

solid foundation therefor in the express use of the preposition *avri*, which Mr. Conant concedes to mean substitution. So that, however true may be a representative imputation, it is true that Jesus gave His life a ransom in the stead of sinners. M. F. JOHNSON.

MIDDLEBORO, MASS.

The Resurrection Body.

THE April number of the HOMILETIC REVIEW contains a sermon by Rev. J. S. Albritton, Fremont, O., on the resurrection of the body. After naming and repudiating the "Swedenborgian theory," the "germ theory," the "theory of common elements," he presents his own theory, which is that of the "literal resurrection of the body." He quotes approvingly from Bishop Newman the following: "The Scriptures teach the literal resurrection of the body which was possessed at the hour of death. It may be changed; much matter not essential to its normal condition and perfection may not be connected with it. The deformities upon it, the result of sin, may all be removed; but as to the identity of particles, that is a great scriptural fact that is not irrational, nor is it contradicted by sound philosophy."

"The principal objection to this theory," says Mr. Albritton, "is the incorporation of the body into other bodies, and, therefore, the resurrection of the identical body is an impossibility." In answer to this objection he says: "I see nothing more objectionable to this theory than to the fact that the dead shall rise again. The resurrection is dependent upon the power of God, and the gathering of the particles is also; and surely this power is equal to the work." Mr. Albritton states the objection with commendable fairness, but fails to obviate it. It is not a question of power, limited or unlimited. Reminding us of the infinite power of God does not help to solve the problem. We require to be shown how it is possible for the particles of matter that may have composed in part or altogether one

hundred, or possibly one thousand, *different* human bodies, to be used in the composition of the resurrection bodies for all to whom they once belonged. In the conflicting claims of one hundred or one thousand for the same particles of matter on the ground that each of the claimants possessed them at the instant of death, infinite wisdom and power can do nothing toward helping us out of the difficulty. If these material particles are employed in the construction of the resurrection body of the one to whom they first belonged, it is clear that they cannot at the same time enter into the composition of other bodies. Taking, for sake of illustration, the number of claimants at one hundred, if the first body into which they entered is given the preference, ninety and nine will lack material for the resurrection body, unless it is drawn from the general reservoir of nature. When we consider the insuperable difficulties of the theory that Mr. Albritton champions, the ease with which he disposes of them is indeed wonderful. In forming and publishing an opinion on a question of this sort, the meaning of the words "same" and "identical" should be well ascertained and clearly explained. This Mr. Albritton did not do; nor did Bishop Newman, from whom he quotes. It seems, however, if he quotes the bishop correctly, that both of them are committed to the defence of the notion that the very *same identical particles* of matter that compose the body at the time of its death will enter into the composition of the resurrection body. The language already quoted from the bishop's sermon justifies this statement.

If by "same" and "identical" is meant what is generally understood by these words, then the foregoing objection, passed over so lightly and flippantly by Mr. Albritton, lies with its full weight against his theory. It is admitted on all hands that great and important changes will be made in the resurrection body—not in *figure* or *size* perhaps, but in *structure*. From our