

The Approaching Advent of Christ

by
Alexander Reese

CHAPTER II

THE RESURRECTION OF THE SAINTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The fundamental point in our inquiry concerns the relation of the Rapture of the risen and transfigured saints to the Day of the Lord. Does the one precede the other by a period of several years? Now concerning the Rapture, there are only three undisputed texts in the Bible that deal with it, namely, 1 Thessalonians 4:17, 2 Thessalonians 2:1, and John 14:3. But there are many passages in both the Old and New Testaments that speak of the resurrection of the holy dead, which, Darbyists assure us, takes place in immediate connection with the Rapture. For the present, therefore, we may dismiss the Rapture from our minds and confine our attention to the first resurrection; for wheresoever the resurrection is, there will the Rapture be also. All admit this except Bullinger and Miss Habershon, whose view we shall examine later.

But it is necessary to explain that in going to the O.T. we do so with no misapprehension concerning the nature and calling of the Church of the N.T. We shall not look for N.T. revelations there; we aim merely at finding out when "the world's grey fathers," and the rest of the holy dead of O.T. times, awake to life. Pre-trib writers themselves assert that if we can fix the epoch of this resurrection, we can know the time of the resurrection of the Church, since the two synchronize. Hence the relevancy of the inquiry.

We shall consider first a passage that, as A. B. Davidson has said in his *Isaiah*, contains "the first clear statement of a resurrection" (p. 194).

(1) Isaiah 26:19 (R.V.).

Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise.
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust;
For thy dew is as the dew of herbs,
And the earth shall cast forth the dead.

This beautiful verse occurs in one of the most remarkable of all Isaiah's prophecies. The section that it is found in--Isaiah 24-27-- is known as "the little Apocalypse of Isaiah." From end to end it shows, in the words of Theodoret (cited by Kelly) "what shall be in the consummation of the present age." And Kelly himself says in his *Isaiah*: "The grand aim of the Spirit is to portray that mighty and universal catastrophe which is succeeded by the times of refreshing for Israel and the earth, of which God has spoken by His holy prophets since the world began" (p. 247).

In chapter 25 we hear the song of redemption, for the Redeemer has come to Zion, and Israel, looking to Him alone, is saved. There follows from restored Israel a hymn of thanksgiving, mingled with a

sense of disappointment at the smallness of her numbers. "The answer to these disappointed hopes is the resurrection, verse 19" (Skinner, *Isaiah*, p. 197).

Eloquent and beautiful are the words of Sir G. A. Smith:

The figures are bold, but bolder is the hope that breaks from them. Like as when the Trumpet shall sound, ver. 19 peals forth the promise of the resurrection--peals the promise forth, in spite of all experience, unsupported by any argument, and upon the strength of its own inherent music. *Thy dead shall live! my dead bodies shall arise!* The change of the personal pronoun is singularly dramatic. Returned Israel is the speaker, first speaking *to* herself; *thy dead*, as if upon the depopulated land, in face of all its homes in ruin, and only the sepulchres of ages standing grim and steadfast, she addressed some despairing double of herself; and secondly she speaks *of* herself: *my dead bodies*, as if all the inhabitants of these tombs, though dead, were still her own, still part of her, the living Israel, and able to arise and bless with their numbers their bereaved mother. These she now addresses: *Awake and sing, ye dwellers in the dust, for a dew of lights is Thy dew, and the land bringeth forth the dead* (pp. 446-7). As, when the dawn comes, the drooping flowers of yesterday are seen erect and lustrous with the dew, every spike a crown of glory, so also shall be the resurrection of the dead (i., p. 449).

Now the question that concerns us is whether we have any indication in this section of Isaiah concerning the time when this momentous event takes place. To an impartial mind there can be no doubt about the answer: this resurrection is to take place at the Day of the Lord, when Jehovah shall come and Israel shall be reconciled to Him. The proofs of this are incontestable. The principal signs and events of the whole prophecy move, to use figurative language, within the cycle of the sixth and seventh seals of the Apocalypse. Here we have the Coming of the Lord, the conversion of Israel, the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom, and the sidereal signs in heaven that immediately precede them. Living Israel is restored and the sleeping saints are brought to life at the beginning of the Messianic Reign, not some years or decades before, as the new theories require.

The reader may be interested to know what explanation pre-tribs give of this passage. Their answer is a flat denial that a bodily resurrection is referred to. Kelly's explanation may be taken as the best available. In his *Isaiah* (p. 267) he deals with the matter. According to him the prophecy in chapter 26:19 has nothing to do with a literal resurrection from the dead but is merely a symbolical representation of the restoration of the nation to Palestine. "It is no question of bodily death," he would have us believe, "but of national revival." But there are insuperable objections to this interpretation.

(a) The ordinary reader feels that the language can bear only one interpretation, namely, that here we have a resurrection of the dead in the ordinary meaning of the term. The wording of the promise indicates unmistakably that this is so. Phrases are used, one after another, that preclude all possibility of spiritualizing.

Dead men come to life,
Dead bodies arise,
Dwellers in the dust awake and sing,
The earth casts forth the dead.

If terms such as these do not signify a literal resurrection from the dead, what terms can? Throughout

the whole Bible we meet with no passage that gives, in the same compass, so unequivocal a testimony to the doctrine of a bodily resurrection. Sir G. A. Smith remarks:

There is no shadow of a reason for limiting this promise to that which some other passages of resurrection in the Old Testament have to be limited: a corporate restoration of the holy State or Church. This is the resurrection of its individual members to a community *which is already restored*; the recovery by Israel of her dead men and women from their separate graves, each with his own freshness and beauty, in that glorious morning when the Sun of Righteousness shall arise, with healing under his wings--*Thy dew, O Jehovah!*

In the same vein Cheyne comments on verse 19: "The descriptions in Hosea and Ezekiel are allegorical (comp. Hosea 6:1, Ezek. 36:27, 37:11-14), whereas the whole context of our passage (especially v. 14) shows that the language of the writer is to be taken literally." He then quotes Matthew Arnold: "Sublimely recovering himself, the prophet cries that God's saints, though they are dead, shall live," and Cheyne himself concludes, "and shall share the duties and the privileges of regenerate Israel" (i., p. 156). Delitzsch says: "Compared with what is stated in the Apocalypse of the New Testament, it is the 'first resurrection' which is here predicted" (i., p. 448). And Skinner remarks: "It is a promise of life from the dead in the most literal sense, a resurrection of those members of the community whom death had seemed to rob of their share in the hope of Israel" (p. 192).

These quotations from what are recognized to be the four best commentaries on Isaiah in the English language, certainly give a more adequate interpretation than those who, like Kelly, explain away the prophecy as "highly figurative language."

(b) If it is legitimate to spiritualize so clear a text as Isaiah 26:19 on the resurrection of the dead, then those of us who insist upon the literal interpretation of the first resurrection in Revelation 20:4 are placed in circumstances of peculiar difficulty when arguing with postmillennialists. These, in opposing Premillennialism, have explained the first resurrection of the Apocalypse in a figurative way. They would have us believe that it signifies the revival of the martyr spirit in the Church or the reign of the saints in life at the present time. And if pre-tribs are at liberty to spiritualize the first resurrection in the O.T., then it is clearly the hollownest inconsistency to cavil at those who explain away that resurrection in the New.

If the expressions under consideration mean only the gathering of the Jews to Palestine, then, to borrow the forceful words of Dean Alford in regard to the postmillennialists' treatment of Revelation 20:4, "there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything."

(c) It is observable also that the theory that the resurrection in Isaiah 26:19 merely signifies the national revival of Israel is clearly inadmissible, because the resurrection in that passage, as we have seen, takes place *after* the Great Tribulation and consequent upon the Coming of Jehovah. But we know from all Scripture that the national revival and restoration of the people *precede* it, for the Seventieth Week opens with the nation of Israel already restored to the land and in league with the Coming Prince (Dan. 9:24). In other words, the national restoration predicted in Ezekiel 37:1-14 takes place years *before* the fulfillment of the resurrection in Isaiah 26:19. As Salmond says in his *Immortality*: "The theme of this great passage is a personal resurrection, not a corporate. The national resurrection is accomplished, and this is the restoration of her dead members to revived Israel" (p. 212).

Kelly raises a further objection to the literal interpretation of verse 19 by urging that if we so interpret the resurrection there, we must likewise interpret verse 14 literally. But this, he maintains, leads to a heterodox doctrine, namely, that the wicked dead will not rise at the resurrection of judgment. But this is a wrong conclusion. We may certainly interpret verse 14 literally without committing Isaiah to the dogma of annihilation. The objection urged springs from a failure to observe carefully the context, and from a hasty appeal to the chance reading of our English version. The prophet is not dealing with the eternal destiny of the wicked, but only with the security of Israel against her former oppressors. The following is a more accurate translation and comment by Delitzsch, one of the greatest of Isaiah's interpreters. (See R.V., mg.).

Jehovah is the King of Israel. He seemed to have lost His dominion when the lords of the world ruled Israel as they liked, but it is otherwise now, and it is only Jehovah through whom Israel can again gratefully celebrate Jehovah's name.

The tyrants who usurped authority over Israel have disappeared without leaving a trace behind. Ver. 14: "*Dead men live not again; shades rise not again; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and annihilated every memorial to them.*" The meaning is not that they are dead for ever, as if there were no resurrection at all after death; the prophet knows certainly there is such a thing, as afterwards appears. When he speaks of "dead men" and "shades," he has in his mind those who have hitherto been oppressors of Israel, who (like the king of Babylon, chap. 14) have been cast down into the realm of the shades, *so that we are not to think of a self-resuscitation, a rising up again* (p. 444; italics his).

It will be clear, therefore, to thoughtful readers, that what the prophet has in mind in verse 14 is not the destiny of unbelievers but the impossibility of Israel's former lords' coming back to life by any means of self-resuscitation. They are locked up in Sheol and cannot come back to life. This was the very purpose of God in sweeping them off the earth. Skinner says: "The long heathen domination is now a thing of the past; the oppressors have gone to the realms of shades, and shall trouble the world no more" (p. 195).

The pre-trib suggestion of spiritualizing the resurrection in Isaiah 26:19, having been found untenable, we conclude that the passage teaches a literal resurrection of the just, and, secondly, that this resurrection will occur not before the apocalyptic Week but at its close.¹

1 Herewith I append additional comments by modern scholars and theologians. Franz Delitzsch: "Compared with what is stated in the Apocalypse of the New Testament, it is the 'first resurrection' which is here predicted" (*Isaiah* i., p. 448). J Skinner: "It is a promise of life from the dead in the most literal sense, a resurrection of those members of the community whom death had seemed to rob of their share in the hope of Israel" (CB, *Isaiah*, i., p. 192). H. C. Orelli: "This is definitely and clearly the sense of the prophecy of Isaiah . . .; here plainly enough the reference is to the dwellers in the dust whom the earth has swallowed up, but must now restore" (*O.T. Prophecy*, p. 303). G. F. Oehler: "That the resurrection must not be regarded as typical (as though only the deliverance of the people of God from their troubles were intended) is evident from the contrast in verse 12 and the whole context" (*O.T. Theology*, ii., p. 393. Clark's ed.). G. Rawlinson: "The prophet proceeds to cheer and encourage his disciples by a clear and positive declaration of the resurrection . . ., but only of the just, perhaps only of the Israelites" (*Pulpit Comm.*, *Isaiah*, i., p.

T. Newberry (p. 71) admits that the resurrection of Isaiah 26:19 is literal, but seeks to save the pre-trib position by maintaining that the dead raised are only those of "the martyred Remnant," who are raised, *ex hypothesi*, seven years after the holy dead of O.T. times. Without anticipating questions to be discussed later, it is to be said that there is no warrant whatever for limiting this resurrection to semi-converted Jews slain in the Great Tribulation. In the next place, it is the doctrine of Scripture² that the Jewish Remnant is converted only at the appearing of Messiah. If, therefore, any of its members die before the Day of the Lord, they will rise not in the first resurrection but the last. But, thirdly, to speak of a *martyred* "Remnant" is a ludicrous contradiction in terms. The Remnant of prophecy consists of those who *escape uninjured* the desolations of the Last Days. They will not die. And we do not usually speak of *drowned* "survivors" of a shipwreck. Just as incongruous is it to speak of a martyred "Remnant." This is the first of several fictions.

(2) Isaiah 25:7-8 (R.V.).

And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering that is cast over all peoples, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He hath swallowed up death for ever; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the reproach of His people shall He take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it.

Happily there is no controversy with our opponents on the import of this passage. They all admit, in view of N.T. usage, that we are to understand a bodily resurrection in the most definite sense. "This, we know from God Himself," says Kelly in his *Isaiah*, "will be realized in the literal resurrection of the body, when the saints are raised" (p. 265). The only question, therefore, that concerns us is the time of the resurrection.

According to the new theories, the resurrection of Israel's holy dead takes place years before the conversion of living Israel, the Coming of Jehovah, and the inauguration of the Kingdom; but according to Isaiah, that resurrection is inseparably bound up with these momentous events. When living Israel turns to Jehovah, sleeping Israel awakes from the dead. Chapter 25 related the establishment in power of Jehovah's Kingdom (v. 6). We then have the resurrection of the dead (vv. 7-8); and in verse 9 we read, "and it shall be said *in that day*--(the day of the Kingdom and resurrection)--Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation." Here we have the Advent of Jehovah and the new welcome He receives from repentant Israel. But these take place *on the day of resurrection*, as the great Apostle conclusively shows in 1 Corinthians 15:54.

Kelly, after making the damaging admission (p. 257) that "the resurrection synchronizes with the deliverance of Israel," quietly proceeds to argue on the presupposition that it precedes it by a period of several years! Darby and Trotter also, when arguing against the postmillennialists, quote Isaiah 25:8 as

416). So also Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 506; Orr, *the Christian View of God and the World* (p. 209); P. Fairbairn, *Typology*, i., p. 301; A. B. Davidson, *O. T. Theology*, pp. 450,528. The literal interpretation is also accepted by some leading Darbyist writers: see *The Scofield Reference Bible*, Newberry's *Englishman's Bible*, refs., W. Trotter, p. 439; E. W. Bullinger, *Companion Bible*, *in loco*.

2 Zech. 12-13; Matt. 23:39; Rom. 11:25-26.

decisive proof that the resurrection of the saints is "indissolubly linked" with the commencement of the reign of Christ.³ Yet when defending their theories on the Rapture, they calmly tell us that the resurrection precedes the millennium by several years, and perhaps decades. But they cannot be allowed to blow hot and cold over the prophecy. If Isaiah 25:8 establishes the truth that the resurrection introduces the renewal of Israel and the reign of Christ, it necessarily overthrows the fiction that the same resurrection is to be followed by the rise and the reign of Antichrist and the deepest degradation that the Nation has ever known. Pre-tribs can have one or the other; they cannot have it both ways.

Here again, therefore, we have found the theories under review in hopeless contradiction with Scripture, and this not on some trivial point but on the central position of the whole ingenious system.

(3) Daniel 12:1-3.

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of Thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book.

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

Here is a passage that, until yesterday, was almost universally applied to the resurrection of the dead in the ordinary sense. Alike among Jewish and Christian expositors, the belief has been general that here we meet with the doctrine of a bodily resurrection. And the reason for this unanimity is not far to seek: the plain sense of the language points clearly in that direction. We are told that many of them that "sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Here are the ordinary idioms for bodily death and resurrection. And in the words that follow we find exalted terms in reference to the resultant glory of the saints who rise. The import of the passage is so clear that Orr, in *The Christian View of God and the World*, remarks: "This needs no comment," (p. 210). And Salmond, in his *Immortality*, observes: "This is the most definite, the most literal, the largest expression of the hope of a resurrection. It is the resurrection of the individual" (p. 213).

That, it is safe to say, is not only the judgment of modern Christian scholars of all schools, but the impression of the general reader who approaches the passage without any preconceptions.

Nevertheless, we are challenged on our interpretation. Pre-tribs insist that we greatly err in referring this passage to a bodily resurrection, for, they say, it relates to nothing more than the future restoration of Israel to Palestine. Kelly in his *Daniel* says: "The passage has no direct reference to a bodily resurrection, which simply furnishes a figure for the national revival of Israel, who are described as sleeping in the dust, to express the greatness of their degradation" (p. 224).

The same view is maintained, as usual, with much energy and dogmatism by Gaebelien in his *Daniel* (p. 200).

3 See chapter 4 on 1 Corinthians 15:54.

And these are the writers who condemn [scorn] the spiritualizing of O.T. prophecies and tell us how unpardonable is the fault of those who explain away the first resurrection in Revelation 20:4! Yet they themselves, when their theories require it, are free to adopt the mischievous canon that they condemn in others. It is pitiable that while modern critical scholars are unanimous in insisting on the literal and miraculous character of the resurrection in Daniel 12:2, the theorists join hands with Sadducees and rationalists in reducing it to thin air. I say rationalists, though a stronger term might have been employed; for it was the infidel Porphyry who first set the fashion in Christendom of "spiritualizing" the resurrection in Daniel. Now beyond question pre-tribs believe in resurrection, and their motive for explaining away Daniel 12:1-3 is different from Porphyry's; but the fact remains that their spiritualizing principle "belongs to that mad Porphyry."⁴ However, let us now examine the pre-trib interpretation of the resurrection.

(a) I must again remind the reader that we are not looking for the resurrection of the Church in this passage. We are concerned only with the question whether the text teaches the resurrection of the holy dead of Daniel's people, the Jews. This disposes of several pages of adroit reasoning by Kelly and his American interpreter. It will be sufficient if we can prove that the righteous dead in Israel are raised, for it is these writers who tell us that the Church will be raised at the same time.

(b) If the terms used in Daniel 12:2-3 do not describe a literal resurrection, with the heavenly glory that follows, can our opponents tell us what terms *can* describe such a resurrection? We read of "sleepers" in the "dust of the earth" "awaking" to "everlasting life," and then of their "shining" like the brightness of the stars in the firmament. If these expressions do not mean literal resurrection from the dead, then literal resurrection must be something different from the idea usually entertained.

In his *Daniel*, Tregelles writes:

"Sleepers in the dust" is a fitting designation of those who sleep the sleep of death, whose bodies are returned to the dust of the ground. If such words were used to denote persons suffering from oppression, and thoroughly degraded, it could only be by a figure taken from the appearance and condition of the dead. But if such a figure were supposed, what would be the import of the "everlasting life" to which the sleepers awake? Could there be such a thing as earthly temporal deliverance to *everlasting* life? This alone shows the impossibility of limiting the meaning of the passage. But, besides this point, it may well be asked, if the language of this verse be not declaratory of a resurrection of the dead, actual and literal, is there any passage of Scripture at all which speaks of such a thing as a resurrection? (p. 168).

(c) That the idea of resurrection may be used in a figurative sense is not at all unreasonable. Indeed, we shall see presently that it is used in the O.T. to signify, as these writers urge, the national gathering and restoration of Israel to Palestine. There can be no logical objection, therefore, to considering the application of this principle to the passage in Daniel. But let us beware of supposing that because the figurative interpretation holds good in one case [that] therefore it may be applied indiscriminately to all. That would be bad logic and worse theology, for it would rob us of the hope of resurrection

4 This was the gloss made by Eudoxius concerning the comment of Polychronius--one of Porphyry's Christian admirers--in his exposition of Daniel 12. "This interpretation of thine, O Polychronius, belongs to that mad Porphyry" (cited by C. D. Maitland, pp. 195-7).

altogether. Every passage must be considered on its merits.

Now if the theory of a figurative interpretation is to hold good, it must be able to give a good account of itself. The figurative resurrection must not only free us from the difficulty that the literal interpretation is supposed to involve us in, but must be consistent with itself and in harmony with the general teaching of the prophetic Scriptures. Can the pre-trib interpretation stand this test? It cannot. A single consideration will prove this conclusively. The whole teaching of Scripture, and certainly of Daniel, is that Israel is gathered to Palestine some considerable time before the beginning of the "time of trouble" mentioned in verse 1. Indeed, that trial is within the period of Antichrist's covenant with the mass of the Jews *already in the land* (Dan. 9:27). That is, Israel as a nation, when the time of tribulation opens, is already raised and gathered in the sense that the Darbyist interpretation of Daniel 12:2-3 presupposes. But according to Daniel 12:2-3, the resurrection takes place at the *conclusion* of the Great Tribulation, for it synchronizes with Israel's deliverance from her last great struggle. The same insuperable difficulty that barred the way to their allegorizing Isaiah 26:19 confronts pre-tribs here.

Referring to the resurrection of Daniel 12:2, Kelly in his *Revelation* says: "It is evidently before the time of deliverance and blessing. . . . This resurrection, literal or figurative, is before the millennium, and after it is a time of greater trouble than Israel ever knew" (p. 456).

But a blind man can see that the exact contrary is the truth. The resurrection *follows* the tribulation. The angel tells Daniel that at that time Israel would be delivered--that is, delivered from the time of trouble just mentioned. Then it is that the sleepers in the dust awake to inherit eternal life and the glory of the resurrection. The two events synchronize. And the veriest tyro [novice] of a prophetic student knows that Israel is delivered at the Day of the Lord,⁵--that is, at the close of Daniel's apocalyptic Week, as Kelly himself argues in the same volume (p. 456). Only the exigencies of a fallacious system could have led a devout teacher to go in the teeth of the plain wording of Scripture.

In view, therefore, of the insurmountable difficulty in the way of allegorizing the interpretation of Daniel 12:2-3, we come back to the view that it refers to the resurrection of the body, more than ever convinced that this is the only interpretation that can stand. And in adopting the literal interpretation of the passage, we not only have the support of almost every ancient and modern scholar of diverse schools,⁶ but also of some of the weightiest advocates of pre-trib theories. Newberry and Scofield in

5 Zech. 12-14; Matt. 23:39; Rev. 14:1-5; Rom. 11:25-27.

6 I append herewith brief additional comments of other scholars. A. B. Davidson: "In Isa. 26:19 and Dan. 12 the actual resurrection of individual members of Israel is predicted (cf. Job 14:13.) (CB, *Ezekiel*, p. 267; cf. his *O.T. Theology*, p. 528). R. Sinker: "The plainest declaration in the O.T. of a future life, 'according to each man's works'" (*Temple Bible*, Daniel, p. 194). A. R. Faussett: "Not the general resurrection, but that of those who share in the first resurrection; the rest of the dead being not to rise until the end of the thousand years" (Rev. 20:3,5,6; cf. 1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:16) (*Daniel, in loco*). S. R. Driver: "The faithful among God's people are delivered; a resurrection of Israelites follows; and the age of bliss then begins for the righteous" (*Daniel*, p. 200). E. B. Pusey: "In chap. 12, after the prediction of the last troubles of Antichrist, the Resurrection is foretold" (*Daniel*, p. 491). *Pulpit Commentary*: "This is a distinct reference to the resurrection of the body," *in loco*. G. F. Oehler: "The resurrection of the dead is, however, decidedly taught in Daniel 12" (*Theology of the O.T.*, ii., p. 395). E. W. Bullinger: On the words "shall awake," he remarks: "This

their editions of the Bible take the resurrection literally, and Trotter defends the same view.

It may be objected by some who accept the literal interpretation in Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2-3, that the passages do not commit us to a strict sequence of events at the time of the End. No doubt it was on this assumption that Scofield and others gave their support to the literal interpretation. But the plea will not avail. The prophecies in Isaiah and Daniel associate the resurrection of the holy dead with the deliverance of living Israel, the Appearing of Jehovah, and the Coming of the Kingdom. Most clearly is this the case in Isaiah 25:8 and 26:19, which occur in the same vision of the "consummation of the Age." And Daniel's visions are a valuable aid in sorting out the leading events of the End-time. To be sure, there are questions on which we await light and concerning which we must remain in suspense, but the time of the resurrection is not one of them. It shines out like a beacon to guide us on our way.

The second half of Daniel 11 deals chiefly with the events of the second half of the apocalyptic Week. The principal personage is the Antichrist of the Last Days. Just at what verse he is introduced is uncertain because of the well-known characteristic of prophecy to unite events on a near and a distant horizon. Verse 45 at any rate gives us the destruction of Antichrist, and this brings us to the close of the Week. But the revealing angel, having shown Daniel the closing events of Antichrist's career, now turns, in keeping with a well-known law of prophecy, to deal with the issues of the apocalyptic Week as they affect the people of God.

"And at that time," he says (i.e., the time of the career of the impious king), "shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time" (12:1).

That this occurs during the closing half of the Week no pre-trib disputes. Now the termination of the week is characterized by two events, among others: first, the destruction of Antichrist; and, secondly, the deliverance of Daniel's people. Antichrist is in the saddle, the Great Tribulation rages, and Daniel's people suffer. But the Adversary comes to his end with none to help him, and the People are delivered--every one that is written in the Book of Life. Nothing can be surer than that here we are at the close of the tribulation. What happens then? The resurrection of the saints: "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake" to everlasting life, and shine like the stars in the night expanse.

We may be sure that when writers like Scofield and Newberry adopted the literal interpretation of Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:2-3, they did so because candor compelled them, and because the other interpretation was strained and unnatural. [But] they should have seen that the obvious interpretation is fatal to their whole scheme of the prophetic future; for according to the prophet Daniel, the resurrection of the holy dead in Israel is accompanied by the overthrow of Antichrist, the deliverance and renewal of the covenant People, and the inauguration of God's kingly rule. But according to pre-tribs, the approaching resurrection of the saints is to be followed by the rise, reign, and triumph of Antichrist and the darkest night in Israel's long history! "It is almost a miracle how people read Scripture without understanding it," remarked Darby on one occasion.⁷ But a more prosaic source of misunderstanding God's word is the being infatuated with some favorite theory and reading into Scripture what pleases

is bodily resurrection" (*Companion Bible*, p. 1205). These testimonies could be greatly increased from the literature since 1914. A few are given at the end of the Excursus to this chapter.

7 *Second Coming*, p. 132.

us. Then there is an application of an alleged saying of Goethe's: "We are never deceived: we deceive ourselves."

With reference to verse 2 of chapter 12, it remains to deal with a difficulty that exists in connection with the current versions. These seem to teach that the resurrection is not limited to the just, but that certain of the wicked dead are raised at the same time "to suffer shame and everlasting contempt." This is a genuine difficulty to many in accepting the literal interpretation of the passage, for in all other Scriptures the first resurrection is limited to the righteous. The apparent discrepancy is also seized upon to warrant the spiritualizing of the resurrection. "If you interpret this resurrection literally," they insist, "you are shut up to believing that unbelievers arise at the first resurrection--an idea that contradicts the rest of Scripture." Well, we have found that Kelly's figurative interpretation not only contradicts Scripture but his own scheme as well. The question is, can the literal interpretation be shown to harmonize with the general teaching of Scripture on the first resurrection?

The answer is that it can. According to competent Hebraists, the second verse of Daniel 12 is not happily translated in the English versions. Tregelles, in his *Daniel*, remarks:

I do not doubt that the right translation of this verse is what has been given above: "And many from among the sleepers of the dust of the earth shall awake; these shall be unto everlasting life; but those (the rest of the sleepers, those who do not awake at this time) shall be unto shame and everlasting contempt." The word which in our Authorized Version is twice rendered "some" is never repeated in any other passage in the Hebrew Bible, in the sense of taking up distributively any general class which had been previously mentioned; this is enough, I believe, to warrant our applying its first occurrence here to the whole of the many who awake, and the second to the mass of the sleepers, those who do not awake at this time. It is clearly not a general resurrection; it is "many from among," and it is only by taking the words in this sense that we can gain any information as to what becomes of those who continue to sleep in the dust of the earth.

This passage has been understood by the Jewish commentators in the sense that I have stated. Of course these men with the veil on their hearts are no guides as to the use of the Old Testament; but they are helps as to the grammatical and lexicographical value of sentences and words. Two of the Rabbis who commented on this prophet were Saadiah Hagggaon (in the tenth century of our era) and Aben Ezra (in the twelfth); the latter of these was a writer of peculiar abilities and accuracy of mind. He explains the verse in the following manner: "*And many*: The Gaon (i.e., R. Saadiah, whom he often quotes) says that its interpretation is, *those who shall be unto everlasting life, and those who shall not awake shall be unto shame and everlasting contempt*" (pp. 165-6).

Nathaniel West, another competent Hebrew scholar, says in his *Thousand Years*:

The true rendering of Dan. 12:2-3, in connection with the context, is "And (at that time) *Many* (of thy people) shall awake (or be separated) *out from among* the sleepers in the earth dust. *These* (who awake) shall be unto life everlasting, but *those* (who do not awake at that time) shall be unto shame and contempt everlasting." So the most renowned Hebrew Doctors render it, and the best Christians exegetes; and it is one of the defects of the *Revised Version* that--for reasons deemed prudent, doubtless, by the Old Testament Company--it has allowed the wrong

impression King James' Version gives to remain. A false doctrine is thereby, through defective rendering, given color from the Word of God, which repudiates it at every step (pp. 266-9).

And in a note West adds:

So Cocceius, the best Hebraist of his day: "No universal resurrection is taught here. These who *are* unto eternal life are distinguished from those who *are* unto eternal shame and contempt. The *former* awake at the time specified, 11:45, 12:1. To carry the verb 'awake' into the second member of the verse is to add to Scripture, which I dare not do." So Saadiah, the prince of Hebrew scholars, the two Kimchis, Abarbanel, Bechai and Maimonides.

Even Driver, who accepts the common rendering, admits that the limitation of the resurrection to the righteous became the prevalent view among Jewish teachers. He says: "The idea that the resurrection was to be limited to Israel appears also among the later Jews; indeed, it became the accepted doctrine that it was to be limited to righteous Israelites" (p. 93).

This is of first importance, for it ought to be allowed that Jews are the best judges of their own language.

In view, therefore, of the evidence produced, I think it is clear that Daniel 12:2, read literally and correctly, is fully in harmony with the doctrine of Scripture upon the first resurrection.⁸

(4) Daniel 12:13 (R.V.).

But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and shalt stand in thy lot, at the end of the days.

One correction needs to be made in the ordinary versions, and that is the elimination of the words "thy way." They do not exist in the Hebrew text. Their presence in the English version assists the thought that the end of Daniel's life is meant. But this is not at all what is intended. The true sense is given by Driver in his *Daniel*:

He is to await the "end" in the grave, from which, in the resurrection spoken of in verse 2, he will arise to take his appointed place, beside the other saints. But *thou, go thou to the end*: i.e., depart to await the end (as in verse 9, there is nothing in the Heb. corresponding to "thy way"); and thou shalt rest (in the grave, Isa. 57:2).

In agreement with this Moffatt renders: "Go and wait for the end; you shall rest in the grave and then rise to enjoy your share at the end of the days."

Here, then, in the clearest manner, Daniel's personal resurrection is associated with the End. What end? The end to which the Book of Daniel makes such frequent reference: the end of the pre-Messianic age, of the times of the Gentiles, of Israel's great tribulation and of her estrangement from God, the end of the career of the Prince that shall come. The first certain occurrence of the phrase in an eschatological

⁸ Trotter, p. 440, defends the reasonableness of the literal interpretation of Dan. 12:2, and refutes the objection that the text involves the resurrection of the wicked at the same time.

sense is in Daniel 9:26: "and even *unto the end* shall be war; desolations are determined" (R.V.). This is the description of the age that we now live in; the age that succeeds the cutting off of Messiah the Prince and the destruction of Daniel's city by the Romans.

Now Daniels' resurrection, as in 12:2-3, is distinctly connected with "the end." As Tregelles observes:

The "end" was a point of time to be waited for, both as to *their* blessing, and the fullness of *his* personally. Daniel was to rest, to lie in his grave amidst the other sleepers of the dust of the earth; but in the end of the days he should stand in his lot, even that lot of which he had before been instructed, in the heavenly glory of those who rise to eternal life (p. 164).

It remains only to summarize the results arrived at in this chapter.

(a) In Isaiah 26:19, "we have the first clear statement of a resurrection"; and this occurs in immediate association with the Coming of Jehovah and the restoration and conversion of living Israel. In the most definite manner it is located at the Day of the Lord (v. 1).

(b) In Isaiah 25:8, which occurs in the same vision, the resurrection of Israel's righteous dead and the removal of the veil of death again take place in immediate association with the Coming of Jehovah, the conversion of Israel, and the inauguration of the Messianic Kingdom.

(c) In Daniel 12:2-3, the resurrection of the saints follows the Great Tribulation, and is accompanied by the destruction of Antichrist and the deliverance of Daniel's people at the Day of the Lord.

(d) In Daniel 12:13, Daniel's personal resurrection is associated with the End of the days of which his book speaks so much. When the End comes, Daniel's rest will be finished, and he will rise and stand in his lot.

(e) In Hosea 6:2 and Ezekiel 37:1-14, the familiar idea of bodily resurrection is used to set forth the future national revival of Israel and her restoration to the land of promise. They are manifestly to be interpreted as figurative.

These conclusions are fatal to the new theories of the Second Advent, because it is a fundamental point in those theories that the sleeping saints of Israel will rise some years before the destruction of Antichrist, the deliverance of Israel, and the Coming of Jehovah and His Kingdom.