

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Christ's Resurrected Body.

In Dr. Sherwood's "Prayer Meeting Service," for February (p. 153), occur the following sentences: "And yet the 'glorified' body of Christ is grander and more beautiful still (than the one he had before crucifixion). In rising from the tomb, all that was mortal, weak, imperfect—all that partook of the 'earth, earthy'—had been left behind, and the body of the God-man put on attributes more exalted and more glorious than matter ever before possessed."

Is this language warranted by the Scriptures? Was the body of Christ "imperfect," "mortal," in the sense we use the term "mortal"? Was not "death by sin, and so death (mortality) hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Romans v: 12). Were the seeds of sin sown in His body? If not, how was He then otherwise "mortal"? "No man taketh my life from me," said He. "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Did Christ leave anything behind Him when He came out of the tomb? Swedenborg says He did; the Bible says, no. Was not the body that came out of the grave precisely the body that went into it? The disciples detected no difference, and testify to none. To my mind this difficulty arises by confounding the "glorified" body with the resurrected body. They are a very different thing. Christ's body was glorified at His ascension. So will be the bodies of His saints. "We shall all be changed," ("both the quick and the dead"—"those that sleep and those that are alive and remain,") "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," not because it is our resurrection, but because it is our ascension. Then shall He "change this vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body."

S. G. BLANCHARD,

Santa Barbara, Cal.

REPLY TO CRITICISM.

We think our brother is "wise above what is written," as well as hyper-critical."

1. As to the living body of Christ, the

testimony of the Scriptures is explicit that it was "flesh and blood," like the body of any other man, born under all the conditions of our common humanity, and while sinless in conduct, subject to all the experiences and infirmities of a common lot. He was not exempt from hunger, thirst, fatigue, sorrow, pain, human friendships, etc., or even death itself, in order to accomplish the end of His mission. He was "*tempted in all points like as we are*," etc., and how could this be, if, in His physical, as well as moral nature, there was no weakness, no element on which temptation could act? The Devil, in the wilderness, assailed Him through a *bodily* appetite, and if there was nothing in Him that could be responsive to such a temptation, then there could be no resistance offered, and there was no virtue in His victory.

Christ's *body* was of the "earth, earthy"—born of a woman, "grew" to manhood, ate, drank, enjoyed, suffered and died. His moral perfection did not exempt His physical being from the laws which govern every one born under the curse of the law. Hence,

2. His resurrection body differed from His living body in the same essential particulars as does the body of every saint. He is the "first fruit" of them that sleep.

Will the brother tell us where the "Bible says" that Christ's body underwent no change in the tomb of Joseph? Surely he cannot have read Paul's account of the resurrection in Corinthians, to which we particularly refer in the paper criticised. Here we have noted the chief points of the change which the body of the saint undergoes in the resurrection. To say that this is descriptive of our "ascension," and that Christ's body was glorified at His "ascension," and not when He came forth the Conqueror over Death and the Grave and all the powers of Hell, is arrant nonsense. There is not a word of Scripture to warrant it. It is contrary to reason and to fact.

J. M. SHERWOOD.