

THE Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. XIII

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1902.

No. 3.

I. Literary.

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE SABBATH SCHOOL.

BY REV. J. W. ROSEBRO, D. D.

I SUPPOSE most of us would say the Sabbath-school had its origin in the work of Robert Raikes in 1781, in Gloucester, England. Moved by the need of the poor and ignorant children, he employed "four decent, well-disposed women" to gather and teach these boys and girls; for this labor each received a "shilling a week." He is called, therefore, "the founder of Sabbath schools."

But this is true only of the modern work. Raikes was unwittingly restoring the "old paths." He was undoubtedly led of the Spirit of God to bring the church back to God's statutes, in which he had commanded Israel to teach his laws to their children. Dr. Trumbull, in his lectures on the Sabbath-school at Yale, shows conclusively that in each synagogue there was a school for the young. Philo states that "the Jews were by parents and teachers instructed in the law from their earliest youth." Josephus corroborates this by showing it was not new in his day. About 80-70 B. C. Simon ben Shetach reestablished the system of schools in every synagogue in all Palestine. Edersheim states that "there is no reasonable doubt that such schools existed in all the synagogues, and that up to ten years of age the Bible was the only text-book." There was also such a school in the temple. In this Jesus was found asking and answering questions when twelve years of age.

RECOGNITION IN HEAVEN.

By REV. J. G. McALLISTER.

OF all the questions that command a world-attention, not one, perhaps, is so full of interest for us as the question of the future life. It is not only that races as wide apart in time and culture as the Egyptians and the American Indians have held the *belief* in a future life; the restless, inquiring minds of men through all the centuries, going beyond this mere belief, have been seeking to ascertain the *nature* of that future life. If another world lies before us, in what respects shall it differ from our own? Is there to be perpetual sunshine and perpetual summer, or shall the days and seasons follow one the other, as here and now? If we ourselves are to people that world, what shall be the nature of the new bodies? Are they to be visible and tangible? Shall they have need of food, and drink, and rest? Shall they be limited in movement, or shall theirs be the speed of light? And if in that world we are to have work to do, what shall that work be? Are men to go further on in handicraft and invention? Is the investigator still to delve among the problems of science, and still to seek, with scope and powers enlarged, their true solution? Over the countless millions of worlds that march through space is there to be a rulership in which the saints shall share? Such are some of the questions the solution of which men for ages have been attempting. The last manuscript for publication from the pen of the late John Fiske was a treatise on eternal life.

And of all the questions that fringe the future world, not one of them, barring the assurance of his own salvation, is to the Christian so full of vivid, personal interest as the question of recognition in heaven.

In this world, by what is more than magic, our souls are knit with other souls in priceless friendships. Death rudely sealed the lips that spoke to us; Death closed the eyes that expressed what words could not; Death stilled the hand that in its pressure gave us strength and cheer. Shall we know our friends in that other world? And shall these friendships, so

precious here, so incomplete, find there renewal and development?

Here, by gracious and express appointment, God has placed us within the charm and protection of the family circle, where the pure love of marriagehood he glorifies and blesses. The circle widens, narrows. One by one its members are tenderly laid to rest, while through the years we sacredly guard their graves. After the unwilling separation, when part of us went from us; after the loyal, loving care of what of them is mortal; after all this, shall the husband know the wife? the brother the sister? the mother the child, to whom deathlessly she clung? or the child the mother, whom here it had not learned to know?

It needs not to be said that for all of this we long; that our longing is of such a nature that if, on the authority of God, it should be told us that our hope is vain, nothing else or less than the bitterness of disappointment would wring our hearts; and that this longing, thus deep, is so instinctive and widespread that it means with us something more than hope, so close to reason and to faith it seems to be. Thus the *rational presumption* in favor of recognition in heaven is certainly of the strongest.

But we want something more than this. We ask for clearer evidence in trial of a subject knit with all life so closely. Proof we wish; or, if not that, then just as near to it as we can come. Nothing about us gives answer. And that answer, if it comes at all, must come, we know, from one source alone. The speculations of the wisest of men, apart from revelation, are worth nothing here, for not one or all of them can balance a single statement of God's word.

What, then, does that word teach us on this subject? Does it affirm, or does it deny, or does it leave wholly in doubt, the question of recognition in heaven?

The response must be that it gives no explicit statement on the subject. Should we look for it through the wide range of Scriptures, we should look in vain. But let another truth be linked with that, namely, that in these Scriptures some truths the most vital are *assumed* without being proved, and are *inferred* without being expressly stated. The very existence of God, on which hangs everything in nature or in grace, is not proved by argument; it is *assumed*, according to the spirit of

the first verse in the Bible, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." And, likewise, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, a vital doctrine, is in no Scripture expressly stated. It is *inferred* from certain facts which *are* stated in Scripture—that he has divine *names* applied to him; that he has divine *attributes* ascribed to him; that he has divine *works* that originate with him; that he has divine *worship* commanded for him. Is the existence of God any the less real or any the less strongly held because it is not proved? Is the divinity of the Holy Spirit any the less real or any the less strongly held because it is not expressly stated? Certainly not. We do not doubt the one or the other. What in one case is assumed, and in the other is inferred, are to us as conclusive as direct proof or statement could make them be. Either this or the end of thinking.

The same is true with the subject of recognition in heaven. There is in Scripture no attempt to prove it; there is no passage that expressly states it. But from the grouping and comparison of what *is* stated there are assumptions and there are inferences that render it no less than certain.

I. Let us consider, first, certain *Scripture incidents* that bear upon the subject.

1. For the first of these we turn to the twenty-eighth chapter of the First Book of Samuel. It is the meeting of King Saul with the prophet, who had died years before. The Philistines, an unnumbered host, had again invaded the Holy Land; the Spirit of God had gone from Saul, and the forsaken king is seeking sympathy and counsel from this prophet, who in life had anointed him, befriended him, warned him, and in death had pitied him. The witch of Endor calls Samuel back from the world of spirits, and God sends him. He appears in the same familiar form. He recalls the conversation he had held with Saul when Agag was spared; the threat then given that his kingdom should fall to David; the reason this was done, disobedience to an express command. To this recollection he adds the prediction that the battle of the next day would go against the king, and issue in the death of himself and his two sons.

Here is an acquaintanceship renewed between Samuel and Saul. Here is memory of *persons*: himself and David, and Saul and Saul's sons. Here is memory of a *relation as to place*:

David is called a "neighbor." Here is memory of *nations*: the Amalekites, Israel, the Philistines. And here is memory of *sin*: the disobedience of Saul. It is not another Saul that Samuel sees in this journey from out the spirit world. It is not another Samuel that Saul sees in this border-land of spirits; it is the same who had always known him, and now vividly remembers him. Samuel had been years in glory. He is in glory now. Were his powers of memory and recognition greater on this brief visit to our world than they were before or after it? greater where sin clogs them than where such limitations are removed?

Is the Samuel in the witch's hut more wise than the Samuel in the house of God?

Is the Samuel in the presence of a wicked woman and a forsaken king mentally more alert than the Samuel among angels and redeemed? We cannot believe it so.

2. The next incident bearing on the subject is found in the twelfth chapter of the Second Book of Samuel. David had succeeded to the vacant throne of Saul; had sinned; had suffered. A child was born of his union with Bathsheba. The prophet Nathan tells him the child shall die. A week of anxious suspense follows; a week in which the little life hung in the balance; a week of fasting and prayer on the part of the now repentant king. The blow falls, and all the more heavily because it comes as penalty. Out of the anguish, yet out of the faith, of that chastened heart there springs a cry. What is it? "Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." "I shall go to him." David was not king only, but prophet as well. The same man, who earlier, within the compass of the long, hard year, when God's arrows were sticking fast, wrote the fifty-first Psalm, and later, in the twenty-third, penned the sentence that has girded many a dying saint, "I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever," here with equal confidence predicts that the child whom death now carries from him he will rejoin in that abiding home of God.

3. The third incident is the transfiguration of our Lord, at night, on a high mountain, with only three disciples by. Several facts are to be noted: "There talked with him two *men*." They were not angels, but men still, glorified though they had been. "Which were Moses and Elias." They were men who had kept even their *names*. Their identity had not been lost among the

multitudes of the other world. "Who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." They were men interested, therefore, in that which was of supremest interest to both worlds. "And when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him." They were men, therefore, who could be *seen*, and *were* seen, by these three apostles. "Let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias." They were men, therefore, who were *made known* to Peter, and *so* made known—whether by Christ's statement or by immediate vision—that Peter wished to honor them according to their standing in history.

Link these facts with the prediction Christ makes of this event. In three gospels it is recorded that "some" of the apostles should see the *kingdom of God* come with power, a "kingdom" which Peter in his Second Epistle identifies with the majestic glory of the Mount of Transfiguration. And here it was, a portion of that kingdom, in which Christ stood the central figure, transferred from heaven to earth. Through that portion we may see visions of the whole. The glimpse we have assures us that we shall meet and know those whom God highly honors. And the greater includes the less. If we can and shall know those whom on this earth we have never seen, it follows, with the force of almost absolute certainty, that we shall recognize the many others whom here we have known and loved.

4. The last incident to be considered is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, as it is recorded for us in the sixteenth chapter of Luke. Whether this parable be the narrative of an actual occurrence or not, we have in it a faithful portraiture of two men, first in this world, and then in the changed relations of the next. Stripped of the drapery, this much clearly remains: the godly Lazarus is borne to a place of blessedness, where he has companionship with Abraham. The ungodly rich man awakes in torment, where, however, he knows Abraham, calling him by name. He recognizes Lazarus, and asks that he be sent to soothe his anguish. Abraham tells him to remember the days of his worse than wasted life, and he does. He remembers his father's home. He remembers his five impenitent brothers. He remembers that he has passed from out the sphere of the living, and yet lives with those who here are called the dead.

And out of that vivid, burning memory he asks that his brothers may be warned by a resurrected messenger.

Here is knowledge of one man in the spirit world by another man in the spirit world—Abraham and Lazarus, Abraham and Dives. Here is recognition of one man by another man in that spirit world, Dives and Lazarus. Here is such recognition, though a great and impassable gulf stretched between. It recalls the plainer prediction of Christ as touching the workers of iniquity: “There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when *ye shall see* Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.”

Now, if a man who is lost is able to recognize a once-despised fellow-man, shall the saint in glory be unable to recognize another saint, his friend?

If that lost man could recognize and communicate with this other “afar off”—over a yawning gulf—shall the brother who worships at the same throne with his long-lost sister, and mingles with the throng that holds her, fail to find her there?

Lazarus, the stranger, seeks companionship with Abraham, and finds it; shall the mother, seeking to clasp within her arms the child dearer than life, seek in vain?

Are new relationships to supplant the old? Is knowledge to be so immediate and minute; is memory to be so vivid and sweeping, about everything but that which was purest in this life, and in itself bearing the worth and witness of eternal preservation? Not only reason and conscience, but Scripture, answer, No.

II. Let us turn now to consider certain *Scripture statements*. Many might be quoted, but those excluded the interpretation of which is not clear, a few of several classes must suffice.

1. There are many passages that teach a *personal immortality*. We should infer this, indeed, from the fact of a coming day of judgment. The man who sins must be the same man who suffers; the man who obeys Christ here must be the same who receives his blessedness there, or the judgment is not in righteousness. We have seen the same thing to be true in the incidents just considered. Samuel, David’s child, Moses and Elijah, Dives and Lazarus, do not become other people when they go out of this life. Their personal identity is preserved.

We know this to be true from the fact that the Christian's death is called a "sleep," and from many declarations of Scripture. In the sixth chapter of John's gospel it is asserted four times, "I will raise him up at the last day."

If we are to be the same persons there as here, may we not *make ourselves known* as the same persons? Powers of perception and memory shall be quickened, as the parable we have studied shows. Can they be in full use, and yet leave us unable to recognize our friends, whose personality, though chastened, is not changed? This recognition it is reasonable to expect.

2. There are certain other passages that teach a *bodily immortality*. The Scriptures assert that Christ, in saving us, redeems not only the soul, but the body also. This body he makes the temple of the Holy Spirit, preserves until his coming, and at his coming raises and transforms.

The nature of this resurrected body the apostle tells us in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. It shall be incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual—this last word indicating doubtless what an able commentator has shown it to mean, "spiritual" in the sense of being fitted for life in a spiritual world, just as our present bodies are "natural" because fitted for the world of nature all about us. The apostle is arguing, we must remember, for a literal bodily resurrection. "It is raised," not a spirit, but "a spiritual *body*."

But will these bodies, once raised, be essentially the same as now? The Scriptures seem to teach it (Phil. iii. 21, R. V.): "Who shall *fashion anew the body of our humiliation*"—not give us a new body—"that it may be conformed to the body of his glory." What is the body of Christ's glory? The body which is his to-day in heaven. Is it the same, essentially, as that in which he lived here on earth? Stephen, the first martyr, looking up steadfastly into heaven, "saw the glory of God, and *Jesus standing* on the right hand of God." Did he see the familiar form which so recently had ascended? The use of a peculiar expression, employed heretofore only by Christ himself, seems to assure us of it: "Behold, I see the heavens opened and the *Son of man* standing on the right hand of God."

That the resurrected body may be transfigured, and yet remain essentially the same, is not impossible. Sorrow transfigures the present body, even in an hour; and day after day

the cellular structure of the body is being torn down, to be swiftly replaced, until after a few years the whole body is renewed. Yet in both cases the essential identity of the body is preserved. Whether or not a like process shall be seen in the next world, this much is clear: the body will be real, visible, tangible, and, though glorified, will bear a resemblance to the body that now is. Add the fact of a bodily immortality to the fact of a personal immortality, and the recognition of friend by friend—such recognition as will need no introduction—seems so probable as to be little short of certain.

3. There are other passages that make it certain,—the passages that teach a *social immortality*. Such a passage is Matt. viii. 11: "And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." Such a passage is that which followed Christ's conversation with the woman at the well, when she had gone with breathless haste to tell of this new and wonderful revealer of human hearts. "Say not ye,"—this to his disciples,—*"there are yet four months, and then cometh harvest; behold, I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathered fruit unto life eternal, that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together."* Another is in 2 Cor. i. 14: "We are your glorying (R. V.), even as ye also are ours, in the day of the Lord Jesus." And 1 Thess. ii. 19: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of glorying (R. V.)? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" And Phil. ii. 16: "Holding forth the word of life that I may glory (R. V.) in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither labored in vain." These passages teach us that social relationships shall still hold place in the next world; that they who have engaged in the same work, whether at the same time or at periods widely separated, shall there meet to rejoice over the fruit at last gathered in; and that those who are saved by the agency of a worker shall meet that worker in heaven, and shall share with him an untold blessedness. All of which means recognition in heaven, or means nothing.

4. There are certain passages which teach an *immortality of honors*, given and received. Christ promised to his chosen

apostles that they should sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, while Paul assures the Corinthians that "the saints shall judge the world." Let that judgment mean as little as it *can* mean, how shall they judge others without *knowing* others? And how shall others honor them as judges without *knowing* them to be judges?

There is to be for some an "abundant entrance"¹ and a "full reward."² Faithfulness in little things will bring rulership "over many things."³ Places of honor shall be given those for whom they are prepared.⁴ Faith that has stood the test will "be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ."⁵ Thus all the saints shall find honors awaiting them, while eminent saints, as the parable shows, will receive abundant honors. How shall these honors be paid, except the person be known to whom they are paid? Imagine Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God, receiving honors from people who do not know that he is Abraham! Imagine that Paul is to be honored, and yet Paul is, and remains, unknown to a single person in all that throng which does him honor! The whole question of honors crowning character and work is simply impossible unless there be a knowledge of the men who are honored. Which is recognition in heaven.

5. There are certain passages that assure us of an immortality of *knowledge*. One will suffice, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, literally rendered: "For now we see in a mirror in a riddle; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I *know fully*, even as also I was fully known." "We see in a mirror in a riddle": everything is misshapen by sin, and the lines of God's government of the world seem twisted and drawn. "But then face to face": shapes of grace are reassumed, and the lines stand clear. "Now I know in part": it is partial knowledge I have of God's character, purpose, glory; of my own self, of my own sinfulness; of the Spirit's sanctifying work; of Christian souls about me, of those even whom I best know. "But then shall I know fully": these all shall stand within a new vision, from which clouds and mists have forever fled away. "Even as I was fully known": my acts and words, my thoughts and motives, are fully known. And such full knowledge shall no doubt be

¹ 2 Pet. i. 11. ² 2 John viii. ³ Matt. xxv. 21. ⁴ Matt. xx. 23. ⁵ 1 Pet. i. 7:

mine at the "revealing of the sons of God." Shall we be omniscient, therefore, knowing all that he knows? No; but this much is plain, or words mean nothing, that our knowledge then, in contrast with our knowledge now, will be measureless. But if we know friends here whom, though heaven holds them, and holds them as children of one household, we shall not be able to know there, then we shall be, not more wise, but more ignorant in that world than we are in this.

Two objections that seem to lie against the reality of recognition in heaven may be briefly answered. The first of these we find embedded in the answer of Christ to the Sadducees, a sect which believed in neither resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit. They saw that if bodily resurrection were real, then recognition must also be; and from this they professed to show the embarrassment that would arise if the marriage relation should be—as they assumed, for argument's sake, it *would* be—continued in the other world. Christ gave answer that in heaven there should be neither marrying nor giving in marriage. Let us study this answer.

Why was marriage instituted? Gen. ii. 18 gives us one reason; it was for companionship. And Mal. ii. 15 the other; it was for the rearing of a godly seed. In heaven there is to be no lack of the one and no need of the other.

Christ could have made one reply, had it been true, that would have cut the knot of every difficulty raised in this cavil, namely, that those who had been married should not *know* each other there. He gave no such reply. He stated only that they should not continue to live apart as man and wife, a relation which, as we can easily see, would be not only unneeded, but out of place in that world. Now, even here the marriage relation is not necessary to the truest congeniality and the deepest love. Witness this congeniality and love between man and man; between members of the same family; between wedded hearts whom circumstances of one or another kind keep apart. Marriage seals and conserves union, but never institutes it. All this in an imperfect world. When that which is perfect is come, we cannot doubt that the best that marriage holds here will be found there in fuller sway. "Love never faileth." We shall love all the saints, but this does not mean that we shall love them all in the same way or in the same degree. For some we shall have intenser

love, even as Christ, who gave us glimpses of heaven, had his beloved disciple and his close friends at Bethany, foregleams of the kingdom in which congenial spirits will find inseparable reunion.

The second objection touches the question of the lost. We mingle here with friends—sometimes with members of our own households—who up to death give no sign of penitence and pass out of life seemingly without hope. If we know our friends who are saved, shall we not know our friends who are lost? If we have memory of this earth, with its close relationships, shall we forget those who helped to make those relationships what they are? And can we remember these friends and not, in knowing their destiny, fail to grieve? We do not know. God, in wisdom and mercy, will, we are sure, veil from our eyes and efface from our memory whatever might cause us grief. But this we know he can do the while that he fully provides for the joyous and endless reunion with those whom we had lost awhile, and who are now by him restored to our embrace.

To sum up what these incidents and statements yield: The reappearance of Samuel teaches us memory and mutual recognition; the grief of David, reunion after death; the transfiguration, introduction to eminent saints of God; the parable of Christ, memory, recognition, introduction. *Personal* immortality teaches us the reasonableness of this recognition; *bodily* immortality make it highly probable, while *social* immortality and an immortality of *honors* and of *knowledge* make such a recognition not only reasonable, not only probable, not only certain, but *necessary*. The two objections urged against the reality of such recognition do not weaken the argument for it, but are separate questions, one of which, as we have seen, is not inconsistent with this recognition; the other of which may with confidence be left to him whose power and wisdom nothing can withstand.

Let the inspired apostle point the caution and give the stimulus: "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless."

Union Theological Seminary, Virginia.