the dead, and those who have died in Christ have not perished (*i.e.*, they are alive: they have obtained that world, they have been raised from the dead).<sup>21</sup> Death does not end it

fore, teaches as clearly as any that there will be more than one general resurrection." We too contend that this passage refers to the resurrection of the righteous, but we would insist that it does not refer to a *bodily* resurrection of the righteous. Paul would not have spoken this way had he been referring to the general resurrection of the body. It will not do to say that Paul was referring to the general resurrection of the body but was thinking only of the aspect of it that relates to the saved dead who are raised to honor; for Paul's words show that he was thinking of *one resurrection*, not *one aspect* of one resurrection. But this does not mean that he was teaching that there is only one resurrection; rather, the stress is upon attaining to the one resurrection about which he is speaking in the context (verses 11-14). Verse 11 either refers to the soul, or it implies that there is a bodily resurrection which relates to the righteous only. It, like Lk. 20:35, is a crucial verse! And to us the context in both cases is conclusive: the resurrection referred to pertains to the soul, not to the body.

<sup>20</sup> C. Hodge (*An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953], p. 321) says in this connection: "The sense in which Christ arose, determines the sense in which the dead are said to rise. As it is the resurrection of Christ's body that is affirmed, so it is the resurrection of the bodies of the dead, and not merely the continued existence of their souls which is affirmed." The fact that Christ arose determines the fact that the dead rise, which is another way of saying that because Christ was raised for their justification the dead live on. Or viewing it negatively, if Christ did not rise, then the dead in Christ have perished. As we view it, this is all the verse is saying; and this is completely in line with verse 18. To assume, as Hodge does, that verse 16 affirms a resurrection of the bodies of the dead, as well as the continued existence of their souls, is assuming more than the verse will allow and is divorcing it from its immediate context.

<sup>21</sup> Calvin (*Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the*

all: the dead rise. Paul said in verse 29: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" It is not clear what is meant by baptism for the dead,<sup>22</sup> but it seems to refer to the tribulations that Christians undergo. So we may view it thus: just as those who have died in Christ have through much tribulation entered into the kingdom of God (*i.e.*, into the heavenly kingdom; this is the same as saying that it is through much tribulation that Christians obtain that world or attain to the resurrection of the dead), so it is through much tribulation that Christians who are living in this life now will enter into the kingdom of God. Paul was saying: If the dead do not rise, why are we undergoing the same tribulations that those who have died underwent when they were in this life? Why are we baptized for the dead? "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise

*Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948], II, 20, 21) says with reference to verse 18 that "the dead have not *perished*, inasmuch as their souls live in a state of separation from their bodies . . . [But he says that] although the souls of the dead are now living, and enjoy quiet repose, yet the whole of their felicity and consolation depends exclusively on the resurrection; because it is well with them on this account, and no other, that they wait for that day, on which they shall be called to the possession of the kingdom of God." From these remarks, it is obvious that Calvin views the felicity and consolation of those who have died in Christ exclusively in connection with the resurrection of the body. But the emphasis in this chapter is not upon the future bodily resurrection but upon the resurrection of Christ from the grave. And the effects of the resurrection of Christ flow in two directions: with reference to the present state of the dead in Christ and with reference to their future state. In other words, reference is made to life after death and to the resurrection at the last day. That is to say, those who have died in Christ have been raised and are alive now, and they will be raised later. The dead in Christ have not perished; they live on with reference to the soul. And the dead in Christ will be raised bodily because Christ has "become the firstfruits of them that slept." We believe that the teaching of this chapter is that because Christ has been raised, the dead in Christ live (with reference to the soul); and because Christ has been raised, the dead in Christ will live (with reference to the body).

<sup>22</sup> Barth (*Die Auferstehung der Toten* [Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1953], p. 102) says that the verse in which this phrase occurs "ist eine *crux interpretum*." And he says further: "Sie müssen sich darauf gefasst mache, dass auch ich Ihnen nicht viel Befreidigendes darüber sagen kann" (*ibid.*). And we must say that even men with a high view of Scripture find this verse a difficult one.

not? let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die" (verse 32). If the dead do not rise (*i.e.*, if the dead do not obtain that world), let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die. It is clear that Paul did not have in mind the bodily resurrection of the dead but the resurrection of the soul from earth to heaven. It might be noted that verses 20–28 and verses 35ff. of I Corinthians 15 concern the bodily resurrection of the dead, but of course as it relates to the righteous dead only.

We believe that we have cited enough passages to establish our contention that the word "resurrection" is not confined to a bodily resurrection. But we might note one other passage. Hebrews 11, verse 35, reads: "Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection." The point to be noted is this: women received their dead raised to life again physically, whereas there were those who did not accept deliverance (*i.e.*, that they might obtain that world, even the resurrection from the dead).<sup>23</sup> The latter were put to death

<sup>23</sup> Calvin (*Commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948], p. 306) says with reference to those who did not accept deliverance: "That they might then live for ever in heaven, they rejected a life on earth, which would have cost them . . . so much as the denial of God, and also the repudiation of their own calling. But we hear what Christ says, that if we seek to save our lives in this world, we shall lose them for ever. If, therefore, the real love of a future resurrection dwells in our hearts, it will easily lead us to the contempt of death." At first sight, it seems as though Calvin is equating life in heaven with a resurrection. But the adjective "future" qualifying the noun "resurrection" seems definitely to indicate that Calvin means the bodily resurrection at the last day. So the basic thought is that it is the love of the future bodily resurrection that leads one to the contempt of death. But it seems to us that the thought in the verse is not that the love of the future bodily resurrection leads one to the contempt of death (although of course the bodily resurrection would be in the background) but that the longing to enter into a glorified state of life with Christ in heaven at the moment of physical death leads one to the contempt of death. It is the prospect of the *immediate* entrance of the soul into heaven at physical death and not the prospect of the *eventual* resurrection of the body that leads one to the contempt of death. In this verse, the contrast seems to be this: from death to living again in this life ("women received their dead raised to life") is contrasted with from life to death to living in the next life ("and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection").

physically, but their souls were raised from earth to heaven to live with Christ there. The resurrection of the soul from earth to heaven to live with Christ there is the first resurrection, about which John speaks in Revelation 20.

Although Revelation 20, verse 4, refers to the first resurrection (or rather to its effect) as it relates to the martyrs only, the first resurrection is not confined to the martyrs. Verse 6 of Revelation 20 says that "blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Blessed are all those who have part in the first resurrection. And the future tenses do not mean that they will be priests of God and reign with Christ only in the future. These are futures of certainty.

The term "the *first* resurrection" implies that there is a *second* resurrection. And the term "the *second* death" implies that there is a *first* death. The fact that the terms "the second resurrection" and "the first death" are wanting is significant. From the expressions "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years" (verse 4b) and "but the rest of the dead lived not again until

In other words, the contrast is between being raised from the dead to live again in this life and being tortured to death to live with Christ in the next life. The raising of the soul from earth to heaven to live with Christ there at physical death is a better resurrection than the raising of the body from death to live again in this life. Now in connection with this passage in Hebrews, Berkhof (*op. cit.*, p. 725) says that "pre-millennarians . . . appeal to certain specific expressions, such as 'a better resurrection', Heb. 11:35, 'the resurrection of life', John 5:29, 'the resurrection of the just', Luke 14:14. . . . These expressions seem to set that resurrection [the resurrection of believers] off as something apart. But these passages merely prove that the Bible distinguishes the resurrection of the righteous from that of the wicked and afford no proof whatsoever that there will be two resurrections, separated from each other by a period of a thousand years." Berkhof implies that these expressions refer to the bodily resurrection, as it relates to the righteous. Now it is true that the "resurrection of life" mentioned in Jno. 5:29 is referring to the body, for in the preceding verse the word "graves" is mentioned. But the "better resurrection" and "the resurrection of the just" are evidently referring to the resurrection that relates to the soul, for in both the contrast is between this world and the next, or this life and the next: in Lk. 14 the contrast is between not being recompensed in this life and being recompensed in the next, and in Heb. 11 it is between living in this life and living in the next.

the thousand years were finished" (verse 5a) it is clear that there is a stress upon the difference in condition between the two groups during the thousand-year period. That is to say, one group *lived* during the thousand years; the other group *did not live* during the thousand years. That is, some of the dead (physically) lived during the thousand-year period, whereas the rest of the dead (physically) did not live during the thousand-year period. (The phrase "the rest of the dead" shows that both groups are dead physically.)<sup>24</sup> So there are the "living" dead and the "dead" dead. The "living" dead are those who have part in the first resurrection and on whom the second death has no power, whereas the "dead" dead are those who have no part in the first resurrection and on whom the second death has power. And the second death has power on the "rest of the dead" with reference to their souls. They are in the same state (*i.e.*, in the disembodied state) as those who lived and reigned with Christ in the first resurrection. And in the light of this, since the terms "the first death" and "the second resurrection" are wanting, they must relate to the body. Therefore, the first death is physical death, which pertains to the just and the unjust alike. And the second resurrection refers to a physical resurrection, which also pertains to the just and the unjust alike.

At this point someone might ask: But do not the words "but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished" (verse 5a) indicate that there will be a bodily resurrection of the "rest of the dead" when the thousand years are finished? In answer to this, we must say that if a bodily resurrection is indicated in this expression, then a bodily resurrection is indicated in the expression "and they lived" in verse 4. For the verb  $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  must be used in the same sense in both expressions. According to the premillennialists, a bodily resurrection is indicated in both expressions. So they are consistent in viewing the verb  $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  in the same sense in both expressions. On the other hand, the amillennialists have generally referred  $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  in verse 4 to a spiritual resurrection and the same verb ( $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ ) in verse 5 to a physical resurrection. But this is hardly tenable. However, we believe that there is no need for the amillennialists so to construe the verbs. The verbs can be

<sup>24</sup> See in this connection Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

construed in the same sense and yet support the amillennial position. As we have shown above, the verb  $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  in verse 4 cannot refer to a bodily resurrection and cannot take the rendering "they came to life." Thus, for the sake of consistency, neither can the verb  $\xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  in verse 5 refer to a bodily resurrection and take the rendering "came to life."

Doubtless much of the confusion has arisen because of a misinterpretation of the expression "but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished" in verse 5. It should be noted in the first place that the verb and the negative particle are  $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\kappa \xi\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , "they did not live" not  $\text{o}\tilde{\upsilon}\kappa \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  "they did not live again." So verse 5a reads: "the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished"; it does not read: "the rest of the dead lived not *again* until the thousand years were finished" (italics ours). And secondly, it is important to note that what verse 5a says is that until ( $\acute{\alpha}\chi\rho\iota$ ) the thousand years were finished (or up to the point of the completion of the thousand years) the rest of the dead did not live. This verse does not say that after the thousand years were finished the rest of the dead lived.<sup>25</sup> In fact, the expression "the rest of the dead did not live until the thousand years were finished" is equivalent to saying that "the second death had power on the rest of the dead during the thousand years." And those on whom the second death has power are never released from its power. So the "rest of the dead" did not live until the thousand years were finished, nor did they live after the thousand years were finished. (And they will never live, *i.e.*, they will never be released from the power the second death has on them.<sup>26</sup> That the word  $\acute{\alpha}\chi\rho\iota$  (until) does not of itself imply that a change occurs after the point to which it refers is reached<sup>27</sup> is shown, for example, by

<sup>25</sup> J. E. Adams (*I Will Tell Thee the Mystery* [Walker, Ia: Perspective Press, 1966], p. 86) is quite mistaken when he says that "the 'rest of the dead' are said to 'live' after the millennium."

<sup>26</sup> Adams (*ibid.*, p. 87) says that the "rest of the dead" are the "non-martyred Christians instead of the unsaved dead." But this is to wrest the phrase of  $\lambda\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\iota \tau\omega\nu \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\omega\nu$  from its context.

<sup>27</sup> It is a pity that the only interpretation we have seen that corresponds to ours is presented by a Roman Catholic scholar, R. Knox (*The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* [New York: Sheed and Ward, 1944] p. 274, note) states: "'While the thousand years lasted'; literally, 'until the thousand years were accomplished'; but this does not

citing Romans 5:13a: "For until [ἄρχεται] the law sin was in the world." Sin was in the world up to the point of the coming of the Mosaic expression of the law. Does this imply that sin was no longer in the world after the coming of the Mosaic expression of the law? Absolutely not! For of course sin is still in the world. From these considerations, it is clear that verse 5a (Revelation 20) does not mention a bodily resurrection.

According to the interpretation we have presented, there is no mention in Revelation 20:4-6 of a bodily resurrection, let alone of two bodily resurrections. Therefore, to say (as the premillennialists do)<sup>28</sup> that two bodily resurrections separated by a thousand years are mentioned is to misconstrue the passage. Only one resurrection is mentioned, and it relates to the soul not to the body. And since this passage speaks of disembodied souls, the thousand-year reign is in heaven and not on earth. And it is taking place now, for only in the intermediate state (*i.e.*, in the state between physical death and the physical resurrection) are disembodied souls reigning with Christ. Thus, according to our interpretation, the passage supports the amillennial position.

Woodbine, Ontario

imply that the reprobate dead came to life at the end of the thousand years."

<sup>28</sup> See, *e.g.*, Feinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-190.

## CROSSCURRENTS

ROBERT D. KNUDSEN

THE collection of essays presented to Dr. C. Van Til and the responses he has made to them in the dedicatory volume celebrating his 75th birthday<sup>1</sup> have touched issues of such fundamental importance that a continuation of the discussion is highly desirable. In fact, for anyone who wishes to labor in the spirit of Van Til's reformational apologetics a firm grasp of certain of these problems has become a necessity. It is in the interests of furthering this discussion and of bringing into it a greater degree of understanding concerning my own contribution that I write what follows.

In the latter part of my essay<sup>2</sup> there is a pointed summarization of certain lines of thought in Van Til followed by four questions that arise if someone takes his point of departure within the theoretical attitude of thought. It is important to understand this section of my essay in terms of what has preceded. The intent and force of the questioning can be understood only in terms of my previous description and interpretation of Van Til's position as an illustration of transcendental apologetical method. This I presented as the most advanced and progressive effort today in the age-old attempt to relate the message of the Scriptures to those whom Schleiermacher called its cultured despisers. This earlier section comprises the body of the essay. The latter section was intended to pose the question, in effect, whether certain indicated lines of thought in Van Til really belong within the transcendental apologetical framework that had just been sketched. These questions were not intended at all to muffle the positive note that had been sounded before;<sup>3</sup> they were

<sup>1</sup> ed. Robert Geehan, *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Theology and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971). (Hereafter cited as JA.)

<sup>2</sup> "Progressive and Regressive Tendencies in Christian Apologetics," JA, 275-298.

<sup>3</sup> The attitude taken in my essay, reflected even in its organization, makes it difficult to understand the concluding paragraph of Van Til's