

## Our Contributors.

### BISHOP REINKENS.

BY REV. W. G. JORDAN, B.A.

On the 4th of January of the present year Bishop Reinkens passed away, at the age of seventy-five years, after a life of strenuous and many-sided endeavour. It is probable that this is a strange name to most of the readers of this journal, but when we consider the character of his work it may be worth while to devote a few lines to the career of this remarkable man. When we think of the "old Catholic" movement in Germany the name of Doellinger comes first to our recollection. Those of us who make no claims to special knowledge of German ecclesiastical affairs have heard of Dr. Doellinger's strong stand against the "ultramontane" influences in the Roman Catholic Church, and his vigorous opposition to the doctrine of papal infallibility. Doellinger on this account was excommunicated April 17th, 1871. In the same year he presided over the Munich old Catholic Congress, but took no part in the movement afterwards—he attended the Cologne Congress in the following year as he opposed the formation of a separate church. After his excommunication he was elected rector of the University of Munich, and continued to exert great influence as theologian and church historian.

Turning now to Reinkens, in a recent biographical sketch (by Dr. F. von Schulte) we are told that he "will have a name in history, apart from his personal significance, because he is the first bishop for a thousand years, in the Latin Church, who has been elected by the clergy and the Church, in the manner of the ancient Christian Church, and has also received the recognition of the State."

J. H. Reinkens was born at Burtscheid, near Aachen, Prussia, March 1st, 1821. His mother died when he was quite young, and in the same period his father suffered great losses, so that the boy's prospects were overclouded, and he had to turn to manual labor to assist his father. He was impelled by a strong impulse to seek a higher education. After passing successfully the preliminary stages, he went to Bonn for the purpose of studying philosophy and theology. In the first year he took the prize for "Prize Essay Concerning the Conception and Division of Virtue Among the Greeks. In due course he passed his theological examinations with great distinction and was consecrated as priest, September, 1848. In the following year he proceeded to his doctor's degree and was already regarded as a remarkable scholar. Soon afterwards he began to teach Church history and distinguished himself in literary and academic circles. On such points it is not necessary now to enter into the details as we are concerned merely with the important facts of his life; suffice it to say that he abounded in labors of many kinds as professor, writer and preacher. From 1860 to 1866 he issued a series of essays on ecclesiastical and historical subjects which by their truth and vigor brought upon him the attacks of the Ultramontane party. A long residence in Rome, 1867 to 1868, gave him a deep insight into the unhealthy condition of the Romish Church. This visit produced a twofold resolution: (1) To refresh his mind by the study of the Ancients. From this sprang his book, "Aristotle on Art," which led the University of Leipzig to give him the doctor's degree. (2) To make a serious investigation into the causes of the degradation of Roman Church-life. Out of this grew various writings on the Pope and the Papacy. Reinkens then plunged into the thick of the battle which was at that time raging around the question of papal infallibility. About Christmas time, 1870, a proclamation was issued prohibiting the students from attending Reinkens' lectures. By the way, we may note that the chief bishop who issued this prohibition had himself voted against the new dogma in the Vatican Council, and after his return home

had "submitted" to Rome. This ban destroyed Reinkens' work as professor, but set him free to fight the great battle.

"In six tracts—"The Papal Decrees of July 16th, 1870"—which explained the irregularity and slavery of the Vatican Council, the universal Episcopate in its relation to Revelation, the rule of tradition in the Ancient Church, the modern papal infallibility and the subjection of the bishops, he showed with deep erudition and splendid style, in a way suited to the common intelligence: how the new dogma rested upon a falsifying of the sources, a misrepresentation of the position of the fathers, and formed the pinnacle of a system which, built upon lies and frauds, destroyed the Church of Christ and offered up all power in the Church as a sacrifice to Romanism and set in the place of faith and love, blind, Jesuitical, corpse-like obedience." This was indeed a throwing down the gauntlet, and from this time the subject of this sketch never shirked the conflict, but with voice and pen fought manfully on the side of freedom, conducting conferences, addressing meetings in different parts of Germany and Switzerland, and in all possible ways using his great personal influences to advance the good cause. At the same time he issued his treatise on "The Teaching of St. Cyprian Concerning the Unity of the Church," in which he shows that the great bishop and martyr of Carthage sees this unity, not in obedience to the Roman Bishop but in the unity of bishop and congregation in faith and love. At the Assembly of the "old Catholic Church" in Cologne consisting of twenty-two priests and fifty-five laymen, the representative of the various congregations, held June 4th, 1873, he was elected bishop by an almost unanimous vote. After considerable resistance he accepted this position and asked not for vows of obedience, but, in the ancient Christian fashion, for vows of love. Then followed his consecration at Rotterdam by Bishop Heykaup, and his recognition by the King of Prussia and several German Princes. Pope Pius IX. condemned him in an encyclical, to which the bishop gave reply in a pastoral wherein he opposed words of genuine Christian love to the abuse and insults which had been hurled at him.

Space will not at present permit anything to be said upon the constitution of the "old Catholic Church," over which Bishop Reinkens presided so long and so honourably. The changes made were perhaps not so radical as a thoroughgoing Protestant would desire, but they were all in the direction of greater purity and freedom of Church life. It is with the activity of the first bishop that we are more immediately concerned. This activity was continuous and varied both in ruling and teaching. He seems to have maintained the independence of his high position, and at the same time worked in harmony with his Synods and coadjutors. The work of visiting congregations and schools scattered over an extensive tract of country must have involved him in incessant toil. He stood forth as a learned defender of the faith, discussing such questions as "Why is the Ultramontane system now prevailing in the Romish Church not Catholic?" and also maintained his position as a popular bishop as shown by the fact that his ten years' Episcopate, his twenty years' tenure of the same office, and his 70th birthday were celebrated by the gathering of large sums for the funds of the Church. The splendid funeral at Bonn attended by representatives from all parts of Germany testified to the deeper impressions he had made upon the life of the people. As a man, patriot, theologian, preacher and ecclesiastical statesman he is one of the prominent figures of this century. He toiled on with true enlightenment and noble enthusiasm for the cause that he had espoused until he broke down under the tremendous labours which he undertook, and at last entered into his well-earned rest. He sought to lead the Church back to the simplicity of primitive times and lived a simple life himself. Remarkable for learning,

strength of character and gentleness of spirit, in his own sphere, and according to his light, he fought the ever-needed battle against papal coercion and Jesuitical casuistry. He united an almost perfect culture to a pure Christian life and did much to stem the current of superstition and meet the cavils of scepticism. When the Church historian comes to sum up the Church life of the nineteenth century it will be found that Bishop Reinkens played no mean part.

Strathroy.

### THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

REV. PROF. F. R. BEATTIE, D.D.

The belief in immortality and a future state is wide spread among men. It prevails in all ages, and among all races of mankind. It has a large place in pagan philosophies, and in heathen mythologies. It also exerts a great influence on the life and conduct of men. The belief in the transmigration of souls and the practice of ancestral worship is full proof of all this.

But the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, strictly speaking, does not so clearly appear in the philosophies of men, or in the pagan systems of religion. The fact that the bodies of men shall one day be reanimated does not clearly appear in any non-biblical system of religion, or in any scheme of philosophy. It is to Revelation that we must turn for full, clear teaching upon this subject; and we may rejoice that God has been pleased to reveal so much upon this great question.

The purpose of this article is to outline in the briefest way the main teachings of the Scriptures in regard to the resurrection of the bodies of men.

In the first place, it is necessary to understand what is meant by the resurrection of the dead, for in popular thinking there may be some confusion in regard to this matter. What is meant, then, by the doctrine or fact now under notice?

It does not relate to the reviving or awakening of the soul. Some hold that during the period between death and the resurrection the disembodied soul is in a state of sleep, or unconsciousness. Those who take this view look upon the resurrection as relating to the awakening of the soul out of this state. It has, they say, no necessary reference to the reviving of the body. But we understand the doctrine of the Scriptures to have direct reference to the bodies of men.

Nor is the doctrine of the resurrection to be identified with that of the mere immortality of the soul. It, of course, assumes the immortality of the soul, but it implies much more, for a person might believe in that doctrine, and yet deny the resurrection of the body, holding that the soul continues to exist forever in its disembodied state. Hence the resurrection of the dead is more than mere immortality, or the future existence of the soul.

The doctrine relates to the body, and implies really three things. First, the body is reanimated by divine power; secondly, the disembodied spirit is brought back from its abode; and, thirdly, the soul and body are reunited in complete personality. Thus the resurrection undoes what death had effected. Death means separation of soul and body, the departure of the soul to the region of spirits, and the dissolution of the body. The resurrection of the dead simply undoes this threefold disaster.

In the second place, the question of the time of the resurrection needs only brief remark. Its time is not known absolutely, because not clearly revealed. It can only be understood relatively to other momentous events yet in the future. It comes immediately before the judgment, and is preparatory thereto, for the complete personality of each member of the human race is to appear before the judge. The trumpet shall sound, the living shall be changed, the dead shall be raised,

the judgment shall be set, its awards shall be made and final destiny shall be forever fixed. This is the order of Scripture.

In the third place, it is interesting and important to note the *parties* who shall be raised at the last great day. All men shall be raised. Every member of the human race shall have a share in this great event. The good and bad, the righteous and wicked, the just and unjust, those on the right hand and those on the left. It is well to keep this clearly in mind, for a type of theory, rather than Scripture teaching, prevails in some quarters, which either denies the resurrection of the wicked, or holds that they are annihilated in connection with the judgment process. To us the very clear teaching of Scripture is that all men of every age and clime, and of every moral condition shall be raised from the dead, and shall have to appear at the bar of the Judge to receive their award according to the deeds done in the body. What disproves the resurrection of the wicked will disprove the resurrection of the righteous, hence both are to be raised up.

In the fourth place, it is interesting to note the fact that the righteous shall be raised *in*, or *through* virtue of their union with Christ, and by the agency of His Spirit, but that the wicked shall be raised *by* the power of Christ judicially exercised. This is a very important thing to keep in view. The resurrection of the believer comes as part of the benefit of the redemptive work of Christ, while the resurrection of the unbeliever is the work of Christ as judge. By reason of their union with Christ, believers are raised with him in glory, and, lacking this union, unbelievers are raised to dishonor.

In the fifth place, the most difficult question relates to the *nature* of the resurrection body. What shall it be like? Shall it be the same as the present body? If so, how far may it be changed and still be the same. It is clearly the teaching of Scripture that it shall be the same body, so changed as to fit it for its eternal estate in weal or woe. But when we raise the questions: In what sense shall it be the same, and what qualities shall it possess? we are brought face to face with mystery, and can only rely on the teaching of the Scriptures for information.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the identity shall not consist in the same kind and number of particles of the material organism. This is not necessary for personal identity and moral responsibility in this life, for the material particles the body are constantly changing from year to year. Only what is necessary to preserve identity, and to form the basis of moral accountability, requires to be preserved. This being secured, we can truly say that the same body which is planted in the grave, is raised at the last great day, and that each member of the race will have his own proper body. As to the difficulties which unsanctified reason may feel in regard to this mysterious fact, we can only say that with God all things are possible, and that the resurrection of the body is no more difficult to think of than its creation at first. In the case of Adam the force of this is evident.

The body thus raised, the same body, shall be so changed as to have entirely new qualities given to it. In general, these qualities shall be such as are necessary for its eternal state, and activity. The Scriptures speak much more clearly in regard to the saved than the lost in this connection; still, by implication, we can reason from the case of the one to that of the other.

The body that shall be will not be flesh and blood, for such cannot subsist in the spiritual abode. But the body of flesh and blood shall be changed, for God giveth the body that shall be with its new qualities. It is to be an incorruptible, glorious, powerful spiritual body. This mortal body shall then put on immortality. Then, further, in the resurrection we are in certain respects to be like the angels, neither eating nor drinking. There is reason to believe also that the present human form will be retained. And, to crown all, we shall be fashioned like unto