

Volume Two

Angelology • Anthropology

Hamartiology

Table of Contents

Angelology

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO ANGELOLOGY

CHAPTER II. GENERAL FACTS ABOUT THE ANGELS

I. ANGELIC SPHERES

II. THE REALITY OF THE ANGELS

III. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ANGELS AND MEN

IV. THE PERSONALITY OF THE ANGELS

V. THE CREATION AND MODE OF EXISTENCE OF THE ANGELS

VI. THE ABODE OF THE ANGELS

VII. THE NUMBER OF THE ANGELS

VIII. THE POWER OF THE ANGELS

IX. THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE ANGELS

1. Governmental Rulers

2. Elect Angels

3. Cherubim, Seraphim, and Living Creatures

a. Cherubim

b. Seraphim

c. Living Creatures

4. Individual Angels

a. Lucifer, Son of the Morning (Isa. 14:12)

b. Michael (Dan. 12:1)

c. Gabriel (Dan. 9:21)

5. Angels Especially Designated

X. THE MINISTRY OF THE ANGELS

XI. THE PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANGELS

XII. THE ANGELS AS SPECTATORS

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER III. ANGELIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MORAL PROBLEM

CHAPTER IV. SATANOLOGY: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER V. SATANOLOGY: THE CAREER OF SATAN

I. SATAN'S CREATION, ORIGINAL ESTATE, AND FALL

II. SATAN'S SIN

1. "I Will Ascend into Heaven"
2. "I Will Exalt My Throne above the Stars of God"
3. "I Will Sit Also upon the Mount of the Congregation, in the Sides of the North"
4. "I Will Ascend above the Heights of the Clouds"
5. "I Will Be Like the Most High"

III. SATAN ACCORDING TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

IV. SATAN ACCORDING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

V. SATAN JUDGED IN THE CROSS

VI. THE EXECUTION OF SATAN'S JUDGMENTS

1. Satan Cast out of Heaven
2. Satan's Judgment at the Second Advent of Christ
3. Satan's Final Judgment

CHAPTER VI. SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S EVIL CHARACTER

I. TWOFOLD WICKEDNESS

1. Ambitious Pride
2. Untruth
 - a. Three Forces
 - (1) The Force of the Man of Sin
 - (2) The Force of the Restrainer
 - (3) The Force of the Destroyer

II. SATAN'S SINFULNESS

CHAPTER VII. SATANOLOGY: THE SATANIC *COSMOS*

I. SATAN'S AUTHORITY OVER THE *COSMOS*

II. THE *COSMOS* IS WHOLLY EVIL

III. SATAN'S UNDERTAKINGS IN THE *COSMOS*

IV. THE THINGS OF THE *COSMOS*

V. THOUGH DETAINED HERE, CHRISTIANS ARE NOT OF THE *COSMOS*

VI. THE IMPOTENCY OF THE *COSMOS*

VII. THE END OF THE *COSMOS*

CHAPTER VIII. SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S MOTIVE

CHAPTER IX. SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S METHOD

CONCLUSION TO SATANOLOGY

CHAPTER X. DEMONOLOGY

ANTHROPOLOGY

CHAPTER XI. INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY

CHAPTER XII. THE ORIGIN OF MAN

I. THE EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

II. REVELATION

III. THE TIME OF MAN'S ORIGIN

CHAPTER XIII. THE MATERIAL PART OF MAN AT CREATION

I. THE STRUCTURAL CHARACTER OF THE HUMAN BODY

II. THE FUTURE OF THE HUMAN BODY

III. VARIOUS USES OF THE WORD *BODY*

IV. THE BODY OF CHRIST

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XIV. THE IMMATERIAL PART OF MAN AT CREATION

I. THE ORIGIN OF THE IMMATERIAL PART OF THE FIRST MAN

II. THE DIVINE IMAGE

III. THE DERIVATION AND PERPETUATION OF THE IMMATERIAL PART OF MAN

1. The Pre-Existence Theory

2. The Creation Theory

3. The Traducian Theory

IV. ELEMENTS WHICH COMPRISE THE IMMATERIAL PART OF MAN

1. Soul
2. Spirit
3. Heart
4. Flesh
5. Mind

V. THE CAPACITIES AND FACULTIES OF THE IMMATERIAL PART OF MAN

1. Intellect
2. Sensibility
3. Will
4. Conscience

CHAPTER XV. THE STATE OF INNOCENCE

- I. THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE FIRST MAN
- II. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FIRST MAN
- III. THE MORAL QUALITIES OF THE FIRST MAN
- IV. THE TEMPTER OF THE FIRST MAN
- V. THE TEMPTATION OF THE FIRST MAN

CHAPTER XVI. THE FALL

- I. SPIRITUAL DEATH AND DEPRAVITY
 - II. PHYSICAL DEATH
- CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XVII. INTRODUCTION TO HAMARTIOLOGY

- I. THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF SIN
- II. THE DERIVATION OF SIN
- III. THE DIVINE PERMISSION OF SIN
 1. The Divine Recognition of the Creature's Free Choice
 2. The Specific Value of Redeemed Beings
 3. The Acquisition of Divine Knowledge
 4. The Instruction of Angels
 5. The Demonstration of the Divine Hatred of Evil
 6. The Righteous Judgments of All Evil
 7. The Manifestation and Exercise of Divine Grace

PREPARATORY REMARKS

CHAPTER XVIII. PERSONAL SIN

I. THE ORIGIN OF SIN

1. The Eternal Anticipation of Sin in the Foreknowledge of God
2. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin in Heaven by an Unfallen Angel
 - a. The Person Who First Sinned
 - b. The Nature of the First Sin
3. The First Concrete Enactment of Sin by a Human Being on Earth

II. THE SINFUL NATURE OF SIN

III. THREE MAJOR PROOFS OF THE EXCEEDING SINFULNESS OF PERSONAL SIN

1. The Angelic Proof
2. The Human Proof
3. The Divine Proof

IV. GENERAL DEFINITIONS

1. Sin against God's Holy Person
 - a. The Theory That Sin Is Selfishness
2. Sin against the Law
 - a. Early Communications Preserved by Tradition
 - b. Human Conscience
 - c. Direct Spiritual Guidance
 - d. The Written Word of God with its Various Age Applications

V. GENERAL TERMS AND CLASSIFICATIONS

VI. THE DIVINE REMEDY FOR PERSONAL SIN

1. Forgiveness
2. Justification

VII. ORIGINAL SIN

VIII. GUILT

IX. UNIVERSALITY

CHAPTER XIX. THE TRANSMITTED SIN NATURE

I. THE FACT OF THE SIN NATURE

II. THE REMEDY FOR THE SIN NATURE

CHAPTER XX. IMPUTED SIN

I. THE SCOPE OF THE DOCTRINE OF IMPUTATION

II. THEORIES OF IMPUTATION

III. THE DIVINE REMEDY FOR IMPUTED SIN

1. The Death of Christ

2. The Keys of Death

3. Death and the Unsaved

4. Death and the Christian

5. Death in the Millennium

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER XXI. MAN'S ESTATE UNDER SIN AND HIS RELATION TO SATAN

I. THE FACT

II. THE REMEDY

III. THE RELATION OF THE UNSAVED TO SATAN

CHAPTER XXII. THE CHRISTIAN'S SIN AND ITS REMEDY

I. THE WORLD

II. THE FLESH

III. THE DEVIL

IV. THE THREEFOLD PROVISION

1. The Word of God

2. The Interceding Christ

3. The Indwelling Spirit

V. THE TWOFOLD EFFECT OF THE CHRISTIAN'S SIN

1. The Effect of the Christian's Sin upon Himself

2. The Effect of the Christian's Sin upon God

VI. THE CHRISTIAN'S SIN NATURE

1. "Flesh"

2. "Old Man"

3. "Sin"

a. The Divine Provision

b. The Believer's Responsibility

VII. THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATION TO IMPUTED SIN

VIII. THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATION TO MAN'S ESTATE UNDER SIN

CHAPTER XXIII. PUNISHMENT

I. CHASTISEMENT

II. SCOURGING

III. RETRIBUTION

CHAPTER XXIV. THE FINAL TRIUMPH OVER ALL SIN

ANGELOLOGY

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO ANGELOLOGY

THE TRUTH that there is an order of celestial beings quite distinct from humanity and from the Godhead who occupy an exalted estate above the present position of fallen man, is the teaching of much Scripture. These celestial beings are mentioned at least 108 times in the Old Testament and 165 times in the New Testament, and out of this extended body of Scripture the student may construct his doctrine of the angels (cf. Gaebelin, *Angels of God*, p. 12).

The designation *angel*—whether *mal.āk* of the Old Testament Hebrew or *aggelos* of the New Testament Greek—means ‘messenger.’ These beings execute the purpose of the One whom they serve. The holy angels are the messengers of their Creator, while the fallen angels are the messengers of Satan—“the god of this world”—whom they elect to serve. Men, too, are sometimes styled *messengers*, as they seem to be addressed in Revelation 1:20, though certain expositors, as well represented by Alford, contend that spirit beings are the messengers of the seven churches of Asia. The term *angel* is not only *generic*, in that it is applied to all orders of created spirits, but it is expressive, also, of their office or service.

When considering the angels, as in other doctrines, there is some field for the exercise of reason. Since God is spirit (John 4:24), partaking in no way of material elements, it is natural to assume that there are created beings who more closely resemble God than do the mundane creatures who combine both the material and the immaterial. There is a material kingdom, an animal kingdom, and a human kingdom; so, it may be assumed, there is an angelic or spirit kingdom. However, Angelology rests not upon reason or supposition, but upon revelation.

As the universe has been ordered, it has not pleased God to give to man any intercourse with the angels, or any consciousness of their presence; yet the Bible states that angels not only observe the affairs of men, but that good angels minister to man’s well-being (Heb. 1:14) and evil angels wage a warfare against that in man which is wrought of God (Eph. 6:12). The reality of angelic influence in human affairs is not restricted to a limited portion of human history. The angels are reported to be present from creation and on into the eternity to come. Under a comprehensive fivefold division of God’s finite creatures, as they now exist, the angels comprise two divisions, namely, the holy angels and the

fallen angels. To these are added the Gentiles, the Jews, and the Christians. However, all classes of beings, regardless of the order or time of beginning, being originated and constituted as they are, go on in their group distinctions into eternity to come. There is no evidence that other orders of finite beings will be introduced in this age or future ages.

In the Middle Ages, unprofitable and often grotesque speculation so characterized the discussion of the doctrine of the angels that a depreciation of this body of truth is abroad today. Of these discussions Dr. Augustus Strong writes: "The scholastics debated the questions, how many angels could stand at once on the point of a needle (relation of angels to space); whether an angel could be in two places at the same time; how great was the interval between the creation of angels and their fall; whether the sin of the first angel caused the sin of the rest; whether as many retained their integrity as fell; whether our atmosphere is the place of punishment for fallen angels; whether guardian-angels have charge of children from baptism, from birth, or while the infant is yet in the womb of its mother" (*Systematic Theology*, sixth edition, p. 221). Thus, also, Rossetti in his *Shadow of Dante* (pp. 14–15) says of Dante: "The fall of the rebel angels he considers to have taken place within twenty seconds of their creation, and to have originated in the pride which made Lucifer unwilling to await the time prefixed by his Maker for enlightening him with perfect knowledge" (cited by Strong, *ibid.*).

The presence of spirit beings has been recognized in almost all systems of religion. On this fact, Dr. William Cooke makes this comment:

Indeed, in nearly all the systems of religion, ancient or modern, we trace such beings; in the Aeons of the Gnostics, the Demons, the Demi-gods, the Genii, and the Lares, which figure so largely in the theogonies, poems, and general literature of heathen antiquity, we have abundant evidence of almost universal belief in the existence of spiritual intelligences, ranging in different orders between man and his Maker. Here, however, we often find truth draped in fiction, and facts distorted by the wildest fancies of mythology. The doctrine of the heathen, respecting spiritual beings, may be thus briefly stated. They believe the souls of departed heroes and good men were exalted to dignity and happiness; these were called demons, and were supposed to be employed as mediators between the supreme divinity and man. There was, however, another class of demons, who were supposed never to have inhabited mortal bodies at all; and of these, there were two sorts: the good, who were employed as the guardians of good men; and evil ones, who were said to envy human happiness, and sought to hinder their virtue and effect their ruin. In these notions we see a substratum of truth; but in the Scriptures we have the truth itself in its original purity, free from the corruptions of superstition and the licentious imagery of the poet; and truth the more majestic from its unadorned simplicity.

Heathen philosophers and poets often spoke of the ministry of spiritual beings. Socrates often spoke of a good demon attending him, and directing and guiding him by his admonitions. Plato taught that the higher kind of demons, such as had never dwelt in mortal bodies, were appointed

guardians unto men. But old Hesiod ascribes a ministering agency to the spirits that had once inhabited mortal bodies during the golden age, and speaks of them as

Aerial spirits, by great Jove design'd
To be on earth the guardians of mankind.
Invisible to mortal eyes they go,
And mark our actions good or bad below;
The immortal spies with watchful care preside,
And twice ten thousand round their charges glide;
They can reward with glory or with gold,
A power they by divine permission hold.

We have here a brief representation of that general sentiment on the offices of these superior beings, which we find so abundantly amplified in the speculations of philosophers, and the dreamy fictions of the poets. But with what steadfast foot we tread when, leaving the flitting theories and amusing dramas of the heathen, we come to the substantial verities of revelation, and in the narrative of simple truth hear what God has said and saints have seen of the angel world.
—*Christian Theology*, 5th edition, pp. 610–11, 21–22

Chapter II

GENERAL FACTS ABOUT THE ANGELS

THE DOCTRINE of the angels lends itself to twelve general divisions, which are now to be attended.

I. Angelic Spheres

In approaching the Biblical revelation relative to angelic beings, it is necessary to consider the broader sphere of the whole universe and not to restrict this contemplation to the limited boundaries of the earth. Modern astronomy has presented evidence for the vastness of material creation. Solar systems greater than this extend on beyond the range of human power to comprehend. Other suns with all that surround them, removed from this earth and its sun by thirty to sixty billion miles, are known to exist. Camille Flammarion states: “Then I understand that all the stars which have ever been observed in the sky, the millions of luminous points which constitute the Milky Way, the innumerable celestial bodies, suns of every magnitude and of every degree of brightness, solar systems, planets and satellites, which by millions and hundreds of millions succeed each other in the void around us, that whatever human tongues have designated by the name of universe, do not in the infinite represent more than an archipelago of celestial islands and not more than a city in a grand total of population, a town of greater or lesser importance. In this city of the limitless empire, in this town of a land without frontiers, our Sun and its system represents a single point, a single house among millions of other habitations. Is our solar system a palace or a hovel in this great city? Probably a hovel. And the earth? The Earth is a room in the solar mansion—a small dwelling, miserably small” (cited by Gaebelein, *The Angels of God*, pp. 8–9).

From earliest times men have considered the question whether this earth is the only inhabited planet. Science ventures guesses, but the Bible speaks with authority on this age-old problem. It is disclosed that the angels dwell in the heavenly spheres and in numbers beyond human computation. They are gathered in groups which are identified as *thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, authorities*, and *the hosts of heaven*. Yet all these are wholly subject to the Lord Jesus Christ who created this universe and all it contains, including angelic beings. He created “things ... visible and invisible” (Col. 1:16). Peter

declares that these beings are subject to Christ (1 Pet. 3:22). No intimation is ever given that these beings are limited to the sphere of this earth or to any restricted part of the universe. Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2). The "Father's house" is no less than the universe in which there are many abodes. Jude asserts (1:6) that angels have their own dwelling places. On this passage Dr. A. C. Gaebelien writes: "In the epistle of Jude we find this significant statement: 'And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day' (Jude 6) ... The one thing we wish to consider is the fact, the outstanding fact, that these angels had 'their own habitation.' They had an estate given to them. This seems to us conclusive that angels have in the heavens habitations, places where they dwell, which they can leave as the unseen ministers of God" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 39–40). Hooker states: "Angels are linked into a kind of corporation amongst themselves.... Consider the angels of God associated, and their law is that which disposeth them as an army, one in order and degree above another (Luke 2:13; Matt. 26:53; Heb. 12:22)" (*Ecc. Polity*, Book I, 4:2, cited by Gerhart, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, I, 644). This consideration is important since it is natural for men to suppose that the human sphere forms a center about which other orders of beings are gathered. Angelic existence antedates that of humanity by countless ages, and what is germane to the united, interrelated commonwealth and accomplishments of angels, for which they were created, has been continuously executed without reference to, or dependence upon, the lower and later order of human subsistence. The meaning of the above cited designations—*thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, authorities*—is little related to or dependent on mundane things. These terms betoken the cooperation amongst the angels themselves. Another sphere of relationship is reflected which is itself as vast as the universe wherein it resides and wherein it functions. The angelic beings are declared to have interest in the things of earth and some service in this direction; but no revelation is given as to the extent and nature of the facts and forces which constitute the reality in which the angels live, which reality was in action ages before the creation of man. The Bible is not addressed to the angels, nor does it enter upon an exhaustive description of their estate or interrelationships. It is implied, however, that a vast universe which the human eye but feebly penetrates is inhabited by unnumbered spirit beings, and that, upon release from the limitations of this sphere, the dwellers of earth are inducted into those extended domains—not to be angels, but to enter the sphere which divine

teleology has designed for them.

The natural human vision is not able to discern the presence of angels, but that fact does not impugn the truth that the angels are about us on every hand. Milton has written by poetic fancy and not by inspiration: “Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep” (cited by Strong, *Systematic Theology*, sixth edition, p. 227). When the natural vision of the young man of 2 Kings 6:17 was augmented, he saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha. One reason angels are rendered invisible to human sight may be that, if they were seen, they would be worshiped. Man, who is so prone to idolatry as to worship the works of his own hands, would hardly be able to resist the worship of angels were they before his eyes. The Apostle admonishes against the “worshipping of angels” (Col. 2:18), and John testifies: “And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God” (Rev. 22:8–9).

II. The Reality of the Angels

In the light of so much revelation, the speculations of gnosticism regarding angels must be rejected. The angels are living beings of the highest position and greatest consequence in the universe. They are more than mere powers emanating from God. Though in no way independent in the sense that they are self-originating, self-sustaining, or capable of self-annihilation, they are free moral beings and have, in past ages at least, held their own destiny within the power of their own choice. It is revealed that some of the angels “sinned” and that they “kept not their first estate” (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6). Of the tremendous issues involved and the far-flung epochs of history embraced in these brief declarations, no complete disclosure is proffered. Whatever occurred, there could be no breaking away from the creature’s relation to the Creator, and, as stated in the Scriptures, these fallen angels must in the end account to the One whom they repudiated (Ezek. 28:16–17; Matt. 25:41). The sufficiency of the angels, like that of all created beings, is of God alone. They live and move by virtue of divine enablement. Even Michael the archangel when in controversy with Satan asserted his dependence on God (Jude 1:9).

III. Relative Importance of Angels and Men

The Scriptures maintain that man was “made a little lower than the angels” (Ps. 8:4–5; Heb. 2:6–7). Whether this refers to estate, or to essential, inherent qualities, is not determined. It is probable that the angels are superior to man in both respects. Much dispute has arisen in earlier days over this question. Among more recent writers, Martensen, with many others, argues that the angels are inferior to men, while Dorner, with even a larger group, contends that the angels are superior. The Bible avers that man was made in the image of God; no such word is spoken of angels. Man possesses a material body with its experiences; no such experience is reported of the angels, though it is evident that demons seek embodiment whenever that is possible. Discoursing on the angels, Dr. Gerhart writes on the relative importance of angels and men: “Man is a physico-spiritual being, organically uniting in his constitution body and soul. The body is not, as has frequently been taught, a clog to the soul or a degradation of manhood, or the infliction of a penalty. It is an element of dignity, a condition of spiritual vitality. Conjoining body and soul in indissoluble unity, man is connected with two worlds. On the one side, bodily organization binds human life, human personality, with matter, with all the forces and processes of nature backward to its beginnings. On the other side, spiritual life allies man to the pre-mundane dominion of Spirit. Connected with the heavenly realm and with the economy of earth, his constitution qualifies him to be the mediator between the infinite and the finite, between the heavenly and the earthly, the material and the spiritual, the representative of God in His relations to the world, the organ of the world in its relations to God. Revelation does not accord this position of dignity to any order of angelic spirits” (*Op. cit.*, pp. 648–49). Martensen in his *Dogmatics* (pp. 132–33) states: “Although the angel, in relation to man, is the more powerful spirit, man’s spirit is nevertheless the richer and the more comprehensive. For the angel in all his power is only the expression of a single one of all those phases which man in the inward nature of his soul, and the richness of his own individuality, is intended to combine into a complete and perfect microcosm. ... It is precisely because the angels are only spirits, not souls, that they cannot possess the same rich existence as man, whose soul is the point of union in which spirit and nature meet” (cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*). No consideration of the relative importance of angels as compared to man will be complete which fails to observe that man, though now sunken to “an horrible pit” and “miry clay,” is, when redeemed, lifted up to a place of secure standing

on the Rock (Ps. 40:2) and destined to be conformed to the image of Christ, which final estate is far above that of the angels. There is a marked discrepancy in much of the effort to draw a contrast between these two orders of divine creation. The Bible is the only source of trustworthy information and is primarily a revelation to man of his own relation to God. Beyond the mere part that angels have in the affairs of men, there is little intimation about those larger spheres of activity into which the angels enter. The discussion reaches no satisfactory conclusion for want of even elementary knowledge regarding the angels.

IV. The Personality of the Angels

Truth bearing on the personality of angels is also attended with difficulties. Agreement cannot be accorded the following vague statement by Martensen:

There are many sorts of spirits under the heavens, and for this very reason also many degrees of spirituality and spiritual independence; and we may therefore very properly assert that the angels are divided into classes. ... If we contemplate the angels in their relation to the conception of personality, we may say: there are powers, whose spirituality is so far from being independent, that they possess only a represented personality; in short, are only personifications. Of such a character are the tempests and flames, which execute the commands of the Lord. ... There exist other powers in the creation which possess a higher degree of spirituality, an intermediate state of existence between personification and personality. Under this category may be classed the spiritual powers in history, as for instance the spirits of nations and the deities of mythology. ... But if in this matter we find powers in history, which hover in the region lying between personality and personification, it is no less certain that revelation recognizes a third class of cosmical powers which constitute a free and personal spiritual kingdom.—*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 131, cited by Gerhart, *op. cit.*, p. 642

Though their service or dignity may vary, there is no implication in the Bible that some angels are more intelligent than others. Every feature of personality is predicated of the angels. They are individual beings, and, though spirits, experience emotions; they render intelligent worship (Ps. 148:2); they behold with due understanding the face of the Father (Matt. 18:10); they know their limitations (Matt. 24:36), their inferiority to the Son of God (Heb. 1:4–14); and, in the case of the fallen angels, they know their ability to do evil. The angels are individuals, yet, though sometimes appearing in a separate capacity, they are subject to classifications and varying ranks of importance.

V. The Creation and Mode of Existence of the Angels

It is assumed from Colossians 1:16–17 that all angels were created simultaneously. In like manner, it is assumed that the creation of angels was

completed at that time and that none will be added to their number. They are not subject to death or any form of extinction; therefore they do not decrease as they do not increase. The plan by which the human family is secured through propagation has no counterpart among the angels. Each angel, being a direct creation of God, stands in immediate and personal relation to the Creator. Of certain of the human family as they appear in the next world, it is said by Christ, "They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matt. 22:28–30). Thus it is concluded that there is no decrease or increase among these heavenly beings.

The existence of angels is assumed in the Scriptures, and the Scriptures form the only source of worthy information bearing on those beings who, aside from supernatural appearances, are not allowed to come into the sphere of human consciousness. As man is the highest creation of earthly spheres, so the angels are the highest creation of larger spheres described in Colossians 1:16–17, where it is written: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." As the angels, in common with all other moral beings, were created by Christ and for Christ, so they abide forever unto the praise of His glory. Though some human beings and certain angels now withhold their worship of God, the greater part of the angels are before His throne in ceaseless adoration. It can be no small issue in the divine counsels that certain creatures fallen in sin withhold their note of praise from the One to whom all honor is due. This repudiation could not go on forever. It is gratifying to read that, in His kingdom reign, Christ will put down all rule and authority, and that, at the close of this present age, He will, by the ministry of angels, gather out of human spheres all things that offend. Of the disposition of enmity in higher spheres it is said: "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:25–26), while of the disposition of enmity in the lower spheres it is written: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt. 13:41–43).

As compared with human and animal existence, the angels may be said to be incorporeal, but only in the sense that they do not sustain a mortal organization.

The Scriptures imply that the angels do have embodiment. God is a Spirit, yet, when addressing the Jews, Christ said of the Father, “Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape” (John 5:37; cf. Ex. 33:23; Ezek. 1:1–28; Ps. 104:1–2). It is essential to a spirit that it have localized, determinate, spiritual form. Too often the problem is confused by imposing upon spiritual beings those limitations which belong to humanity. For the saints in heaven there is promised a “spiritual body”—a body adapted to the spirit of man (1 Cor. 15:44). Such, indeed, is the body of the glorified Lord (Phil. 3:21). There are many kinds of bodies even on the earth, the Apostle points out (1 Cor. 15:39–40), and goes on to say: “There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial.” It is small evidence that there are no celestial bodies, if the issue rests on no more than the truth that man has no power to discern such bodies. Spirits have a definite form of organization which is adapted to the law of their being. They are both finite and spacial. All this may be true though they are far removed from this mundane economy. They are able to approach the sphere of human life, but that fact in no way imposes upon them the conformity to human existence. The appearance of angels may be, as occasion demands, so like men that they pass as men. How else could some “entertain angels unawares” (Heb. 13:2)? On the other hand, their appearance is sometimes in dazzling white and blazing glory (Matt. 28:2–4). When Christ declared, “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have” (Luke 24:37–39), He did not imply that a spirit has no body at all, but, rather, that they do have bodies which in constitution are different from those of men. In a discreet and prudent manner Dr. William Cooke has canvassed the complicated field of truth relative to the nature and corporality of the angels thus:

In the Old Testament the Psalmist calls them spirits—“*Who maketh his angels spirits,*” civ. 4. And in the New Testament they are designated by the same term—“*Are they not all ministering spirits?*” Heb. 1:14. Here, however, a question arises—are angels so spiritual as to be absolutely immaterial like God? or are they enshrined in a refined material fabric? Opinions both ancient and modern are much divided on this subject. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nicene, Cyril, and Chrysostom held that angels are absolutely immaterial; but Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Caesarius, and Tertullian, among the earlier fathers, thought those blessed beings were enshrined in a refined material fabric. The term spirit, applied to them, does not of itself absolutely decide the question; for as that word in both Hebrew and Greek is primarily a material term, indicating wind, air, or breath, it may without violence be applied either to a pure spirit or to a refined material nature. It is true that, on the appearance of angels to man, they assumed a visible human form. This fact, however, does not prove their materiality; for human spirits in the intermediate state, though disembodied, have in their intercourse with man appeared in a material human form: on the Mount of Transfiguration Moses, as well as Elias, was recognized as a man; and the Elders who appeared to and conversed with John, in the Apocalypse, had also the human form.—Rev. 5:5, and 7:13. Yet

such appearances cannot absolutely decide the question. Theologically, there is nothing incongruous or improbable in the supposition that angels are invested with a refined material nature. Heaven is undoubtedly suitable as a habitat for such. Enoch and Elijah were exalted body and soul to heaven by translation; the glorified humanity of our Lord is there enthroned; and angels, though enshrined in a material fabric, may dwell in the splendours of the Divine presence. . . . Yet, as it is a law of adaptation, that no such gross materiality as “flesh and blood” can enter that region of blessedness, it follows that if angels are enshrined in a material frame, it must be so refined in its nature as to exclude all that involves the possibility of decay, and any organization with animal appetites and wants. Our Lord himself has decided this, by affirming that human beings in heaven neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God (Matt. 22:30). In this comparison between the final state of the righteous and the present state of angels, we have a glimpse of the condition of both. It invests our theme with augmented interest to know that the exalted beings with whom we are to live for ever, have a nature so much in common with our own; it is still more interesting to know that in the higher attributes of both, angels and men so much resemble the human nature of Christ.—*Christian Theology*, pp. 613–14

Medieval art has seized upon the account (Dan. 9:21) that an angel “flew swiftly” as the ground of their imposition of wings upon all angelic beings. It is true, however, that the cherubim, seraphim, or living creatures, are said to have wings. And thus the cherubim appear in golden images above the ark of the mercy seat. Angels pass from one locality to another with incredible speed (Dan. 9:21).

VI. The Abode of the Angels

The abode of the angels is likewise a matter of definite revelation. An intimation has been recorded earlier of the truth that the whole universe is inhabited by innumerable hosts of spirit beings. This vast order of beings with all their classifications have fixed abodes and centers for their activities. By the use of the phrase, “the angels which are in heaven” (Mark 13:32), Christ definitely asserts that angels inhabit heavenly spheres. The Apostle writes, “though an angel from heaven” (Gal. 1:8), and, “the whole family in heaven and earth” (Eph. 3:15). Likewise, in the prayer which Christ taught His disciples, they were instructed to say: “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10). Dr. A. C. Gaebelein has written of the abode of the angels, saying:

In the Hebrew, heaven is in the plural, “the heavens.” The Bible speaks of three heavens, the third heaven is the heaven of heavens, the dwelling place of God, where His throne has always been. The tabernacle possessed by His earthly people, Israel, was a pattern of the heavens. Moses upon the mountain had looked into the vast heavens and saw the three heavens. He had no telescope. But God Himself showed to him the mysteries of the heavens. Then God admonished him when he was about to make the tabernacle and said to His servant, “See, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mountain” (Heb. 8:5). The tabernacle had three compartments, the outer court, the Holy part and the Holiest. Once a year the high priest entered

this earthly place of worship to pass through the outer court, into the Holy part, and, finally, carrying the sacrificial blood, he entered into the Holiest to sprinkle the blood in Jehovah's holy presence. But Aaron was only a type of Him who is greater than Aaron, the true High Priest. Of Him, the true Priest, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, it is written that He passed *through the heavens* (Heb. 4:14). "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24). He passed through the heavens, the outer court, the heaven surrounding the earth; the holy part, the immense universes, with their immeasurable distance, and finally He entered the third heaven, that heaven astronomy knows exists, but which no telescope can ever reach. In the heavenlies, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, are the principalities and the powers, the innumerable company of angels. Their dwelling places are in these heavens. God who created them, who made them spirits and clothed them with bodies suited to their spirit nature, must have also assigned to them habitations. ... It is also significant and not without meaning that the phrase "the host of heavens" means both the stars and the angelic hosts; the "Lord of Hosts" has also the same double meaning, for He is the Lord of the stars and the Lord of the angels.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 34–35

VII. The Number of the Angels

Its allusion to the number of the angels is one of the superlatives of the Bible. They are there described in multitudes "which no man could number." It is reasonable to conclude that there are as many spirit beings in existence as there will have been human beings in all their history on the earth. It is significant that as the phrase "the host of heaven" describes both the material stars and the angels, the latter may be as much beyond number as the former (Gen. 15:5). To quote Dr. Cooke, again, where he gathers Biblical testimony on the number of the angels:

Hear what Micaiah says, "I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left."—1 Kings 22:19. Hear what David says, "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even many thousands of angels."—Psal. 68:17. Elisha saw one detachment of these celestial beings sent to be his bodyguard, when "the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about him."—2 Kings 6:17. Hear what Daniel saw, "Thousand thousands were ministering unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand were standing before him." —Dan. 7:10. Behold what the watchful shepherds saw and heard on the morn of the Redeemer's birth, "A multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest."—Luke 2:13. Hear what Jesus says, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?"—Matt. 26:53. Look again at the magnificent spectacle which John saw and heard as he gazed into the heavenly world, "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living ones and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," etc.—Rev. 5:12. If these numbers be taken literally, they indicate 202 millions, yet they were only a part of the celestial host. It is probable, however, these figures were not intended to indicate any precise number, but that the multitude was immense, beyond what usually enters into human computation. Hence in Hebrews 12:22, we read not of any definite or limited number, however great, but of "an innumerable company of angels."—*Op. cit.*, pp. 614–15

VIII. The Power of the Angels

What is true of all creatures relative to the power they exert, is equally true of the angels: their power is derived from God. Their power, however great, is restricted. They are unable to do those things which are peculiar to Deity—create, act without means, or search the human heart. They may influence the human mind as one creature may influence another. The knowledge of this truth is of great importance when, as later, contemplation will be given to the ascendancy evil spirits may assume over human beings. It will be found that human beings are able to thwart the influence of evil spirits only by divine enablement (Eph. 6:10–12; 1 John 4:4). Even an angel may claim divine assistance when in conflict with another angel (Jude 1:9). Continuing in his same comprehensive manner, Dr. Cooke writes of angelic power:

“Strong angel” and “mighty angel,” are terms we read in the Apocalypse. The name Gabriel means *the mighty one of God*; and among the designations of angelic orders we find that of powers (δυνάμεις). The attribute of extraordinary power pertains to angelic natures in general, as we learn from David, who exclaims, “Bless the Lord, ye his angels, who excel in strength.” It is impossible to form any comparison between the power of a spiritual being, such as an angel, and the physical power of man, which is limited by his organization. If, however, the power of man be estimated by the wondrous effects he can produce by his superior knowledge, and the appliances he can use, we have then displays which may give us some faint idea of the resources of angelic power, for probably their superior knowledge of nature would enable them to employ in a far higher degree than ourselves the resources of the universe, to fulfil any commission which God might give them to perform. Whatever be the mode or media by which their powers are exerted, the effects thereof are astounding. Milton describes them as plucking the seated hills from their foundations and hurling them on their antagonists. This is poetry; but in the records of Scripture we have truth without the colour of fiction; and here we find one angel, as a minister of vengeance, destroying 70 thousand persons of the kingdom of David in three days; another destroying in one night 85 thousand stout warriors in the mail-clad army of Assyria’s proud monarch; and another destroying all the first-born of Egypt in one single night. In the Apocalypse we see angels holding the four winds of heaven, discharging the vials, and wielding the thunders of Jehovah’s wrath upon the guilty nations; the old earth trembles under the displays of their mighty power as the ministers of a sin-avenging God. But angels are equally powerful for good; and while their holy nature makes them the faithful executors of justice, their benevolence, as well as their holiness, makes them delight to employ their energies in the service of mercy.—*Ibid.*, pp. 620–21

IX. The Classification of the Angels

1. GOVERNMENTAL RULERS. Revelation specifies certain groups as well as various important individuals amongst the angels. Mention has been made of five major representations of supremacy among these beings, namely, thrones (θρόνοι), dominions (κυριότητες), principalities (ἀρχαί), authorities (ἐξουσίαι), and powers (δυνάμεις). Since the Bible does not indulge in useless tautology, it

may be believed that there is a specific meaning to each of these denominations, which meaning no doubt corresponds to earthly realities which bear these appellations. The revealed truth regarding the angels is not sufficiently complete for a full analogy to be set up. The term *thrones* refers to those who sit upon them, *dominions* to those who rule, *principalities* to those who govern, *powers* to those who exercise supremacy, and *authorities* to those invested with imperial responsibility. Though there is seeming similarity in these denominations, it may be assumed that representation is made by these titles to incomprehensible dignity and varying degrees of rank. Heavenly spheres of rule exceed human empires as the universe exceeds the earth.

2. ELECT ANGELS. Reference in 1 Timothy 5:21 to “elect angels” at once opens an interesting field of inquiry regarding the extent to which the doctrine of sovereign election is to be traced in the relation of angels to their Creator. It will be conceded that angels are created for a purpose and that in their realm, as with man, the designs of the Creator are to be executed to infinity. The fall of some angels is no more unanticipated by God than the fall of man. It may be implied, also, that angels have passed a period of probation.

3. CHERUBIM, SERAPHIM, AND LIVING CREATURES. Interpretations bearing on this threefold classification of the angels vary greatly. Dr. A. H. Strong contends that they are “artificial, temporary, symbolic figures” which have “not themselves personal existences.” He seeks to sustain this idea by the assertion that these specific designations are not coupled with the angels in any Scripture passage. Smith (*Bible Dictionary*) and Alford (*Greek Testament*) maintain that these are only symbols of the attributes of God. The great proportion of expositors salute these as exalted angels of the highest station, quite apart, perhaps, from governments. Some expositors seek to discover distinctions of position and rank between those to whom these appellations are assigned. It is more satisfactory to accord to them not only the highest station, but one and the same general grouping. The different terms used seem to indicate a distinction in service rendered rather than in essential position. Because of the exalted state of these angels, the service they render should be considered with due attention.

a. Cherubim. The *cherubim* title speaks of their high and holy position and their responsibility as such is closely related to the throne of God as defenders of His holy character and presence. In a note under Ezekiel 1:5, Dr. C. I. Scofield, in his *Reference Bible*, makes the following statement:

The “living creatures” are identical with the Cherubim. The subject is somewhat obscure, but from the position of the Cherubim at the gate of Eden, upon the cover of the ark of the covenant, and in Rev. 4., it is clearly gathered that they have to do with the vindication of the holiness of God as against the presumptuous pride of sinful man who, despite his sin, would “put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life” (Gen. 3:22–24). Upon the ark of the covenant, of one substance with the mercy-seat, they saw the sprinkled blood which, in type, spake of the perfect maintenance of the divine righteousness by the sacrifice of Christ (Ex. 25:17–20; Rom. 3:24–26, *notes*). The living creatures (or Cherubim) appear to be actual beings of the angelic order. Cf. Isa. 6:2, *note*. The Cherubim or living creatures are not identical with the Seraphim (Isa. 6:2–7). They appear to have to do with the holiness of God as outraged by *sin*; the Seraphim with *uncleanness* in the people of God. The passage in Ezekiel is highly figurative, but the effect was the revelation to the prophet of the Shekinah glory of the LORD. Such revelations are connected invariably with new blessing and service. Cf. Ex. 3:2–10; Isa. 6:1–10; Dan. 10:5–14; Rev. 1:12–19.

The cherubim first appear at the gate of the Garden of Eden after man has been expelled and as protectors lest man return to pollute the holy presence of God. They appear again as protectors, though in golden images, over the ark of the covenant where God was pleased to dwell. The curtain of the tabernacle, which separated between the divine presence and the unholy people, was embroidered with figures of cherubim (Ex. 26:1). Ezekiel refers to these beings under this title nineteen times and the truth concerning them is to be derived from these passages. He presents them as having four appearances—the face of a lion, the face of an ox, the face of a man, and the face of an eagle (Ezek. 1:3–28; 10:1–22). This symbolism relates them at once to the living creatures of John’s vision (Rev. 4:6–5:14, etc.—the translation of ζῶον by *beast* is unsatisfactory).

b. Seraphim. The *seraphim* title speaks of unceasing worship, their ministry of purification, and their humility. They appear in Scripture but once under this designation (Isa. 6:1–3). Their threefold ascription of worship as recorded by Isaiah is again stated by John (Rev. 4:8) and under the title of the living creatures, which fact goes far to establish the identity of this group. Dr. Scofield writes as a note under Isaiah 6:1–3: “Heb. *Burners*. The word occurs only here. Cf. Ezk. 1:5, *note*. The Seraphim are, in many respects, in contrast with the Cherubim, though both are expressive of the divine holiness, which demands that the *sinner* shall have access to the divine presence only through a sacrifice which really vindicates the righteousness of God (Rom. 3:24–26, *notes*), and that the *saint* shall be cleansed before serving. Gen. 3:22–24 illustrates the first; Isa. 6:1–8 the second. The Cherubim may be said to have to do with the altar, the Seraphim with the laver” (*Op. cit.*).

c. Living Creatures. The *living creatures* is a title which represents these angels as manifesting the fullness of divine life, unceasing activity, and abiding

participation in the worship of God.

Uncertainty, at best, must characterize human understanding regarding the angels. Of their majesty and worship of God and of the surpassing glory of the Object of their adoration, Bishop Bull (1634–1710), as quoted by Dr. Gaebelien (*Op. cit.*, pp. 46–47), wrote:

When we consider what glorious beings the angels are, and yet that they are but creatures of, and servants to, the God whom we serve, waiting before His Throne, and humbly attending His commands; this consideration, if we let it sink deeply into our hearts, must needs possess us with most awful apprehensions of the glorious majesty of our God at all times, but especially in our approaches to Him in His worship, and fill us with the greatest reverence and humility. We should do well often to call to mind Daniel's vision, to whom was represented the "Ancient of Days sitting upon His throne, a thousand thousand ministering unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before Him."

With what reverence should we behave ourselves in our addresses to the Divine Majesty, before whom the Seraphim themselves hide their faces! And if they cover their feet, are conscious to themselves of their natural imperfection, compared to the infinitely glorious God; how should we clods of earth, we vile sinners, blush and be ashamed in His presence, assuming no confidence to ourselves, but what is founded on the mercies of God and the merits of our blessed Redeemer and Advocate, Jesus Christ!

And when we find ourselves inclined to pride and vanity, to think highly of ourselves and of our services to God, let us reflect at what a vast distance we come behind the holy angels; how far short our poor, lame, imperfect services are of their holy and excellent ministry. Yet, when we think of the ministry which the holy angels perform towards God, and for us; let us at the same time propound them to ourselves, as patterns and examples for our imitation.

4. INDIVIDUAL ANGELS.

a. LUCIFER, SON OF THE MORNING (Isa. 14:12). This, the most exalted one of the angels—both by creation and by appointment—occupies a place in the text of Scripture next to the Persons of the Godhead. By his sin—the first in the universe, so far as revelation discloses—he became Satan and appears in the Word of God under about forty different titles. As he is the theme of the following section on Satanology, further examination of the truth bearing on this mighty angel will be deferred at this point.

b. Michael (Dan. 12:1). The meaning of this name, which meaning is significant, is *Who is like God?* In what respect he is like God is not disclosed, but from the three passages wherein he is directly mentioned it is to be seen that he is in great authority. According to Daniel 12:1, he is said to be the one who "standeth" for Daniel's people, Israel, doubtless in some form of defense. In Jude 1:9 he is seen to be in controversy with Satan over the body of Moses; but in such a situation and in spite of all his greatness, he dare not "bring a railing accusation against Satan," but, falling back in dependence upon God, he

declares, “The Lord rebuke thee.” In this text he is given the added title of *archangel*; and there is but one archangel. Michael is again seen in prediction recorded in Revelation 12:7–12. He, as head of the armies of heaven, fights a victorious battle in heaven against Satan and his angels. It is further revealed that the “voice of the archangel” will be heard when Christ returns for the Church (1 Thess. 4:16).

c. Gabriel (Dan. 9:21). The meaning of this designation is *the mighty one*, and he is evidently all that the name implies. He is never said in the Bible to be an archangel, though often so styled by men. He appears four times, as the Scriptures record, and always as a messenger or revealer of the divine purpose. He spoke to Daniel concerning the end time (Dan. 8:15–27). Similarly, he brought to Daniel the almost incomparable prediction of Daniel 9:20–27. The prophet had discovered from the writings of Jeremiah (25:11–12) that the allotted period for Israel in Babylon was seventy years, and at the time when these years were about completed. He therefore gave himself to prayer for his people. The prayer, as recorded, could have occupied but a few moments, yet in that time Gabriel passed with incredible swiftness from the throne of God to the praying prophet on earth. It was then this angel unfolded the purpose of Jehovah concerning the future of Israel. It was Gabriel who brought the message to Zacharias of the birth of John, and he it was who came with the greatest of all messages to the Virgin Mary regarding the birth of Christ and of His ministry as King on David’s throne (Luke 1:26–33).

5. ANGELS ESPECIALLY DESIGNATED. Certain angels are known only by the service they render. Of these, there are those that serve as angels of judgment (Gen. 19:13; 2 Sam. 24:16; 2 Kings 19:35; Ezek. 9:1, 5, 7; Ps. 78:49). Account is made of the “watcher” (Dan. 4:13, 23); “angel of the abyss” (Rev. 9:11); “angel over fire” (Rev. 14:18); “angel of the waters” (Rev. 16:5); and of “seven angels” (Rev. 8:2). In the Apocryphal writings mention is made of three angels not spoken of in the Bible, namely, Raphael, Uriel, and Jeremiel.

Properly, no reference is made in this enumeration to the Angel of Jehovah since, as has been demonstrated in a previous section, that Being in none other than the preincarnate Christ—the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Being in no way related to created angels, He should not be classed with them.

X. The Ministry of the Angels

The 273 references in the Bible to the angels are largely accounts of their

activities, and by these a very wide field of achievement is disclosed. However, that which is most important is not their relation to the inhabitants of earth, but rather their service to God. This is primarily a service of worship and suggests the ineffable majesty and glory of God, which unfallen angels understand, and which, because of the infinity of the worthiness of God, continues without ceasing forever. John states that in their worship the living creatures “rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come” (Rev. 4:8). Isaiah asserts that they “cried one unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory” (Isa. 6:3). To the same end the Psalmist writes: “Bless the LORD, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word” (Ps. 103:20); “Praise ye the LORD. Praise ye the LORD from the heavens: praise him in the heights. Praise ye him, all his angels: praise ye him, all his hosts” (Ps. 148:1–2). Their humility, suggested by the covering of their feet (Isa. 6:2), is natural since they are ever before Him whose majesty and glory is transcendent. The birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ were to the angels stupendous realities. It is of no small consequence that, as stated by the Apostle, Christ, while here on the earth, “was seen of angels” (1 Tim. 3:16). Their interest in, and devotion to, the Lord of glory is measured to some degree by the worship they have offered Him from their creation to the present hour. Only feebly does the most spiritual of saints anticipate what it will be to look directly and unendingly upon the face of the Lord of glory. The response that will be awakened in the heart of man—enlarged as to its capacity beyond measure—as he views his Creator and Redeemer cannot be foreseen; but such has ever been the experience of the angels. They behold the Lord without a veil between. Their consideration of Him while here on earth is befittingly presented by Dr. Cooke:

How constant their attendance on the Incarnate Saviour during his mysterious life amongst men! At his birth they are his heralds, and with songs exultant announce the glad tidings to mankind. In his temptation they minister to him; in his agonies they succour him; on his resurrection they are the first to proclaim his triumph; on his ascension they come to escort him to the mediatorial throne; in his glorified state they render him supreme homage as their Lord; and when he returns to judge the world they will form his retinue! What sublime thoughts would be suggested, what emotions of wonder and joy would be excited, by the scenes they witnessed on earth and still witness in heaven, in reference to Christ, his two-fold nature, and his great redeeming work. *God incarnate!* This was new to them. They had seen the Son in his Deity; but never till now enshrined in humanity. What amazing condescension! *Obeying his own law as if he were a mere creature, and in the attitude of a servant!* This was new. They had seen him as the governor of the universe; but never till now as a subject! *Encountering Satan in conflict and prolonged temptation!* This was new. They had seen him frown the arch-rebel from his presence and hurl him to perdition;

but never till now submitting to be tempted by him whose subtilty and power had seduced myriads to eternal ruin. *Suffering the scorn and reproach of sinful men!* This was new. They had seen myriads of happy spirits worship, adore, and love him; but never till now had they seen him personally insulted, reproached, and maltreated by his creatures. *Groaning in Gethsemane, and crucified between two thieves, and dying as a sacrificial victim!* This was new. They had seen him supremely happy and glorious; but to see him agonize, to hear that dying wail, and to behold him a bloody corpse, and all this to save the world which had revolted from him! What mysterious love! *To see him, after all this, enthroned and glorified in human nature.* This was a new fact in the moral history of the universe. The whole scenes were full of interest, wonder, and mystery; a gradation of wonders rising in succession, until they culminated in the permanent presence of the God-man, resplendent with a glory that fills the heaven of heavens. Here were chapters of instruction for angelic minds to ponder; here were developments of hidden truths; here were discoveries of the Divine perfections, never known before; and still unfolding in brighter effulgence as ages roll on! —*Op. cit.*, pp. 622–23

The faithful service of angels to mankind cannot be explained on the ground of their own love for humanity. They are interested in that which concerns their God. If He would give His Son to die for a lost race of men, they would follow Him as far as possible and at least give instant service, for His sake, wherever it is appointed unto them. It is not imagination, but reality, that the angels are servants of men in a thousand ways. No truth is more established by Scripture than that stated in Hebrews 1:14: “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?”

With respect to the specific ministries of the angels in the earth and in behalf of mankind—especially the saints—the details form a very extensive field of investigation such as cannot be undertaken here to any extent. Though angels were present at creation, no reference is made to their ministries on earth until the days of Abraham. In company with the LORD, they visited the patriarch at Mamre (Gen. 18:1–2), and from there went on to deliver Lot. The angels appeared to Jacob and were familiar to Moses. It is written that the Law “was ordained by angels” (Gal. 3:19), and it was administered by the “disposition of angels” (Acts 7:53). Their care of God’s elect people is asserted in both Testaments. In Psalm 91:11–12 it is written: “For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone”; and in Hebrews 1:14: “Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?” It is an angel with the three men in the furnace of fire (Dan. 3:25), and with Daniel in the den of lions (Dan. 6:22).

In Old Testament terminology, sometimes angels are called *sons of God* while men are called *servants of God*. In the New Testament this is reversed. Angels are servants, and Christians are sons of God. This peculiar order may be due to

the fact that, in the Old Testament, men are seen as related to this sphere over which angels are superior; while, in the New Testament, saints are seen as related to their final exaltation into the likeness of Christ, compared to which estate the angels are inferior.

Turning to the New Testament, it is to be observed that many of the references to the angels are found in the Gospels and the Acts. In view of the truth that it was their Creator, the Lord of glory, whom they worship and adore, that was laying aside His glory and descending to a sphere “lower than the angels,” it is not strange that one from the heavenly hosts should announce the birth of the forerunner to his father; the birth of the Savior to Mary; that the angels should announce His birth to the world; that they should direct the flight into Egypt; that they ministered to Him in the wilderness; that they succored Him in the garden; that they were ready in legions to defend Him should He call; that they saw Him die and His body placed in the tomb; that they were present to announce His resurrection; and that they gave counsel to His disciples at the moment of His ascension back to heaven. Thus it is seen that the relation of the angels to the incarnate Son of God is one of the major features of revelation, and upon these disclosures the devout mind may dwell with profit. In the plan of God, the present age is evidently void of angelic manifestations. This could easily be due to the fact that, as in no other age, the saints of God are indwelt by the Holy Spirit and are subject to His leading, which leading is more constant, vital, and exalting than angelic visitations could possibly be. However, the angels are prominent at the close of this age. It is then that the Lord returns with the shout of the archangel. At His second advent, “The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth” (Matt. 13:41–42; cf. vs. 30). It is then, also, that Christ shall “send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect [Israel] from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other” (Matt. 24:31). The presence of angels in the scenes of the second advent is emphasized generally. It is written: “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works” (Matt. 16:27); “Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God” (Luke 12:8–9). To these may be added Jude 1:14–15, in which context the words *ten thousands of saints* is better rendered *holy myriads*, and may refer to

the angels.

Following the kingdom age, in which no angelic ministrations are predicted and when the King is present in His visible glory to rule and the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28–32; Acts 2:16–21), the angels are again seen and finally and eternally related to the city which comes down from God out of heaven (Heb. 12:22–24; Rev. 21:12).

Certain New Testament passages indicate specific angelic ministrations. Luke 16:22 asserts that the angels transported at death a soul into another sphere; whether this is always the case is a pure conjecture. Acts 5:19 and 12:7 relate the deliverance of apostles from prison. Acts 8:26; 10:3; 27:23 recount messages which angels bore.

XI. The Progressive Discipline of the Angels

The Scriptures disclose the truth that the angels are learning much from their observations of men on earth—especially in the outworking of redemption. Incidentally, this indicates that the angels are not omniscient. However, it should not be concluded that the angels know less than men. What, indeed, would be the field of discovery and interest to men were it given to them to see all that transpires in angelic spheres? Peter's declaration, "which things the angels desire to look into" (1 Pet. 1:12), divulges the truth relative to their interest in the affairs of men. It is significant that these "things" referred to relate to God's program in the first and second advents of Christ and the gospel of divine grace now to be preached to the whole world. To the same end, the Church on earth is an unveiling to the angels of the wisdom of God. It is written: "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10). Thus, also, the Church will yet be an unveiling to angels of divine grace; for it is said: "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:7). Writing on this theme, Otto Von Gerlach pointed out: "By the revelation of Himself in Christ, by the institution of the Christian Church on earth, God after a manner hitherto unknown glorifies Himself before the heavenly principalities. They who until now had, filled with awe, been praising Him for the wonder of creation, now see His wisdom glorified in a new form in the Christian communion through the manifold ways by which lost men are saved. Entirely new and inexhaustible wealth of divine wisdom was manifested in redemption" (cited by Gerhart, *op. cit.*, p. 664).

There is no basis for a belief that redemption through Christ's death is extended to the fallen angels (cf. Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10). The holy angels evidently are benefited and pass into higher spheres of knowledge and consequent spirituality through what they see of redeeming love in Christ. Thus Christ becomes to them a Mediator. No writer has stated this with more clarity than Dr. Gerhart; to quote:

Emphasis is put by the apostle on the fact that unto principalities God's wisdom is made known *through the Church*. The existence of the Church, and the preaching of the unsearchable riches by the Church, condition the growth of the angels in spiritual knowledge. How much more of Christian truth will not the "principalities" know when the Church, now imperfect, shall attain to perfection; now militant, warring against enemies both human and diabolical, shall become the Church triumphant? The final consummation at the Second Coming will affect not only the relative position and the spiritual knowledge of the angels, but Scripture suggests that the final consummation will likewise affect the *life* of the angels. Indirectly at least, they will participate in the spiritual benefits which come to the Church from the Son of Man. Paul teaches that God the Father made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in the Beloved unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth. Both the human race upon the earth and the angelic orders in the heavens are embraced in "all things" to be summed up in Christ. Angelic spirits will then bear a relation to the Head of the Church which they do not bear to Him now, and which they will not realize before "the fulness of the time." Of similar import is the prophetic vision of Paul in Eph. [correction: Colossians] 1:20. It was the good pleasure of the Father through the Son to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heaven. Things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created through the Son, and unto the Son. Accordingly all angelic orders exist for the Son; He is their *end*. In the Son these orders of spirits consist, hold together; He is the law by which they are upheld and governed. Having made peace between God and men, between Gentiles and Jews through the blood of His cross, He becomes also for the angels a Mediator through whom their life passes from its present plane to a higher plane of spiritual perfection and glory. The kingdom of the Son of Man comprehends all orders of angelic spirits no less than all races of mankind. When the impending transcendent eon now in process of ripening shall supersede the current eon, angels as a consequence of the glorification of the body mystical will rise into more intimate fellowship with the fountal Source of life, of light, and love. But though as to their life and knowledge advanced to a higher status of spiritual perfection through the Church, yet in the final glory of the kingdom the position and office of the angels will be subordinate to the authority and office of the saints.—*Ibid.*, pp. 664–65

XII. The Angels as Spectators

In four instances angels are said to be observing. In Luke 15:10 they are seen beholding the joy of the Lord over one sinner who repents. It is not the joy of the angels, as too often supposed (cf. Jude 1:24). In Luke 12:8–9, the word of Christ is written, "Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth

me before men shall be denied before the angels of God.” So, also, the whole earthlife of Christ was “seen of angels” (1 Tim 3:16), and in Revelation 14:10–11, the angels are said to observe the eternal woes of those who “worship the beast and his image.” Over against this, the Church, it is predicted, shall judge angels (1 Cor. 6:3), as poorly prepared as they are at present to judge in the least of matters on the earth.

The presence of the angels is recorded at the creation of material things (Job 38:7); at the giving of the Law (Gal. 3:19; Acts 7:53; Heb. 2:2); at the birth of Christ (Luke 2:13), at the temptation (Matt. 4:11), at the resurrection (Matt. 28:2), at the ascension (Acts 1:10), and at the second coming (Matt. 13:37–39; 24:31; 25:31; 2 Thess. 1:7).

Conclusion

A consciousness of the reality of the vast hosts of angelic beings—the benefit derived from the good, and the opposition of the bad—can be gained only through meditation upon the Scriptures that record these truths, and through prayer.

Chapter III

ANGELIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MORAL PROBLEM

BY THE WORDS *moral problem* is indicated the conflict which is ever present where free moral agents confront the issues of both good and evil. The force of this conflict reaches a climax in three major instances: (a) the fall of the angels, (b) the fall of man, and (c) the sin-bearing death of Christ. Of these, the first and second are closely related, as are the second and third; but the relation between the first and third is remote, being of principles rather than persons. Evil began with the lapse of an angel. That lapse was followed by a multitude of other angels (Rev. 12:4). The same lapse was enacted by the first man and transmitted to his race in the form of a depraved nature. Tracing backwards over this historical sequence, it is possible to recognize that the race was injured in the sin of its federal head, that the federal head was tempted by the angel who first sinned in heaven, and that a multitude of angels sinned under the influence of that same original sinner. Thus far no insuperable problem arises; but it is difficult, indeed, to go one step further and assign a reason why an unfallen, unttempted (that is, from without), highly enlightened angel, who stood in the immediate presence of God and who must have comprehended the difference between moral light and moral darkness, should have chosen the darkness. How can the birth of moral evil from the womb of moral good be explained? The metaphysical aspect of the origin of evil is a problem which theologians have never solved, and, regarding it, only certain consequential features may be observed by the finite mind.

As in the case of the fall of man, it is imperative, in the light of revelation concerning God, to recognize certain unchangeable truths when approaching the perplexing subject of the fall of the angels. These are: (a) That God is Himself holy and in no sense is He directly or indirectly the instigator of angelic sin. (b) Though angels were created to fill a divine purpose, their fall was anticipated from all eternity. (c) They were given the autonomy of angels, which assigned to them the freedom to remain in, or depart from, that holy estate into which they were inducted by creation. (d) Angels who fell, unlike men who by physical birth inherit the corrupted nature which their federal head acquired through the first human sin, stood directly related to God in original angelic holiness from

which position each fell individually as did the first angel. And (e) though the fall of man opened the way whereby the grace of God might be displayed in redemption (Eph. 2:7), there is no compensating good of any degree to be seen in connection with the fact that angels sinned.

Angels were created with the responsibility of self-determination. This was the divine ideal represented by them in creation. The possibility of evil was not with them in any sense a necessity. To assert that God should have prevented their fall since He had power to do so, is to array the divine will in government against the divine will in creation—against the divine will as represented in the constitution of the angels. Though the angels when created awakened to consciousness in an estate of holiness and untempted by any outward solicitation, it was, nevertheless, incumbent upon them both to will and to do that which pertains to holiness. As in the case of man, a period of probation seems to have been extended to the angels. God's love for them was that of the Creator for His creature; but they were assigned to that freedom of action which is germane to angelic responsibility. Such freedom was accorded to the first man, but with this far-reaching exception: there was already in existence a kingdom of evil with its outward and forceful solicitation to wickedness. No such untoward, outward influence challenged the angels when they entered upon their conscious existence. The multitude of angels who sinned under the influence of the first sinning angel are at once eliminated from the problem. They fell each one individually, but by the force of influences which arose after they had experienced their holy estate. Confirmed good is for unfallen angels who ever behold and enjoy the presence of God a far more probable consequence than it could be with fallen man, who has never beheld God nor experienced a moment of untarnished holiness. Augustine states: "Let none doubt that the holy angels in their heavenly abode are, though not, indeed, co-eternal with God, yet secure and certain of eternal and true felicity" (*City of God*, Book XI, 33, cited by Gerhart, *Institutes*, I, 670). So, also, Richard Hooker asserts: "God which moveth mere natural agents as an efficient only, doth otherwise move His holy angels: for beholding the face of God (Matt. 18:10), and being rapt with the love of His beauty, they cleave inseparably forever unto Him. Desire to resemble Him in goodness maketh them unwearable and even unsatiable in their longing to do by all means all manner of good unto all the creatures of God, but especially unto the children of men" (*Book I*, iv. 1, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 670–71).

Angels were definitely influenced in the direction of holiness. That constant

communion with God which is accorded the holy angels and was originally extended to all angels, is measureless in its potentiality. The one law of angelic existence was the will of their Creator. That law answered every need of angelic experience and felicity. It determined every detail of their relation to God and to each other. To depart from that will was to assume a false attitude toward all things. To what extent this departure changed love into hate and bitterness, will be considered at a later time.

Concerning the problem of the first sin of the first angel, it may be observed that, under existing conditions, almost every avenue along which sin advances was wanting. Self-assertion against God was the only direction in which such a being could sin. On this patent truth Hooker has written: "It seemeth therefore that there was no other way for angels to sin, but by reflex of their understanding upon themselves; when being held with admiration of their own sublimity and honor, the memory of their subordination unto God and their dependency on Him was drowned in this conceit; whereupon their adoration, love and imitation of God could not choose but be also interrupted" (*Ecc. Pol.*, Book I, ch. iv. 2, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 672). This conceit which assumed self-direction where the Creator proposed to be the authority and guide, is alluded to by the Apostle when he wrote of a "novice" in matters of church order: "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation [crime] of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6; cf. Isa. 14:12; Ezek. 28:17). Though the nature of the first sin be thus so definitely disclosed, it yet remains a mystery how this principle of evil could find welcome in such a being. To go on with God as infinite wisdom has specified was angelic sanity, to say the least. To depart from that course was angelic insanity—but that sort of insanity which is responsible. Sin has no place in the constitution and status of an unfallen angel. Its presence is lawlessness and void of reason.

Both philosophy and theology have approached the problem which the first sin presents and have offered their solutions. Whatever vestige of truth these may suggest, none is sufficient. To attempt the discovery of an understandable reason where the mind recognizes that reason failed, as it did when the angel sinned, is to undertake the impossible. Sin, being a contradiction of reason and irrational in itself, is not subject to reason. It is quite possible that an irrational creature accustomed to unholy ways may lend sympathetic understanding to the insanity which a fellow creature exhibits, but that provides no reason which might serve as an explanation for an unfallen angel's sin.

The creature—whether angel or human—is created to be God-centered. To become self-centered is a contradiction of the basic law of creature existence.

The falsification of God's moral order, is, when self-centered, complete. It is also found to be a violation of the original design relative to interrelationships between finite beings themselves. Sin is not only against God, but is against all other fellow beings.

The lapse of an unfallen angel at once gives rise to two important theological questions, namely, (a) How could a holy God permit any creature to sin? and (b) How could an uninfluenced, unfallen angel sin? In considering the issue presented in the former of these questions, it may be said—though the subject is foreign to the present discussion—that God's original creation is declared to be *good* in His own holy eyes; that He, being omniscient and knowing that certain moral beings would lapse and fall, nevertheless brought them into being when possessed with that certain knowledge; yet everywhere, in the case of angels as in the case of men, He predicates moral failure of those who fail and never of Himself. As for the second question, this much may be added to what has gone before: Moral evil is an ultimate fact in the universe which can neither be explained nor explained away. When traced to its inception as committed by the first unfallen angel, the truth is developed which estimates sin to be a mystery, irrational, and exceedingly sinful. Sin is not in God as it is not in any part of His original creation. The decree of God anticipated all that would ever be; yet sin originates, not in the divine decree, but in the free act of the sinner. Sin is not in the constitution of creatures as they came from the creative hand of God, else all would sin. Sin is not an inherent weakness of the creature, else all would have failed. Sin is not a concomitant with free moral agency, else all free moral agents must fall. Dr. Gerhart, writing of the first sin, says: "*Ego* asserts itself against its own fundamental law, a fact for which no reason is to be assigned other than this, that the possibility of false choosing is a prerogative of finite autonomous being" (*Ibid.*, 688). But Dr. Gerhart would admit that the mere power of choice constitutes no reason for choosing. The problem is unanswered. Augustine has discoursed on this feature of sin with genuine profit: "If we ask the cause of the misery of the bad angels it occurs to us, and not unreasonably, that they are miserable because they have forsaken Him who supremely is, and have turned to themselves who have no such essence. And this vice, what else is it called than pride? ... If the further question be asked, What was the efficient cause of their evil will? There is none. For what is it which makes the will bad, when it is the will itself which makes the action bad? And consequently the bad will is the cause of the bad action, but nothing is the efficient cause of the bad will.... When the will abandons what is above itself, and turns to what is lower, it

becomes evil, not because that is evil to which it turns, but because the turning itself is wicked. Therefore it is not an inferior thing which has made the will evil, but it is itself which has become so by wickedly desiring an inferior thing” (*City of God*, Book XII, vi, cited by Gerhart, *ibid.*, 685).

Sin is self-centered living and action on the part of a creature who is by creation designed to be wholly centered in God. One course is present anguish and leads to perdition; the other is present tranquillity and leads to eternal glory. Some measure of these truths must have been understood by the angels, hence the more is the inception of sin a mystery. Evil in the world is not an accident or a thing unforeseen by God, else He could not predict, as He does, its course and end. The conflict of the ages is compressed into the few words of Genesis 3:15. Evil must run its course and make its full demonstration that it may be judged, not as a theory, but as a concrete actuality. “The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full” (Gen. 15:16). The wheat and tares must grow together to the end of the age (Matt. 13:30). And He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom He hath ordained (Acts 17:31). And the man of sin will be revealed only in God’s appointed time (2 Thess. 2:6–8). Thus it is disclosed that evil must continue along with good until each shall reach its determined end. That the evil will be judged and dismissed forever is the assuring testimony of the Scriptures.

Chapter IV

SATANOLOGY: INTRODUCTION

WHETHER HOLY, or unholy, the spirit beings are alike designated *angels* (Rev. 12:7). The unholy angels are usually referred to as δαίμονες or δαιμόνια, being properly translated *demons*. There is but one διάβολος or *devil*. As there is one archangel among angels that are holy, so there is one archangel among angels that are unholy. The chief of the fallen angels appears under at least forty appellations. Of these some are descriptive titles and some are proper names. When he is styled “the accuser of our brethren” (Rev. 12:10), a descriptive title appears. There is much revealed, also, in the proper names. These are: *Serpent* (ὄφις), which implies his *guile*; *Lucifer, son of the morning*, which is his title in heaven before his fall (Isa. 14:12); *Devil* (Διάβολος), which means *accuser*, or *slanderer*, and is Greek in origin; *Satan* (Σατανᾶς), which means *resister*, and is Hebrew in origin; *Apollyon* (Ἀπολλύων), which means *destroyer*; *Dragon* (Δράκων), which implies his *power*; *the prince of this world*; *the prince of the power of the air*; *the god of this world*. Four of these personal titles appear in one verse (Rev. 12:9). The designation *Belial* may be applied to the chief of the unholy angels only by implication, though the Apostle assigns to this name a personal and definite character when he inquires “What concord hath Christ with Belial?” (2 Cor. 6:15). H. A. W. Meyer (cf. Gerhart, *Institutes*, 691) contends that that term is a general reference to Satan, much like Πονηρός—*the evil one* (cf. Matt. 6:13; John 17:15; 2 Thess. 3:3; 1 John 5:19). It is evident from Matthew 12:24 (cf. vs. 27) that the Jews were wont to refer to this great being by the name Beelzebub (Βεελζεβούλ, cf. 2 Kings 1:2–3, 6, 16), which implies that he is “prince of the demons.” As Διάβολος he stands alone, the infernal agent who is in command of all δαιμόνια or demons. This mighty angel appears in the Bible with prominence, importance, and power second only to the Godhead Three. He is as often mentioned in the text of the Scriptures as all of the angels together. He is drawn into the story of human history from its first page to its last and always presented as a most vital factor in the ongoings of men, of angels, and of the universe itself. It is of great significance that the Scriptures trace with detail and care this archfiend from his creation, through all his career, and on to his final judgment. Such distinction is not accorded to another angel, or to any human being, however he may be used of God. No other is so analyzed and published concerning his motives, methods, character, and purpose as is this one.

The theologian is confronted with this vast revelation and is challenged to give heed to this, a major doctrine of the Bible—the truth concerning a being who is the originator of sin, the promoter of it both in angelic and human spheres, and the most imperious opponent of the things of God. But few can say with the Apostle, “We are not ignorant of his devices.” This being is one “which deceiveth the whole world” and in no manner more evident than that the world does not believe that he really exists. This unbelief, doubtless, is greatly to his advantage. Being uninformed and misinformed, people, to an appalling degree, become an easy prey to the power of the enemy of souls. Modern Sadducees seek to resolve this awful being into a “figure of speech,” “a metaphorical personification of evil,” or a “delusion of unsound minds.” They deny his personality as they do that of the demons. Satan would encourage such impressions since they disarm prejudice and fear in relation to his infernal undertakings. As for this mighty angel being only a “figure of speech” without real personality, it may be observed that figures of speech are not created angels who sin and serve in realms of darkness and are doomed to a final and dreadful judgment at the hand of God. A metaphor would hardly enter a herd of swine and precipitate their instant destruction. Nor would a metaphor offer the kingdoms of this world to the Lord of glory, asserting that those kingdoms were delivered unto it and that it gave them to whomsoever it would. Dr. Gerhart has spoken emphatically on this phase of this theme when he says:

The rationalistic exegesis which ascribes demoniacal possessions to superstition and turns the records of the New Testament on this dark theme into delusive fancies, if applied to all Bible teaching on things invisible and preternatural, would resolve the entire spiritual world into unreality. There is but a short step between a mockery of the Devil and a mockery of the Redeemer. It is not forgotten that belief in the personality of the Devil and in the influence of demons on human affairs assumed grotesque forms during the middle ages; nor that mistaken interpretations of diabolical possessions have led good men to commit deeds of horror. But does the abuse of the facts of Scripture prove that there is no truth in their representations respecting the power of the Devil over bad men and over nature? Is it superstition to hold that Satan is that “evil one” who is the “prince of this world”? because some theologians and scholars have in other ages misunderstood and misapplied some of our Lord’s miracles? If this principle of reasoning were applied to real superstitions, would not the monstrous errors of polytheism prove that there is no God? would not the oracle at Delphi prove that Isaiah cannot be a genuine prophet? Or the fetish worship of Africa prove that no worship is worthy of man? or the *totem* of our American Indians prove that there is no divine Providence?—*Op. cit.*, pp. 709–10

As fully as of any person in the Bible, every element of personality is predicated of Satan. By the contriving method which would deprive Satan of personality, the Lord Himself and the Holy Spirit could also be thus deprived, and by such torturing of the Bible that Book becomes one adapted only to

mislead those who read it. The world strangely retains the Biblical terminology relative to Satan, though every vestige of that terminology is emptied of its true meaning. Without reference to revelation, the world has imagined a grotesque being, fitted with strange trappings, who has been made the central character in fiction and theatrical performances and then, being convinced that no such a being as they portray exists, they have consigned the whole body of revealed truth to the limbo of myths of a bygone age. Unfortunately, the real being set forth in the Bible is not dismissed by such puerile and wicked disregard of God's solemn truth. There is no want of evidence for the personality either of Satan or the demons. The record of their doings, like their destiny, forms the darkest pages of the Word of God. The lake of fire is prepared, not for men, but "for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). Characters of fiction and metaphors are not judged by the death of Christ nor are they consigned to the lake of fire.

The fall of this mighty angel was not a compromise between good and evil. He became the embodiment of evil and wholly void of good. The essential wickedness of this being could not be estimated by the finite mind. His wickedness, however, is constructive and in line with vast undertakings and ideals which are evil because of their opposition to God. Further consideration of the consummate sin of this being will be seen as this thesis advances. It need only be added here that Satan is a living personification of deception. Most revealing are the words of Christ addressed to the Jews: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it" (John 8:44). Thus also a threefold testimony is given in the Revelation. In 12:9 it is declared that Satan is the deceiver of the whole world; in 20:2–3 it is predicted that he will be cast into the abyss and shut up and sealed, to the end that he shall "deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled." Similarly, when released, he is said to "go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth" (20:7–8). Thus, also, in the tribulation, the man of sin will cause the people to believe *the lie*, which lie is instigated by the devil and received by the people because of "strong delusion." With all this before the mind, it is not difficult to account for the present deceptions which are so general; that modern teachers disbelieve in the personality of Satan; that the unregenerate give no consideration to his reality; and that Christians everywhere are misinformed about his devices. Few indeed would knowingly march under Satan's banner. Yet, it will be seen that there are but few who do not to some

degree give allegiance to him. Since the whole truth regarding the angels is strangely unreal to human minds, it is perhaps somewhat to be expected that there will be little actuality in the thinking of many people concerning Satan and the demons. However restricted the natural mind may be in this direction, there is no excuse for an open denial of revelation, which revelation is both clear and extensive.

He who would be found faithful and useful as a worthy exponent of the Scriptures and a guide to human souls, should comprehend, next to knowing the triune God and the positive values of His redeeming grace, the truth relative to the enemy of God, who “as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour” (1 Pet. 5:8). The Christian’s conflicts and trials are wholly accounted for within the three realities—the *world*, the *flesh*, and the *devil*—but this mighty enemy is “the god of this world,” and the evil nature which dominates the flesh was born of Satan’s lie in the Garden of Eden, and he is himself a living contender against the believer—not alone in the sphere of flesh and blood, but in the realms of spiritual life and activity.

If the text of the Scriptures is observed, it will be found that this greatest of foes is held before the Christian’s contemplation next only to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Should the knowledge of this foe be wanting—as it must be so far as usual theological studies are concerned—the results can be no less than tragic, reaching on to eternity. If this theme is given the corresponding attention in a course of study which it sustains in the Bible, many pages must be assigned to it with no apology for so doing. Above all, let it not be deemed superstition when attention is given to such extended and explicit revelation and when this portion of Scripture is taken in its natural and literal meaning. Utterly unscriptural and fanatical notions are easily engendered relative to evil spirits among those less instructed in the Word of God; but so much the more is it imperative that care shall be exercised to conform to that which has been revealed. The heathen have ever been tortured by their unfounded imaginations about the presence and influence of evil spirits, and gratitude becomes the Christian in view of the clear revelation which God has given.

Belief in the malign influence of evil spirits antedates the Bible and extends to regions into which the Bible has never penetrated. Plutarch states: “It was a very ancient opinion, that there are certain wicked and malignant demons, who envy good men, and endeavour to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers at least of greater happiness than they enjoy” (*de Defect. Orac.*, p. 431, tom. 2, Edit. Paris, 1624, cited by Cooke, *Christian Theology*, p.

628). The devil worship of Africa, Burma, Ceylon, Persia, and Chaldea is a development which is evidently a perversion of the earlier divine revelation at the beginning of the race. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* states: "There are, no doubt, serious difficulties in the way of accepting the doctrine of a personal, superhuman, evil power as Satan is described to be. It is doubtful, however, whether these difficulties may not be due, at least in part, to a misunderstanding of the doctrine and certain of its implications. In addition, it must be acknowledged, that whatever difficulties there may be in the teaching, they are exaggerated and, at the same time, not fairly met by the vague and irrational skepticism which denies without investigation. There are difficulties involved in any view of the world. To say the least, some problems are met by the view of a superhuman, evil world-power" (IV, 2695).

By many it is believed that the earth was, in its first order, like other planets, the abode of spirit beings; that Satan was in authority over this realm; and that the chaos which is indicated in Genesis 1:2 was the direct result of Satan's sin. Little may be known of these matters and again the silence of God should be respected.

Three general objections have been raised against the Biblical doctrine of Satan. (1) It is asserted that it has its origin in mythology. This conception cannot be sustained. The Bible does not systematize this division of doctrine more than any other. All that is set forth is with that saneness and restraint which characterizes the divine world-conception as a whole. (2) The second objection is that the doctrine of Satan conforms to the dualism of Zoroastrianism. To this it may be replied that the whole doctrine of evil—apart from the eternal divine anticipation of it—had its beginning and will as definitely come to its end. All evil not only exists by divine permission, but is under divine restraint. (3) It is yet said that the doctrine of Satan destroys the unity of God; but the creation by God of other wills than His own, since, in the end, they are accountable to Him, in no way militates against the unity of God. In the end, as from the beginning, "God is all in all."

The main divisions of satanology, as here to be attended, are: (a) Satan's career; (b) Satan's evil character; (c) the satanic *cosmos*; (d) Satan's motive; and (e) Satan's method.

Chapter V

SATANOLOGY: THE CAREER OF SATAN

AT THE OPENING of this division of satanology it is fitting to pause in thanksgiving to God for the Book He has prepared, preserved, and presented to His people, which Book discloses truth with infinite accuracy relative to the dwellers in spirit realms and points out the nature of these beings with specific reference to the relation they sustain to humanity. As before asserted, the Word of God dwells at great length on the truth concerning one mighty angel. Extended revelation is given about his creation, his original estate, his fall, the development and manifestation of his authority, his various judgments and his final consignment to the lake of fire. The revealed career of Satan is a long story reaching back into the dateless past and on into eternity to come, and is full of important details.

I. Satan's Creation, Original Estate, and Fall

These three features of the history of this great angel are so interrelated that they can hardly be treated separately. The central passage bearing specifically on these aspects of Satan's career is—

Ezekiel 28:11–19. A considerable portion of this immediate context is to be taken up verse by verse, but in preparation for that undertaking it may be observed that revelation concerning Satan begins with the dateless period between the creation of the heavens and the earth in that perfect form in which they first appeared (Gen. 1:1) and the desolating judgments which ended that period, when the earth became waste and empty (Gen. 1:2; Isa. 24:1; Jer. 4:23–26). This extended passage from Ezekiel, it will be seen, is a delineation of the mightiest of the angels—most significant indeed is the fact that more is said of this one angel than any other and more than is said of all other angels together — of the age of earth's primal glory, and of the initial angelic sin. It is reasonable to expect that the Bible will provide information on history so vital and determining as this; and it does. The immediate, surrounding context of Ezekiel's prophecy presents a record of divine judgments upon Israel's enemies, and, according to 1 Chronicles 21:1, Satan belongs to that group. The portion which presents truth regarding Satan is somewhat concealing since it is couched in oriental imagery. This is as legitimate a means of divine expression as any

other form of literature, but it yields its message to those only who pursue its deeper meaning with worthy attention. In the right understanding of this so vital disclosure concerning Satan, it is of no little importance to note that the preceding verses of this chapter (Ezek. 28:1–10), though addressed to “the prince of Tyrus,” are as clearly a word to the man of sin—Satan’s final embodiment and masterpiece—as is that which follows a word to Satan himself. There is notable significance in the manner in which these two addresses are related and placed in sequence. The man of sin is identified throughout the Word of God by his blasphemous assumption to be God. This, indeed, is the substance of the resemblance between Antiochus Epiphanes and the man of sin (cf. Dan. 8:9 with 7:8. Note, also, on the man of sin Matt. 24:15; 2 Thess. 2:3–4; Rev. 13:6). Ezekiel 28:1–10 asserts this characteristic with peculiar emphasis. As a prince is inferior and subject to a king, thus it is that the man of sin is subject to Satan.

Preceding this address to a “prince” and a “king” in Tyrus, allusion is made to four nations—Ammon, Moab, Edom, and Philistia—and the messages to these are compressed into seventeen verses, while the message to the one city, Tyrus, occupies eighty-three verses. This proportion is arresting, suggesting as it does the symbolic importance of that one city. Tyre was the merchant city of the world, as was Babylon the Great. By this emphasis is intimated the promotion of the world’s ideal of success. As in the world today, to leave everything here and take nothing into the next world is deemed *success*, but to leave nothing here and take all into the next world is *failure*. Tyre is the symbol of a mammon-loving world.

This address to the “king of Tyrus” identifies the person in view by one of his forty titles by which he is designated in the Bible. As David’s greater Son is distinguished in the Messianic Psalms from David by the supernatural features set forth, in like manner the person saluted in this Scripture as “king of Tyrus” is discovered to be the highest of the angels. It could not be a mortal. Some of the important features of this Scripture are here attended:

28:11–12. “Moreover the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.”

Surpassing importance will be assigned to this Scripture when it is recognized that this is the word of Jehovah to the “king of Tyrus,” and not the word of the prophet. A lamentation, which means intense anguish accompanied with beating of the breast, is a most impressive term when it describes Jehovah’s sorrow

poured out over the erring; and is it not ever so? Does Jehovah ever fail to lament over His erring creatures? If it were conceded that there might be a secondary application of this lament to some king in Tyrus, such a conjecture would be of little value or meaning in view of the supernatural features which are immediately introduced; for “Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty.” Such an expression is superlative even according to divine standards. The intimation is that all divine creative power along the two lines of *wisdom and beauty* are represented in this being. Such terminology has no place in the mouth of Jehovah concerning a fallen man who, at best, is but a heathen king. The expression, however, is according to truth when seen to be a message to the greatest of angels in his unfallen state.

28:13. “Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.”

It makes little difference whether this is a reference to a primal Eden or the Eden of Genesis, chapter 3. Satan has been in both; but no one will assert that any king of Tyrus was so favored. The bedecking with jewels suggests his great importance and the luster of his appearance. Thus in splendor was he exhibited in the Garden of Eden, for his name, *nāḥāsh*, translated “serpent,” means ‘the shining one.’ The Apostle states that he is even now transformed into an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14). These precious stones are displayed but three times as recorded in the Bible: (a) in the high priest’s breastplate, and were a manifestation of divine grace; (b) in the New Jerusalem, which reflects the glory of God; and (c) as the covering of this great angel, which signalizes the highest in creation. No distinction could be imposed on any creature more exalting than is imposed by these covering stones. Similarly, this imagery presents this angel as created to have been a diadem of praise to his Creator. “Tabrets and pipes” were prepared in him. He did not need an instrument of praise to glorify his Creator; *he* was a diadem of praise. But by far the most revealing declaration in this verse is the affirmation that he is a *created* being. This essential truth is announced again in verse 15 where it is said that he was “perfect” in all his ways from the day in which he was created. The power and wisdom of this being are so vast that not a few have supposed him to be as eternal as God Himself. Being a creature, he must, regardless of his estate, be subject, in the end, to his Creator, and account to Him. This Satan will yet do.

28:14. “Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire.”

That this being belongs to the order of the cherubim is arresting. As before indicated, this group of angels is related to the throne of God as protectors and defenders of His holiness. The proofs of this contention, so recently listed, need not be repeated here. Jehovah addresses a special word at this point to this angel: “I have set thee so,” and this is followed by the revealing words “Thou wast upon the holy mountain of God.” This specific service as cherub, or protector, was over the very throne of God—since the phrase, *the mountain of God*, is, in its Old Testament usage, the seat of God’s authority (cf. Ex. 4:27; Ps. 2:6; 3:4; 43:3; 68:15; Isa. 2:2; 11:9). From these disclosures it may be concluded that this great angel was created above all angels and to be a defender of the throne of God. If it be suggested that God, being the Almighty, would not need such defense, it may be said that it is not a question about what God needs, but rather a revelation about what God has chosen to arrange. He doubtless did not *need* the cherubim at the gate of Eden, yet He placed them there.

The remaining phrase—“Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire”—is somewhat obscure. It might refer to a primal glory of the earth. The stones of fire may be the manifestation of that consuming fire which Jehovah is. In such a case, this declaration would suggest that the first estate of this angel was one in which he walked in unbroken relation to divine holiness.

Returning for the moment to the identification of this being, it will be acknowledged that no king of Tyrus answers to this exalted description. No such fallen man was ever a diadem of praise, nor was he directly created of God, nor did he belong to the cherubim, nor had he been placed on the holy mountain of God, nor walked amidst the stones of fire, nor was he perfect in all his ways from creation.

28:15. “Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.”

The description now changes and the fact of the first sin of this angel is disclosed. Iniquity was found in him. The intimation is that a secret sin was uncovered. The omniscience of God cannot be deceived nor does it fail to know all things. If our secret sins are in the light of His countenance (Ps. 90:8), it would be equally true of the secret sins of the angels.

28:16. “By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of

the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.”

The word *merchandise* is full of suggestion. The same thought occurs respecting the man of sin as expressed by the word *traffic* (vs. 5). The thought here expressed is far removed from the barter and trade in merchandise by human beings. The meaning of the term is ‘to go about.’ Pember suggests that it is a matter of slander. It may indicate that going about among the angels which was necessary to secure their allegiance to his program of rebellion against God. The direct accusation, “Thou hast sinned,” and the casting out, are important features in the career of Satan and these will be considered in more detail presently.

28:17. “Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.”

The sin of Satan is here intimated, which sin is described more fully in other portions of Scripture. The self-centered nature of all sin is evident in this instance. It is, however, a long step from “the stones of fire,” with all the exalted honor and glory that such language expresses, to the lake of fire to which Satan’s career is tending.

28:18–19. “Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee: thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more.”

It is obvious that these verses point out the immediate, future, and final judgment of God upon this mighty angel, all of which is more completely described in other parts of the Bible.

In this one context God records the origin, estate, character, and sin of the greatest of angels. The importance of this revelation as it bears upon the doctrine of the angels and on the doctrine of man generally cannot be overestimated. God did not create Satan as such; He created an angel who was perfect in all his ways, and that angel sinned by opposing the will of God. By this act he became Satan the resister, and all else that all his titles imply. The ancient question raised by the skeptics of the past with respect to who made the devil has been answered in this passage just considered. There it is seen that God created a holy angel possessing the power of choice between good and evil, and he chose to do the

evil. Through the degenerating power of sin, Satan, as did Adam, became an entirely different being from that which God created. When God creates a being to fill a purpose, that being must be a perfect fulfillment of that divine ideal. It is, therefore, well, when seeking to discover the measurements of this great angel, to identify the purpose for which Satan was created and evaluate the qualities which were his in view of that purpose. By his sin he lost his original holiness and heavenly standing, but he retains his wisdom, and he has turned his surpassing abilities into ways of evil and his understanding has been prostituted to the level of *lies, deceptions, snares, and wiles*. The extent of these evil undertakings, their exalted character, his motive, and method, constitute a portion of this vast theme which will yet be pursued. In his book *Satan*, F. C. Jennings sums up at the end of his lucid exposition of the Ezekiel passage after this manner: “(a) By its setting and language it can apply to no child of fallen man—that is impossible. (b) It must therefore necessarily refer to a spirit or angel. (c) This angel or spirit, whoever it was, was personally the topstone of that primal creation. (d) His office was to protect the Throne of God, to forbid the approach of evil, or any unrighteousness. (e) Iniquity was found in him, and that iniquity was self-exaltation. (f) Sentence of expulsion from his place is pronounced, although not actually, or at least fully, executed” (pp. 55–56).

II. Satan’s Sin

With the same clarity and extended detail the precise sin of Satan is delineated in the Sacred Text, and in one central passage, namely, Isaiah 14:12–17. It is true that, from the beginning, Satan has not ceased sinning; but interest is focused specifically upon his initial sin, which sin, so far as God has been pleased to reveal, was the first sin to be committed in the universe. A partial exposition of this momentous passage has already been undertaken in an earlier division of this thesis, and it properly appears again as a fundamental consideration in hamartiology. In fact, the first sin to be committed not only bears much on our understanding of the one who commits it, but is the norm or pattern of all sin, demonstrating, as it does, the element in sin which makes it what it is—“exceeding sinful” (Rom. 7:13).

By reference to a fall from heaven, this passage (Isa. 14:12–17) raises the weighty question whether Satan is now with respect to his abode veritably cast out of heaven, or still dwelling in the sphere into which he was placed when created. A popular notion, which obtains quite apart from revelation, assumes

that Satan is dwelling in lower regions, if not in hell itself. In this connection, it is essential to consider again the truth that there are three heavens in view in the Bible: (a) that of the atmosphere in which “the birds of the heavens” move, and in which the “prince of the power of the air” has authority and is active; (b) the stellar spaces which, as before indicated, are the abode of angelic beings; and (c) the “third heaven” which is the abode of the triune God, the location of which cannot be determined. The question at issue is whether Satan, and with him the fallen angels, are cast out of their original habitation. Certain passages shed light on this problem. Of Christ it is written that “he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven” (Luke 10:18). Whether this was history or prophecy must be determined by the verdict of other Scriptures. Revelation 12:7–9 relates a casting out of Satan from heaven to the earth and, as there described, it is evidently future. The passage states: “And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.” The prophet Ezekiel foresees a casting out of Satan. He writes of Satan: “Thou hast sinned: therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God” (28:16–19). This word does not disclose the time when that promise will be fulfilled, beyond the fact that it is in these verses associated with the final judgments that are to come upon Satan. Certain passages assume that Satan is now in that heaven to which he has title by creation. In Job 1:6 and 2:1 it is asserted that Satan was then present in heaven. It is written: “Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them” (Job 1:6). Apparently, there was nothing unusual in Satan’s presence in that place, or on that occasion. He is called upon to report on his activities; and he does so. In that report he incidentally discloses the truth that he has sufficient freedom and latitude to go “to and fro in the earth,” as well as to appear in the very presence of God on high. Christ gave to Peter this warning: “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired [ἐξήτησάτο, ‘demanded by asking’] to have you, that he may sift you as wheat” (Luke 22:31). The implication is that Satan appeared personally before God with this request. Again, the Apostle enjoins: “Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places”

(Eph. 6:11–12, R.V.). To the same end this passage declares that the evil powers are yet in heavenly spheres. The evidence which this body of Scripture presents—and apparently there is no counter testimony—is that Satan is yet in his original abode and will be until, according to Revelation 12:7–9, he will be, as a part of the tribulation experience, cast into the earth.

It is requisite, as well, if the two great passages—Ezekiel 28:11–19 and Isaiah 14:12–17, which contribute most to the making known of Satan’s early history—are to be interpreted according to truth, to distinguish the different viewpoints of these human authors. Ezekiel in his prophetic vision stood on the threshold of angelic history and saw in *prospect* on to the end of Satan’s career, whereas Isaiah in his prophetic vision stood at the end of this history and saw in *retrospect* what he records. The truth that Isaiah thus looked backwards from the end time accounts for the opening sentence of his prophecy, which assumes that this mighty angel will have then fallen from heaven. Much that is found in this prediction is yet unfulfilled in its complete measure. The colossal undertakings of this angel as Isaiah saw them are not yet concluded.

Yet again, extreme contrasts are employed by these two prophets in the titles they apply to this angel. When entering upon his description of the high and holy estate of this angel as first created, Ezekiel addresses him, speaking for Jehovah, by the earthly title, “king of Tyrus”; while Isaiah, essaying to set forth the degradation of this being, addresses him by his heavenly title, “Lucifer, son of the morning.” It would seem that these titles are thus purposely employed to the end that these two estates—that which is of the highest of all creative power, and that which is the lowest debasement of an angel—may be brought into startling juxtaposition. The title “Lucifer, son of the morning” is the glorious heavenly designation of this great angel before his moral fall. *Lucifer* means ‘bright’ or ‘shining one’—and is almost identical with *nāḥāsh*, the serpent, which means ‘the shining one.’ Christ bears the titles, “bright and morning star” and “Sun of righteousness.” The titles “Lucifer, son of the morning” and “bright and morning star” are much the same. Christ is called “the last Adam” as a successor to the first Adam who fell. Is it not possible that, in some unrevealed manner, He is “the bright and morning star” as successor to the fallen “Lucifer, son of the morning”? This is but one of many parallels and contrasts between Christ and Satan, between Christ and Adam, and between Satan and Adam.

The prophecy by Isaiah is as follows: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I

will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners?" (14:12–17).

Thus the prophet announces the fall of this angel, the occasion of the fall, and something of his stupendous power. Of the latter, it is said that he it was who didst "weaken the nations," "that made the earth to tremble," "that did shake kingdoms," "that made the world as a wilderness," "destroyed the cities thereof," and "opened not the house of his prisoners." Much of this vast program is yet unaccomplished, and the authority and power which it connotes belongs to a later discussion. Again it is emphasized that Satan's sin was intended to be a secret. This is the meaning of the words, "Thou hast said in thine heart." Likewise, it is stated in this passage that Lucifer's sin consisted in five awful *I will's* against the will of God. Feeble indeed is the power of human imagination to picture the crisis in this universe at the moment when the first repudiation of God took place in heaven. These five "I will's" of Satan are evidently various aspects of one sin. Writing of the acceptable characteristics of an officer of the church, the Apostle states that he must not be a novice "lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation [crime] of the devil" (1 Tim. 3:6). Christ stated that Satan abode not in the truth, that he was dominated with an unholy desire, and that he was a murderer from the beginning (John 8:44). All these disclosures are, no doubt, but various ways of describing one sin—that of seeking to rise above the sphere in which he was created, and above the purpose and service assigned to him. This, it will be observed, is the essential character of human sin, as it is of the angels. Satan's five "I will's" are:

1. "I WILL ASCEND INTO HEAVEN." In this, the first aspect of Satan's sin, he apparently proposed to take up his *abode* in the third or highest heaven where God and the redeemed abide (2 Cor. 12:1–4). The abode of the angels is evidently on a lower plane; for, when returning to the highest heaven after His resurrection, Christ is said to have been seated "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion" (Eph. 1:20–21); but Satan, whose abode is that of the angels, even though his duties give him access to both earth and the higher spheres (cf. Job. 1:6; Ezek. 28:14), in unholy self-promotion determined that his

abode should be higher than that sphere to which he had been appointed by his Creator. The redeeming grace of God will not be satisfied until some among men, who by original position are lower than the angels (Ps. 8:4–6; Heb. 2:6–8), are lifted to eternal citizenship in the highest sphere (John 14:3; 17:21–24; Col. 3:3–4; Heb. 2:10; 10:19–20); but Satan has no right either by position or redemption to claim that sphere as the place of his abode. His self-seeking intention as disclosed in this declaration is an outrage against the Creator’s plan and purpose.

2. “I WILL EXALT MY THRONE ABOVE THE STARS OF GOD.” By this statement it is revealed that Satan, though appointed to the guardianship of the throne of God, aspired to the possession of a throne of his own and to rule over the “stars of God.” The angelic beings, rather than the stellar system, are obviously in view (Job 38:7; Jude 1:13; Rev. 12:3–4; 22:16). Evidently very much of Satan’s unholy ambition to possess a throne has been permitted, for it is revealed that he is now a recognized, though judged, king with throne-authority both in the heavenly realm (Matt. 12:26; Eph. 2:2; Col. 2:13–15) and earthly sphere (Luke 4:5–6; 2 Cor. 4:4 and Rev. 2:13, where “seat” is an inadequate translation of *θρόνος*). The sinful character of Satan’s purpose to secure a throne is apparent.

3. “I WILL SIT ALSO UPON THE MOUNT OF THE CONGREGATION, IN THE SIDES OF THE NORTH.” As has been stated, “the mount” is a phrase which evidently refers to the seat of divine government in the earth (Isa. 2:1–4), and the reference to “the congregation” is as clearly of Israel. Thus this specific assumption seems to aim at a share at least (note the word *also*) in the earthly Messianic rule. That rule is to be from Jerusalem, the city of the great King. The Messiah, we are told (Ps. 48:2), will reign from Mount Zion “on the sides of the north.” It is also disclosed that in the cross, which was set up on the north side of Jerusalem, Christ judged and spoiled principalities and powers (Col.2:15). It is possible that when thus judged, Satan’s unholy designs upon the Messianic rule were thwarted forever.

4. “I WILL ASCEND ABOVE THE HEIGHTS OF THE CLOUDS.” The meaning of this assumption will probably be discovered in the use of the word *clouds*. Of upwards of one hundred and fifty references in the Bible to clouds, fully one hundred are related to the divine presence and glory. Jehovah appeared in the cloud (Ex. 16:10); the cloud was termed “the cloud of Jehovah” (Ex. 40:38); when Jehovah was present the cloud filled the house (1 Kings 8:10); “Jehovah

rideth upon a swift cloud” (Ps. 104:3; Isa. 19:1); Christ is to come, as He went, upon the clouds of heaven (Matt. 24:30; Acts 1:9; Rev. 1:7); so the ransomed people appear (Israel, Isa. 60:8; and the Church, 1 Thess. 4:17). Satan’s “man of sin” will exalt himself “above all that is called God, or that is worshipped” (2 Thess. 2:4), and by this assumption Satan is evidently seeking to secure for himself some of the glory which belongs to God alone.

5. “I WILL BE LIKE THE MOST HIGH.” This, the fifth and last of Satan’s “I will’s” against the will of God, may be considered as a key to the understanding and tracing of his motives and methods. In spite of an almost universal impression that Satan’s ideal for himself is to be *unlike* God, he is here revealed as being actuated with the purpose to be *like* God. However, this ambition is not to be like Jehovah, the self-existent One, which no created being could ever be; but to be like the Most High, which title signifies the “possessor of heaven and earth” (Gen. 14:19, 22). Satan’s purpose, then, is to gain authority over heaven and earth. The essential evil character of sin here, as everywhere, is an unwillingness on the part of the creature to abide in the precise position in which he has been placed by the Creator. In pursuing this life-purpose as imitator of God and counterfeiter of God’s undertakings, Satan, apparently with sincerity, recommended to Adam and Eve that they, too, “be as gods.” The original word here translated “gods” is *Elohim* and the plural form of *Elohim* evidently accounts for the plural “gods.” What Satan really said was, “Ye shall be as *Elohim*.” In response to that suggestion, which only reflected Satan’s own supreme ambition to be like the Most High, Adam entered upon the same course of unholy repudiation of the divine purpose. So universal has this form of sin become that man thinks he has accomplished much when, if ever, he, through divine grace, reaches the place where his will is surrendered to God—the place, indeed, from which man should never have departed. In the strange, inexplicable permission of God, Satan’s ideal man, the man of sin, will yet declare himself to be God, sitting in the temple of God (2 Thess. 2:4); but this appears to be the climax of man’s unholy assumption and constitutes the sign of the end of the age (Matt. 24:15).

Satan’s sin may thus be summarized as a purpose to secure (1) the highest heavenly position; (2) regal rights both in heaven and on earth; (3) Messianic recognition; (4) glory which belongs to God alone; and (5) a likeness to the Most High, the “possessor of heaven and earth.”

There can be no adequate estimation of the immediate effect of Satan’s initial

sin, first upon himself, and then upon that vast host of spirit beings who, in allegiance to Satan, “kept not their first estate”; or of the final effect of that sin upon the entire human race whose federal head adopted the same satanic repudiation of God.

III. Satan According to the Old Testament

Satan is presented in the Old Testament under various characterizations, but he appears only four times in the Old Testament under the Hebrew appellation *Satan*. In 1 Chronicles 21:1 a record is made of the truth that Satan moved David to number Israel contrary to the will of God, and this act on Satan’s part well illustrates his purpose and character. Both Psalm 109:6 and Zechariah 3:1–2 disclose the same satanic design. In the former of these two passages, Satan’s presence is invoked as a judgment on the enemies of Jehovah, while, in the second, Satan is seen standing in an attitude of readiness to resist the divine purpose in behalf of Joshua, the high priest. It is Jehovah who directly rebukes Satan, which truth has its parallel in Jude 1:9 where it is said that Michael calls on Jehovah to rebuke Satan for his opposition. The remaining Old Testament reference to Satan is the illuminating account of Jehovah’s controversy with Satan over Job. As this Scripture makes claim to an extended consideration under the next division of satanology, no further attention will be given it at this point beyond the recognition that Satan here, as always, appears as the opposer of God.

The whole revelation of Satan’s rebellious world-power is not found in the Old Testament, but is reserved for the New Testament. Such a disclosure was doubtless withheld as being too demanding upon those of the Old Testament to whom a fuller revelation of truth had not come. There is a progress of doctrine concerning things evil as there is concerning things good, and these two developments could not lose their interrelation and balance. In the Old Testament, Jehovah is Himself presented as permitting that which occurs, which is always the basic fact (Ex. 10:20; 1 Sam. 16:14; Isa. 45:7; Amos 3:6). The divine permission here, as ever, in no way relieves those who sin of the responsibility for their sin. The very first title by which this great angel is introduced in the Bible is not fully clarified with respect to its meaning until as late as Revelation 12:9 (cf. 2 Cor. 11:3).

IV. Satan According to the New Testament

At the opening of the New Testament the student is confronted with the extreme activity of Satan and the demons. It would seem that all possible opposition resident in the fallen angels was marshaled for the encounter. As certainly as the eternal purpose of God in redemption was about to be actualized, the more violent contrariety is set up by the powers of darkness. Such utmost effort on Satan's part is according to revealed truth, but also is according to reason. There is but one situation to compare with this, namely, the period that will immediately precede the second advent of Christ when, as announced in Revelation 16:13–14, "the spirits of devils, working miracles, go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." This situation is more completely portrayed in the second Psalm, as also in Revelation 19:17–21. The true character of that coming conflict is divulged when it is thus observed that these warring kings will be demon-possessed.

Satan's activity as described in the New Testament may be given a twofold classification—that which arises through his authority as a king over evil spirits, and that which arises through his world-dominion. In reply to those who accused Him of casting out Satan by the power of Satan, Christ said that a house that is divided against itself cannot stand, and asked the question, If Satan cast out Satan how shall his kingdom stand? This passage is mentioned only to bring forward the truth that Satan has a kingdom of evil spirits. This statement by Christ is more than implication; it is a direct assertion and its reality must be heeded. So, also, Satan is said to be the "god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4) and in authority over this world to the extent that he gives its kingdoms to whomsoever he will (Luke 4:6). It is probable that every activity of Satan will be found to be related to one or the other of these spheres of authority.

At the threshold of Christ's ministry on earth, Satan met Him in the wilderness. There is mystery concealed in this encounter which, it is probable, extends to realms of angelic reality. It also penetrates into the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. The temptation is apparently within the sphere of His humanity and suggests the exercise of the human features—body, soul, and spirit—in their adjustment to the presence and exactings of His Deity. Into that sphere of relationship the human mind may not enter; yet the clear statement which the Bible sets forth should be accepted. Without doubt these supernatural issues are within the range of Satan's understanding, and afford a wide field for conflict which human experience cannot parallel. The features of the situation are faithfully presented. Christ being filled with the Spirit, He is led of the Spirit

into the wilderness and there undergoes a testing which continued forty days and nights. As a climax to this testing, Satan presents a threefold suggestion. The first involved the breaking down of that separation which Christ faithfully preserved between His Deity and His humanity. If the common demands of food and drink were supernaturally supplied by His Deity, He would not be in all points tested as are His followers in this world. The second test involved a short cut, apart from sacrifice, to the possession of the kingdoms of this world. These are covenanted to the Son (Ps. 2:8–9) by the Father and the securing of them with respect to title formed a part of His triumph in the cross. To some degree Satan has personal interests to serve, for there is a wide difference between exchanging the kingdoms of the world for the worship of the Son of God as compared with going on to a doom which deprives him of everything but the lake of fire. In the third instance, there is offered to Christ the securing of a recognition from the people apart from the path of suffering and shame. In all three testings Christ met Satan's proposals with the Word of God, and demonstrated the fact that the action which Satan suggests is not the will of God. The first Adam was overcome by Satan; the Last Adam drove Satan from the field. As Son of God with His Deity in view, the outcome could not be otherwise; as a man with His humanity in view, the victory is measureless and forms a pattern for all the saints of God in all the ages.

What may be suggested about Satan's later attacks upon Christ by the words, "And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season" (Luke 4:13), is not easy to trace; but that other attempts were made, which may have characterized much of the life and work of Christ in all the days before the cross, is certain.

V. Satan Judged in the Cross

When tracing his career, the cross as a judgment of Satan and all his hosts of spirits is the next event in order, and again the theme reaches out into the larger realms where the life and service of angels are situated. Issues are involved which lie outside the earthly sphere. For this reason the theme should be approached with caution. That which is revealed is to be received as God's revelation and from this certain general conclusions may be drawn. In His death, Christ dealt with sin as a principle, or as a whole; and while it is the joyous privilege of a human being to know that his personal sin is met to the satisfaction of God in the death of Christ, it is evident that the thing achieved by Christ is as

boundless as the universe and as timeless as eternity. The Colossian Epistle contains two notable passages which enunciate the limitless character of Christ's work upon the cross. Having in 1:15–18 assigned to Christ the creatorship of all things and the pre-eminence above all His creation, the Epistle goes on to state in verses 19 through 22: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight." The scope of this reconciliation which the cross provides is as limitless as that realm which includes both heaven and earth. The term *reconciliation* is not the equivalent of *restoration*, or *salvation*. Its precise meaning is 'to change thoroughly,' and its achievement is seen in the fact that the divine estimation of all things has been changed completely by the cross. When it is said, as in 2 Corinthians 5:19, that God has reconciled the world unto Himself, it is not by so much declared that all men are saved, or that all will be saved. And with a similar meaning, the reconciliation of "all things," as asserted in Colossians 1:20, does not intimate that all things in heaven and on earth are now perfected in the sight of God, or that they necessarily ever will be. The reconciliation which is now wrought by the cross has provided a ground for the redemption of those before chosen of God and a ground for the judgment of those who reject His provisions for them. The Scriptures do not even hint that fallen men who continue impenitent, or that fallen angels, will be rescued from their doom (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:12–15). It is probable that what is thus involved cannot be reduced to the level of human understanding, but the truth that Christ's death extends a benefit to things in heaven and to things on earth is made clear. Satan and his hosts are judged. Their fallen beings and their evil deeds have come up for divine judgment, and are now judged, though the execution of that judgment is yet future. Though the heel of the Judge of all things was bruised, it is also as certain that the head of "the serpent" has been bruised. It is impossible that one shall be bruised without the bruising of the other.

The second passage in Colossians is exceedingly explicit, though all that it announces may not be understood by dwellers in this sphere. It reads: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them

in it” (2:14–15). Here, as before, the value of the cross is seen to extend into two realms, that which is human (vs. 14), and that which is angelic (vs. 15). That which extends to human realms is not now being considered; but within the realms of that which is angelic, stupendous accomplishments are indicated by the disclosure that Christ in His death *spoiled* principalities and powers, made a shew of them openly, and *triumphed over* them. The human imagination might picture all this as being brought to pass in a final assize, but here it is taught that its achievement through the cross of Christ is a present reality. Since the theme is as vast as the sphere and destiny of the angels, it is the part of wisdom that the student shall approach its consideration with due humility. The truth that Satan was judged in the cross of Christ is confirmed by two recorded statements by Christ: “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out” (John 12:31); “Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:11). These were made immediately before the crucifixion and relate Satan’s judgment to Christ’s anticipated death. To these statements may be added Hebrews 2:14, which declares: “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” Thus by explicit teaching the Bible reiterates the truth that Satan and his hosts came to judgment, even being spoiled, unveiled, triumphed over, judged, and cast out by Christ in His death. Such, indeed, is the historical fact, though it yet remains to discover something of the issues of that judgment with its immediate and future results. Of the immediate results, it may be repeated that a distinction must be drawn between a judgment gained which is in the nature of a legal sentence not yet executed, and the final administering of the penalty. The evidence is conclusive that the sentence is not yet executed since throughout this age following the cross Satan is, by divine authority, given the designations “the prince of the power of the air” (Eph. 2:2), and “the god of this world” (2 Cor. 4:4). He evidently is permitted to continue as a usurper until the time of his execution. An illustration of Satan’s present relation to this world may be taken from the history of Saul and David. It is natural that David, the first to occupy the Davidic throne, should be a type of Christ predicted to be the last and most glorious occupant of that throne (Luke 1:31–33). As there was a period between the anointing of David and the final banishment of Saul, in which Saul reigned as a usurper, though under divine sentence and David was the God-appointed king, in like manner there is now a similar period in which Satan rules as a usurper, though under sentence, and the actual occupation of Christ’s throne is

still future. In this period Satan, the rejected monarch, still rules, hunting to the death all those who have allied themselves with Christ, the God-anointed King. On this so important period of Satan's career and the peculiar character of it as typified in Saul, F. C. Jennings writes:

Thus you remember that God permitted Israel to choose their first King, and they chose Saul; as to whom we are told that "*from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people.*" Why are we told this? Have we exhausted its significance when we picture to ourselves the towering height of that human king? I am sure not; but rather would the Spirit of God, provide a perfect figure or type of him, who, exactly in the same way, towered over *his* fellows: in other words was, as the other Scriptures we have glanced at show, the most exalted of all created spiritual intelligences. But Saul disobeys, or, to use language that shall suggest the parallel I desire to keep before us;— "*iniquity was found in him*"; see Ezek. 28:15; and he was set aside from his kingly office: the kingdom was rent from him (I Sam. 15:27, 28), and then God anointed another king of His own choice: *A shepherd king*, David! Now no one questions David being a type of the beloved Son of God; why should not Saul afford us also a type of His opponent? He surely does. But,—and this is the point that must be carefully noted and weighed,—*Saul retains the throne of Israel, and is still recognized as the king, long after he is divinely rejected*; the sentence is pronounced, but judgment is not at once executed, whilst David, the now true king, is "hunted like a partridge upon the mountains, or finds his refuge in the cave of Adullam!" God does not at once intervene by *power*, and take the dignities of the kingdom from Saul,—although he has lost all *title* to them—and put them in David's hand: the power is Saul's,—the title is David's. The latter is king *de jure*, the former *de facto*. Do you not see the marvellous and clear analogy? Satan too, whilst he may have forfeited all *title* to the throne of the earth—we shall consider this more carefully directly—still cleaves as did Saul, to its power and dignity; claims, as did Saul, all the power of its government; whilst the true David, to whom all belongs in *title*, is, as it were, in the cave of Adullam, where a few "discontented" ones, those who are not satisfied with such a condition of things—have found their way to Him, and own Him, even in the day of His rejection, as rightful Lord of all. Therefore whilst Satan is the prince of this world at the present time, we are led by the analogy of the inspired history, as by every clear Scripture, to regard him as its *usurping* prince: a prince in *power*, but not in *title*. Yet whilst now a usurper, as Saul was: still since he was, also as Saul, divinely anointed as king, the dignity of that anointing still lingers on him, so that Michael recognized that dignity—not speaking evil, but reverently (even as David spoke of Saul ever as "the Lord's Anointed") and saying "*the Lord rebuke thee.*"—*Op. cit.*, pp. 25–27

Returning to the central truth as recorded in Colossians 2:15, it will be remembered that the specific crime which caused Satan's fall, the fall of the angels, and the fall of man, though being prompted by pride (1 Tim. 3:6; Ezek. 28:16–17) and leading on to a career of iniquity, is that this mighty angel assumed to oppose the plan and purpose of God both for himself and for other creatures. He introduced a philosophy of life, a mode of procedure, which is directly opposed to the revealed will of God. It is a lie in the sense that it contradicts that which is infinitely true. What form of judgment a holy God must impose upon such an immeasurable offense is not for men to determine. The judgment properly has in view the crime itself. Such, indeed, is the reason for an

unending confinement in the lake of fire. Satan declared, “I will exalt my throne above the stars of God ... I will be like the most High.” This, it is evident, is the essential feature of Satan’s program. In line with that purpose, he wrested the scepter from Adam and has held sway over the vast majority of the human family throughout all its generations. They being separated from God, as described in Ephesians 2:12, possessed no way to God until the sacrifice of Calvary was made. It is true that to the small company of people, Israel, as to the patriarchs, was extended the cure of sin by blood sacrifice; but the great mass of humanity remained without hope and without God in the world. It would seem, therefore, that the basis of Satan’s dominion over humanity was largely the fact that they were not eligible to any higher relationship. On this basis, had God approached any fallen human beings, Satan would have pleaded God’s own holiness as the reason why God should not so act. Satan is committed to his infernal philosophy and to the defense of those who have embraced it. At least he will not surrender them apart from the most drastic resistance within his power. As long as man’s unholiness was not yet taken to the cross, the conflict was largely in Satan’s favor. In Isaiah 14:17 it is written of Satan that “he opened not the house of his prisoners.” This statement is illuminating. However, when referring to what Christ would do by His sacrifice, the same prophet goes on to say that Christ would come “to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound” (Isa. 61:1; cf. Luke 4:16–21). The incarceration to which these Scriptures refer is more serious and extensive than anything that obtains in human governments. No suggestion will be found here that those justly in prison for crime are to be released from that judgment. The bondage came with the repudiation of God on the part of the responsible head of the race. These prisoners are not only bondslaves to sin, but are in bondage to the evil one. He it is who energizes all the sons of disobedience (Eph. 2:2); Satan had bound in physical distress a “daughter of Abraham” (Luke 13:16); by him had been exercised the “power of death” (Heb. 2:14–15); and the Apostle witnesses frequently to the activities of Satan (cf. 1 Cor. 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor. 12:7; 1 Thess. 2:18). The incomparable invitations—“Come ... whosoever will” and, “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out”—are possible only through the redemption which Christ has wrought. The door is open wide. The gospel is to be preached to “every creature.”

Thus it is seen that Christ’s judgment of Satan which was wrought through the cross had primarily to do with Satan’s original crime and with the God-repudiating philosophy which that crime represents. The *principle* of evil was

judged. The cross-judgment reaches out to a lost world for whom Christ died and becomes the basis of the gospel of salvation.

Investigation into the very extensive body of literature which bears on Satan's activity and influence upon both the saved and unsaved in the present age must be passed over at this point and included in later divisions of this general theme.

VI. The Execution of Satan's Judgments

The execution of those judgments which were secured against Satan by Christ through the cross is anticipated in the Word of God in three stages or successive events. These are to be considered quite apart from three judgments already past, namely, (a) the moral degradation and corresponding loss of standing which was due to that fall, (b) the sentence pronounced against him in the Garden of Eden, and (c) the judgment of the cross. The future threefold execution of judgment upon Satan may be stated thus:

1. SATAN CAST OUT OF HEAVEN. The casting of Satan out of heaven and the confining of him with his angels to the restricted sphere of the earth is described in Revelation 12:7–12. This passage reads: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Beyond the disclosure of the central truth that Satan and his angels will be cast out of heaven, this passage unfolds much vital revelation. The means that will be employed to cast Satan and his angels down is none other than the authority and power of the holy angels under the leadership of Michael. These fallen angels, being overcome, are as exiles from their native spheres, confined to the earth. A song of rejoicing ascends in heaven because of the relief which the absence of these fallen angels secures. All this is most suggestive. Likewise a woe is addressed to the earth in

view of the calamity which their presence imposes upon the dwellers of earth. It is in connection with this exile that Satan's great wrath is stirred, and it is then, apparently, that he becomes aware that the cause which has engaged him from the first has been lost forever. The presence of Satan and his hosts restricted to the earth and in measureless wrath could hardly be cause for joy on the earth. On the contrary, this situation is one of the most essential contributing factors in that great tribulation which is predicted for those very days (Matt. 24:21; Dan. 12:1). That this tribulation falls heaviest upon the nation Israel is asserted here (cf. 12:13–17), as in all the Scriptures.

The casting out of the satanic hosts from heaven means much, also, to the "brethren" whom Satan has not ceased to accuse before God night and day, and it is a most vital truth which is added in the words, "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." The question may be raised at this point about what it is that constitutes Satan's opposition to God's ways with men. No little resentment may exist against the truth that redemption has not been extended to fallen angels as it is extended to fallen men. It would seem that Satan still exercises some of his original responsibility, as the defender and promoter of righteousness on which the throne of God must ever rest. Satan's ministers pose as "ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11:15); but reference is made in this text to *personal* or *self-promoted* righteousness. The redemptive plan proposes to constitute sinners righteous before God through the merit of Christ which He released and provided for the lost in His death. The constituting of sinners to be righteous through the saving work of Christ is easily believed to be a point of satanic opposition against God. There is nothing else about the gospel which Satan would resist, or concerning which he would "blind the minds" of those who are lost (2 Cor. 4:3–4). The one who specializes in self-promoted righteousness has always been the least able to comprehend and the greatest objector to the doctrine of imputed righteousness. Certainly it is not to be counted as strange if Satan himself is, like those among men who are energized by him, opposed to that which is the abiding fruit of redeeming grace. The accusations which Satan has hurled against the brethren have no doubt been concerning actual sin and unrighteousness on their part. It is inconceivable that he would charge them with that which is wholly untrue. Such a course would fall by its own weight. It is rather that Satan is as offended by the arrangement whereby saints are preserved in spite of their unworthiness as he is by the imputing of righteousness to meritless sinners in the first place. The Scriptures offer an illustration of this unassailable position of those who are redeemed God

said to Balak through the unwilling prophet Balaam, I have “not beheld iniquity in Jacob,” or “perverseness in Israel.” There was evil in this people, but, when attacked by the foe of divine grace, Jehovah delighted to declare that He did not *see* or *behold* that on which the enemy based his accusations. God does not assert that these wicked things do not exist; He states that He, having covered them with redeeming blood, does not see or behold what the enemy points out. However, when dealing with these whom He has redeemed, Jehovah is tireless in His effort to separate them from all their evil ways. Of this great truth the Psalmist writes: “If thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?” (Psalm 130:3). That He does not mark iniquity is possible only through redemption and is never a matter of mere graciousness. The wrathful attitude of Balak is a reflection of the attitude of Satan who energized him. In like manner, the evil which was condemned in Cain is not immorality, but rather the Satanic ideal of self-worthiness as a basis of divine acceptance. The blood-sacrifice of Abel, looking on to the fruits of redemption, provided a perfect relationship to God to which no fallen being could ever attain by works of personal righteousness.

The saints are to be rewarded before the judgment seat of Christ in heaven. At that time no mention is to be made of sins already washed away by the blood of the Lamb. Such silence with respect to canceled sin could not be in heaven until the accuser is cast out. Great joy will be the portion of those who thus enter into the full realization of divine forgiveness and acceptance.

2. SATAN’S JUDGMENT AT THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST. As a part of that which transpires at the glorious return of Christ—which coming terminates the great tribulation (Matt. 24:30), and ends the reign of the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:8–10)—Satan is bound by a great chain and cast into the abyss. This event is described by these words: “And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season” (Rev. 20:1–3). In this passage, as in that previously cited, there is much revealed beyond the fact that Satan is bound and cast into the abyss and sealed. It is asserted that Satan is the deceiver of the whole world, and assurance is given that the earth will be free from these deceptions for a period said to be “a thousand years.” His

wrathful presence in the earth during a preceding period has contributed much to the agony of the great tribulation. Thus, also, his restraint from all activity contributes much to the peace and righteousness on the earth for the thousand years. The human mind could not comprehend all that is involved in these disclosures. Further on in this context it is revealed that, at the end of a thousand years, Satan will be loosed for a “little season.” It is written: “And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them” (20:7–9). The nations are said to be deceived again and that deception plunges them once more—and for the last time—into war. It is predicted that war shall cease during that kingdom age of peace (Isa. 2:1–4), and that it is immediately resorted to upon the release of Satan from the abyss. This twofold truth that there is no war on earth when Satan’s power and deceptions are withdrawn and that it is immediately revived as soon as these deceptions are again cast over the earth, demonstrates clearly the cause of all war in the earth. It is the last war, for God Himself intervenes with supernatural judgments and destruction.

A corresponding Old Testament prediction adds much to the disclosure that Satan will be in the abyss. It is said in Isaiah 24:21–23: “And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously.” If, as seems justified, the “high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth [that are then] upon earth” is a reference to fallen angels and their principalities and powers, it is made clear that the fallen angels, along with their chief, are also placed in the abyss. Where else could they be at such a time? It is generally true that in the Scriptures a king and his kingdom are closely related and whatever befalls one befalls the other (cf. Dan. 2:37–38). On this principle of interpretation, it may be assumed that these fallen angels accompany Satan on to the end of his career. It will be observed that some of these are already in chains awaiting the final judgment which shall come upon all evil spirits (Jude 1:6; 2 Pet. 2:4); and it is of great significance

that, as witnesses at least, the saints will be associated with Christ in this judgment (1 Cor. 6:3).

3. SATAN'S FINAL JUDGMENT. The Scripture itself will best describe the last step in the execution of Satan's judgment: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10).

Chapter VI

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S EVIL CHARACTER

IN APPROACHING this difficult and intricate subject, a certain inquiry is in order, namely, What latitude is accorded angels in the exercise of their powers in the direction of evil? The implications of Scripture and the deductions of reason contend, in answer to this question, that much that is possible as sin with men is impossible with angels and is foreign to them. There is no evidence that angels are tempted in the realms of those sins which find expression through the human body—immoral relations, gluttony, and the perversion of normal bodily functions. It is equally certain that there is no occasion for avarice, parsimoniousness, or thievery among the angels since, so far as is known, they are not burdened with possessions of any description whatever. In truth it is easier to discover the sins which are predicated of the angels than to list those which they, for obvious reasons, do not practice. Angelic sin is along the lines of two closely related evils—*ambitious pride* and *untruth*—as these may be manifested within the range of angelic existence. Within the scope of these two sins the evil character of Satan must be computed. The sinfulness of Satan's sin is not to be discovered by comparing it with wickedness in human spheres, but rather by a due comparison of it with the holiness of God, and in the light of that which God has required of the angels.

As God is the embodiment of good, so Satan, in his restricted sphere, is the embodiment of evil. God, being infinite, is infinitely good; Satan, being finite, is evil to the extent of his resources and means. Since he is the highest of all creation, Satan is the one of all creatures to assume the position of *antigod*. It is recognized that Satan will yet introduce and exalt the Antichrist; but, it is clear, from the beginning he has arrogated to himself the function of *antigod*. This assumption is the supreme conception which actuates his ambitious pride. To a like degree he is *antitruth*, but in realms and ways which challenge the closest attention of every student of Bible doctrine. To the same extent to which this great angel surpasses human understanding, his evil nature and undertakings reach beyond human comprehension. However, it is anticipated that the Spirit-taught believers shall pursue these vast themes with some discernment and to a large degree of profit. Popular impressions of the character of Satan are erroneous. Doubtless, if called to face the truth of the precise nature of Satan's sin, the man of the world would find little fault in him. It could not be otherwise

since the worldling has himself adopted as his prototype the very, evil ideals of Satan. The world could not be expected to sit thus in judgment upon itself, and this is especially true in view of the fact that Satan has blinded the minds of those who believe not that which is of God. The evil character of Satan will be found embraced in the twofold wickedness—ambitious pride and untruth—which is charged against him.

I. Twofold Wickedness

1. AMBITIOUS PRIDE. Though the entire career of Satan is but an unbroken manifestation of his pride, there are three passages of Scripture which directly indict Satan with respect to this specific sin:

1 Timothy 3:6. This notable passage urges the unwisdom of appointing a young and inexperienced convert to the office of bishop or elder in the church. Such an officer should not be a “novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation [‘judgment’] of the devil” —not a judgment to be imposed by the devil, but the judgment God imposes on the devil for the same sin of pride. The next verse asserts that there is a *reproach* of the devil (cf. Jude 1:9; 2 Pet. 2:11), and a *snare* of the devil (cf. 2 Tim. 2:26); but the text in question warns against the experience of Satan’s judgment which follows the enacting of Satan’s sin—ambitious pride. Citation of this passage at this point is for the purpose of enforcing the truth that Satan’s notable sin was pride. The effect upon the novice would be, as it was upon Satan, a beclouding of the mind with respect to real values. The verb τυφόομαι, translated “lifted up,” means ‘to make a smoke’ and by it to be blinded (cf. 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:4). It is of interest to observe that the intimation is that Satan himself experienced a besotting of the mind which to some extent made his sinful course a possibility.

Ezekiel 28:17. Reference must be had again to this passage because of its clear revelation relative to Satan’s sinful, self-promoting pride. To quote: “Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.” He who had been created for the highest position and service, before described, has become conscious and proud of his wisdom and beauty. It will be seen from verse 12 that the wisdom is *full* and the beauty is *perfect*. The meaning of such terms, describing, as they do, the mind of Jehovah in His appreciation of this angel, cannot be traced by man. Doubtless there were these qualities in this angel which made pride a natural consequence.

With that befogging of mind which pride engenders, it is possible so to be misguided as to undertake the very opposite line of action from that which infinite wisdom has dictated.

Isaiah 14:12–14. Though quoted and expounded before, this illuminating passage is cited again: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.”

Pride is here seen to prompt this great angel to unholy ambition. With a beclouded mind, he easily repudiates the Creator and displays dissatisfaction with the estate into which he was divinely placed. He proposes by ambition and self-promotion to advance his estate to the highest heaven and into the likeness of the Most High.

Thus it is set forth by divine authority that Satan’s career of evil began with pride and that, through its power to confuse the mind, it has led him on into all the ways of evil which are recorded of him. The all-important fruit of Satan’s pride is the fact that “he abode not in the truth.”

2. UNTRUTH. An extended list of indictments against Satan is to be presented shortly and it would seem impossible that all that is charged against this evil angel could originate from the one sin of untruth which was engendered by pride. Christ’s own word in reference to Satan’s first procedure in the way of sin is both revealing and final. He said: “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it” (John 8:44). And to this may be added: “He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil” (1 John 3:8).

The charge that these Jews, to whom Christ spoke, were of their father the devil is a serious one, and has provoked perplexity and controversy. There being a spiritual birth in which the one who believes in Christ is the recipient of the divine nature—that which is foreign to normal human life—thus there is such a thing as a reception of satanic ideals to the end that the life which receives them is, to a marked degree, the child of the one who originates the manner of life

which is embraced. The designation three times employed by the Apostle, *children of disobedience* (Eph. 2:2; 5:6; Col. 3:6), and Peter's phrase *cursed children* (2 Pet. 2:14—cf. *obedient children* of 1 Pet. 1:14), are all most significant, the context of which passages invites the student's most careful exegesis to the end that the exact import of these appellations may be apprehended. The characterizing disobedience to which reference is made is federal—as is the characterizing obedience (cf. Rom. 5:19). By natural birth all are subject to divine wrath which is due to the disobedience of the federal head of the race and by which the race fell; yet children, with respect to their personal childlikeness and innocence, portray citizenship in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 18:1–4). Since federal and not personal disobedience is in view, the implications of the title are as applicable to one unregenerate person as to another and without regard to personal subservience. Hence, also, it is right to conclude that all unregenerate persons are alike in need of the provisions of divine grace.

All of this substantiates the truth that there is a solemn reality in Christ's words, "Ye are of your father the devil," and it is on the ground of this filiation and the unavoidable expression of its inner qualities that He goes on to say, "and the lusts of your father ye will ['your will is to'] do." With unquestionable authority Christ relates the parentage which sin generates, not at all to Adam who is only a link in the chain (Rom. 5:12), but to the originator of evil—Satan. *Children of Adam* is a mild designation compared with *children of the devil*. Christ asserts the reality of the latter.

The statement that Satan "was a murderer from the beginning" seems to be the result of Satan's influence upon other creatures. Whether there is any sense in which this charge might apply to Satan's injury to other angels or not, it is easily traceable that he seduced men into sin which subjected them to death. It is reasonable to assume—and not without Scripture warrant—that the one who caused man to sin also caused the lesser angels to sin. The origin of sin is not distributed among various individuals; it is invariably assigned to the one who must, therefore, have degraded angels as he has degraded men. The satanic principle manifested in Cain moved Cain to slay Abel who, in turn, manifested the divine purpose and ideal. According to the Bible, murder is in the intent as well as in the overt act (1 John 3:12, 15). Satan slew Adam and Eve, though their years were many before death came to them. They who were by creation as immortal as the angels, paid the assured price of death which Satan's counsel imposed upon them.

The root of the matter lies concealed in the accompanying accusation by

Christ in which He said that the devil “abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” As set forth in the Bible, the general theme of untruth is vast indeed; but specific importance is given to untruth as the opposite of that truth which God is. In its essential nature untruth is antigod being as it is not only a misrepresentation of the Person and character of God, but a distortion of His purpose and ways. As human understanding fails to apprehend the crisis involved when Satan “abode not in the truth,” so, to even a greater degree, human language is impotent as a means of depicting the untruths which were involved. Satan chose not to continue in the precise sphere into which he was placed by the infinite will and benevolence of God. But it is not alone a case of one sphere as over against another; it is also a case of the choice of one principle or philosophy of life as over against another. What God had revealed of Himself as the supreme authority and designed with respect to relationships and activity for this great angel was *the truth* in which a perfect whole embraces all its parts. Such an extensive incorporation of truth which reflected the infinity of the Designer in every particular of it could not suffer the slightest disarrangement of its perfect balance and symmetry—let alone a complete shattering of all its vital aspects. In his impious action, the great angel proposed a course of independent achievement which at once in principle dethroned the God of truth and enthroned self. Every feature of this intention was in opposition to, and independent of, God. Such violence will not be rightly estimated apart from a due consideration of the fact that the creature—angel or man—is designed to be guided by God alone. Of man’s need of divine guidance, Jeremiah writes: “O LORD, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps” (Jer. 10:23). As before indicated, to attempt independent, self-directed life is the only course open to the creature wherein he may satisfy his satanic desire to resemble God. The resemblance is feeble indeed, but it serves to satisfy the insanity which sin really is. There is little wonder that misery bulks so large in the world when it is recognized that almost every human life is lived without any conscious reliance upon God. What anguish independence of God has inflicted on fallen angels is not fully revealed. Their destiny, like that of fallen unregenerate humanity, is but a normal consummation of their wretched career. God Himself, with all that enters into His perfect plan and purpose, is *truth* in its absolute and plenary sense. To continue with Him in the course He has designed, is the highest destiny possible for any creature. To depart from that course is to experience the present and future penalties of evil.

Two Greek words which are translated into English by terms which connote evil, are most revealing with respect to the essential character of sin. These are ἁμαρτία, which means missing the mark, and ἄνομος, which means without law, or lawless. The latter may mean only the fact concerning the Gentiles that to them the Mosaic Law was never given (1 Cor. 9:21), or it may imply *willful* rejection of authority (1 John 3:4). The former word is capable of expressing that colossal failure which is missing God's perfect purpose and end, while the latter suggests all the rebellion of the evil one in his original sin. In missing the divine purpose for him, Satan became the antigod destined to the lake of fire forever. Such an end as a miscarriage of so perfect a beginning is tragedy to an incomprehensible degree. However, the present discussion has more to do with Satan's lawless sin when he repudiated God and rejected God's will for him. His lawlessness was not a mere disregard for an existing code of regulations; it was a complete rejection of the Lawgiver and all His benevolent intentions for an endless life.

It is notable, also, that the wickedness of sin is not exhausted in the high crime of disowning God and His benevolent plan; it goes on to enthrone self and espouse a different and wholly unworthy, God-dishonoring manner of life. Satan's sin was not merely *negative* in its rejection of God; it was *positive* also in that it constructed a philosophy of life, a line of action, which originated with Satan, was self-centered, and excluded God. The entire treatment of satanology must be adjusted to these stupendous facts.

It may be concluded that, in its ultimate form, untruth is a substitution of self for God and the assumption of a self-designed plan of life for that purposed by the Creator. This is *the lie*. It is such because it is antigod from every angle of consideration. This is the limitless meaning of Christ's word regarding Satan when He said that "he abode not in the truth," which is the negative feature of Satan's sin. Christ also declared that Satan was a liar from the beginning, which as fully represents the positive feature of that original sin. A partial or compromising departure from God is impossible. God is either everything or nothing in these relationships. All untruth as seen in misguided lives partakes of, and grows out of, Satan's lie in disowning the truth which God is. Satan is "a liar, and the father of it" (cf. Rom. 1:25; Eph. 4:25; 2 Thess. 2:11).

It is not without specific meaning that Christ goes on in this context to say that He Himself tells the truth, that none might convince Him of sin, and that those who are of God hear God's words. Similarly, since Christ came forth from God, it is impossible that one should be of God and at the same time reject the

One whom God has sent into the world. How very much is declared when Christ said “I am ... the truth”! He was not only God [the Truth] manifest in the flesh, but as the perfect man, He abode in the truth in the sense that He did always and only those things which were well-pleasing to His Father. In the most drastic testing which Satan could impose upon Him, He did not sin by departing from the precise purpose of His Father for Him.

The satanic lie was imported into the Garden of Eden and was there adopted by the first parents of the race. Satan said to them, “Be as Elohim” (Gen. 3:5). The untruth did not in this instance consist in the mere fact that they would not really be as *Elohim*, though Satan said they would; it consisted in rejecting God and His purpose for them. The philosophy represented by these words is diabolical in all its parts. Its hellish character is not mitigated by the fact that it is well-nigh universal, or by the truth that those who are under its curse are unaware that there is any other and better philosophy extant. The Apostle records of those who embrace this devilish philosophy, “Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.... Who changed the truth of God into a [‘the’] lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. ... And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful” (Rom. 1:21–22, 25, 28–31). The lamentable sins which follow the repudiation of God are but the innumerable lies which are the legitimate offspring of the first lie. The whole present world-system is a product and manifestation of the lie—but more of this anon. The spectacle of a world in open rebellion against Jehovah and His Messiah is pictured in Psalm 2:1–3, which reads: “Why do the heathen [‘nations’] rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.” It is evident that this Scripture is to be fulfilled at the end time, when the lie is in its fullest manifestation. The course of evil moves on to its determined end, and slight indeed has been the adjustment of theology to the

Scriptures when theology so generally anticipates a converted world before the King returns. The lie is not predicted to become the truth by any process whatsoever. It develops in its own evil course and is terminated at the zenith of its wickedness by the One into whose hands all judgment has been committed and in the program of His second advent.

No more determining passage of the Bible may be contemplated relative to the final manifestation of the lie than 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12, in which all the forces of lawlessness are seen to concentrate in the lawless one. Assurance is advanced also that all will be judged of God on the sole ground that they believe the lie. The passage being central and final on this theme is quoted in full and according to a translation by Dean Alford in his New Testament notes:

(1) But we entreat you, brethren, in regard of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together to Him,—(2) in order that ye should not be lightly shaken from your mind nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by epistle as from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is present. (3) Let no man deceive you in any manner: for [that day shall not come] unless there have come the apostasy first, and there have been revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, (4) he that withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God or an object of adoration, so that he sits in the temple of God, skewing himself that he is God. (5)... (6) And now ye know that which hinders, in order that he may be revealed in his own time. (7) For the MYSTERY ALREADY is working of lawlessness, only until he that now hinders be removed: (8) and then shall be REVEALED the LAWLESS ONE, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of His mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of His coming: (9) whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, (10) and in all deceit of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order to their being saved. (11) And on this account God is sending to them the working of error, in order that they should believe the falsehood, (12) that all might be judged who did not believe the truth, but found pleasure in iniquity.—*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., Vol. II, Pt. I, Intro., p. 79

A temptation at once arises to enter fully into this context, which may better be attempted under Eschatology. However, three forces must be identified in the interest of even a tentative contemplation of all that is here disclosed—(a) the force of the man of sin, (b) the force of the Restrainer, and (c) the force of the Destroyer.

a. Three Forces.

(1) *The Force of the Man of Sin.* With unequivocal language the Apostle predicts that before the Day of the Lord (not the “Day of Christ,” as in the A.V.) can come the man of sin must appear. The title is specific and no warrant exists for confusing it with the more general name of Antichrist. Doubtless the man of sin is antichrist with respect to doctrine and practice. In fact, he appears as the supreme satanic counterfeit of Christ. He is Satan’s last and most misleading

deception after whom the world is destined to follow (Rev. 13:4–8); but in no Scripture is this individual styled *Antichrist*. This point is stressed because of the fact that much interpretation of this passage falls back on the more general declarations respecting Antichrist and thus fails to arrive at the essential truth here set forth regarding a specific *person*. He appears throughout this context in the singular and of him are predicated only those things which belong to a person. Having quoted at length from the early fathers—Irenaeus, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine, and Jerome—Dean Alford goes on to say: “The first particulars in the history must be gleaned from the early Fathers. And their interpretation is for the most part well marked and consistent. They all regard it as a prophecy of the future, as yet unfulfilled when they wrote. They all regard the coming (*parousia*) as the personal return of our Lord to judgment and to bring in His Kingdom. They all regard the adversary here described as an individual person, the incarnation and concentration of sin” (*ibid.*, 79–80). In spite of the added titles given here to this person—*son of perdition and lawless one*—with all that they imply, the Church of Rome has professed to see this person realized in Martin Luther and all that follow him, and not a few of the Protestants return the doubtful compliment by professing to see this one fulfilled in the Pope and the system he represents. In respect to the latter belief, which has had wide favor, it may be said that although much stress may be laid on the assumption of the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ and that he sits in a place of ecclesiastical power, he could not under any worthy interpretation of the text be made to correspond to the one who “withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God.” In like manner, if the Papacy is the man of sin, then all has been fulfilled fifteen centuries ago—even the destruction of this one by the return of Christ. Though a superman because of satanic power, the man of sin is, nevertheless, a *man* and his predicted appearing and career are unfulfilled. Any departure from this conclusion must involve doubts with regard to the inspiration of the text itself. After nineteen hundred years this prophecy stands unfulfilled. The Apostle could not change his terminology were he to write today of this expectation. The man of sin has not appeared; nor has the Day of the Lord begun. The mystery of lawlessness is yet working as it was in Paul’s day. Whatever may be conjured up to resemble Antichrist, it must be required again that the present issue pertains to a person styled “the man of sin, the son of perdition” and “the lawless one.” The last designation—*the lawless one*—relates him directly to the satanic lie and the consummator of all that lie holds in store.

Disagreement has been recorded with respect to the identification of the temple in which this lawless one is to be seated. Early writers contended that it is a church of some description. Later writers are more agreed that it is a restored Jewish temple. It may be no more than a temporary tabernacle which will be serving for the Jewish worship of Jehovah, which will be in progress at that time (cf. Dan. 9:27; Rev. 13:6).

(2) *The Force of the Restrainer.* Having identified the anticipated man of sin, the Apostle proceeds to assert that the satanic consummation will not be allowed its realization until the time which God has determined. Doubtless, Satan would hasten this consummation, but it awaits God's appointed time. The Restrainer will go on restraining lawlessness until He—the Restrainer—be taken out of the way. The antigod philosophy is working and none could be able or worthy to restrain evil on so vast a scale other than a Person in the Godhead; and, since the Holy Spirit is the resident active power of God in the world during this age, it is reasonable to conclude that He thus restrains. Of no other force could it be said that it will be at a given time removed in order that the climax of all evil may be realized in the appearing and power of the man of sin. In His resident presence as One who tabernacles in the Church and not as an omnipresent One, the Spirit will remove from the world at the time the Church is translated to heaven (1 Thess. 4:13–18). What the corruption of the world really is will be demonstrated in those few terrible years following the removal of restraint, in which the lawless one prospers.

(3) *The Force of the Destroyer.* The returning Christ destroys the lawless one. Writing of this great event and using, as was common, the title *Antichrist* when the man of sin was in view, Chrysostom states: "Just as a fire, when it is approaching, merely causes the lesser insects to shrivel up, and consumes them, so shall Christ, with His word alone and His appearing, consume Antichrist. It is enough that the Lord is come: forthwith Antichrist and all belonging to him have perished" (cited by Alford, *ibid.*, 80–81). The coming on to the scene of the man of sin is said to be "according to the working ['energizing'] of Satan and in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and in all deceit of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order to their being saved." Such is the imposition of the lawless one in the exercise of Satan's power and falsehood. Upon those who are perishing, having rejected the love of the truth—the opposite of Satan's falsehood—God is Himself sending a working of error in order that they should believe the lie, to the end that all may be judged who rejected the truth and found pleasure in that

which is opposed to truth. What is latent evil in these Christ-rejectors is brought out into a place of obvious recognition, that there may be none to question the righteousness of that judgment which comes upon them. This judgment is said to be due directly to the fact that they believed the lie —the original lie which repudiates the God of all truth and rejects His benevolent purpose. This lie becomes the *I will* of the creature against the will of the Creator to whom all obedience, deference, and submission belong. These two possible courses of action—agreement or disagreement with God—are presented by the Apostle John, when writing on the general theme of the cure of the Christian's sin, in these words: "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth" (1 John 1:6). *The truth* is something to be done, and to fail to do the truth is to perform, or commit, a lie by action. In its mad adjustment to Satan's philosophy of life and purpose apart from God, the whole world is enacting the lie, and their judgment must be that which falls on Satan and all who repudiate God.

II. Satan's Sinfulness

In this universe there are "heights and depths" which might hinder a child of God (Rom. 8:39). In relation to wisdom and knowledge concerning God, there are depths (Rom. 11:33; 1 Cor. 2:10). In the love of God there are both heights and depths (Eph. 3:18). The term *depths* is most suggestive and is used, with but one exception, to represent the realities which are hidden in God, the exception being found in Revelation 2:24 where there is reference to the *deep* things of Satan. Satanic doctrine is in view as in 1 Timothy 4:1, where *doctrines of demons* are mentioned. Naturally, Satan's doctrine does not run in the way of redemption through Christ's death or the exalted position secured by being in the resurrected Christ. Satan's doctrine exalts self and directs in the way of Cain, or self-promoted righteousness. It is a way of life wholly independent of God whatever elements of truth it may borrow or incorporate. Satan's original God-rejecting sin has spawned into the dimensions which embrace the fallen angels and the whole human family in its hundreds of generations. For the fallen angels there is no hope; but for fallen humanity a gospel of divine grace, made possible through the blood of Christ, is provided. By the grace of God the saved one is returned to right relations with God.

Satan holds the unenviable title of chief of all sinners. He is the original sinner. He has wrought the most injury. He has practiced sin longer than any

other. He sinned against the greatest light. Only God can compute the extent and hideous character of Satan's sinfulness. Yet this very sin is of such a nature that the so-called self-made man of the world would extol it. It is the thing which the unregenerate claim to be their personal right, when they live on in independence of God. A partial record of the indictments which God brings against Satan is here appended:

- (1) He repudiated God in the beginning (Isa. 14:12–14).
- (2) He drew a third part of the stars of heaven after him (Rev. 12:4).
- (3) He sinned from the beginning (1 John 3:8).
- (4) He is a liar from the beginning (John 8:44).
- (5) In the Garden of Eden he belittled God and advised the first parents to repudiate God (Gen. 3:1–5).
- (6) He insinuated to Jehovah that Job loved and served Him only as he was hired to do so (Job 1:9). No greater insult could be addressed to Jehovah than that He is not really to be loved on the ground of His own worthiness, but, being rich, is able to hire men like Job to *pretend* that they love Him.
- (7) When permitted to act his own part, Satan brought five terrible calamities on Job (Job 1:13–2:7).
- (8) He stood up against Israel (1 Chron. 21:1; Ps. 109:6; Zech. 3:1–2).
- (9) He weakened the nations (Isa. 14:12).
- (10) He made the earth to tremble (Isa. 14:16).
- (11) He did shake kingdoms (Isa. 14:16).
- (12) He makes the world a wilderness (Isa. 14:17).
- (13) He destroys the cities thereof (Isa. 14:17).
- (14) He opened not the house of his prisoners (Isa. 14:17).
- (15) He causes war on earth with all its horrors; for when bound, war ceases, and when loosed, war is resumed (Rev. 20:2, 7–8).
- (16) He tempted the Son of God forty days and then left Him but for a season. He proposed to Christ that He forsake His mission, that He distrust His Father's goodness, and that He worship the devil (Luke 4:1–13).
- (17) He bound a daughter of Abraham eighteen years (Luke 13:16; cf. Acts 10:38).
- (18) He entered Judas and prompted him to betray the Son of God (John 13:2).
- (19) He blinds the minds of those who are lost (2 Cor. 4:3–4).
- (20) He takes away the Word out of the hearts of the unsaved, lest they should believe and be saved (Luke 8:12).

(21) He deals with saints with wiles and snares (Eph. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:26).

(22) He has exercised and abused the power of death (Heb. 2:14; cf. Rev. 1:18).

(23) He, an adversary, as a roaring lion goeth about seeking whom he may devour (1 Pet. 5:8).

(24) He is opposed to God; is the persecutor of saints, the “father” of lies. Through his emissaries he dethrones reason, tortures human beings, and moves them to superstition and idolatry.

Dr. William Cooke writes with great clearness of the depravity of Satan and his angels:

The law of dependency is universal, because God alone is the fountain of all being and of all good. Every creature, however high in the scale of existence, is dependent on God, not only for its being, but for its goodness; and therefore its goodness or holiness can be perpetuated only by union with Him. Sin severs the soul from God; and severed from him, the soul is deprived of his favour, and of his strength to uphold it in virtue and goodness; and deprived of his favour and sustaining power, it is thrown upon itself, and becomes actuated by its own selfish instinct; and as selfishness becomes intensified, there is no sin, however deep in guilt and malignity, that may not grow out of it. Such has been the direct effect of the apostasy of angels. The selfishness which engendered the first sin has, during the lapse of ages, produced and developed every malignant principle which now so darkly stains their condition. Hatred of God produces hatred of all good—of all good in itself, and of all beings that are good, and of envy at their happiness. From hatred and envy springs the desire to corrupt whatever is good, and destroy whatever is happy. This desire seeks its end by stratagem, deceit, and all available means within reach. The archfiend is called “Satan,” which means an adversary; “The old serpent,” because of his guile; “A liar,” “a liar from the beginning,” “the father of lies,” and “when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own.” He is called “Apollyon,” which means Destroyer, because he delighteth in destroying the souls of men, and “goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.” Not only is he a destroyer, but “a murderer,” a murderer of both bodies and souls; all his arts of seduction having murder as its ultimate object. All the sin and misery of our world for six thousand years, and all the sin and misery of its future history, and all the misery of hell, is not only the result of his agency and influence, but results in which he and his minions find their gratification.— *Christian Theology*, pp. 631–32

The power of Satan and his fallen angels is limited. They are but finite creatures who can do nothing outside the permissive will of God. Satan could do nothing against Job (and this was his complaint) until divinely permitted to do so. Satan and his angels are in possession of great knowledge, but they are not omniscient; they have vast power, when permitted to employ it, but they are not omnipotent; they cover the world by their delegated responsibility, but they are not omnipresent. They can suggest evil, but cannot coerce the will of another creature. They may spread snares and devices to ruin the children of God, but they cannot compel any other being to comply with their designs. They have power over nature when permitted to use it, but they can create nothing, nor can

they employ God's creation other than as He decrees. They never defeated God. In truth, God uses Satan as an instrument to chasten and correct the erring saints (Luke 22:31–32; 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20). The knowledge of these limitations cannot but be a comfort to those Christians who take seriously their conflict with the powers of darkness.

Chapter VII

SATANOLOGY: THE SATANIC *COSMOS*

THE PRESENT division of satanology is a theme of vast proportions—incomprehensible, unrecognized, and unidentified. To an extent which seems to have no parallel in the Bible, this great body of truth is represented by one word, which word—κόσμος (‘cosmos’)—is found in the New Testament 187 times and is translated in every instance, but one, by the English word *world*. No moment need be given to the closely related fact that the English word *world* is also a translation of two other Greek terms—αἰών, in its various forms and having a time meaning, 41 times; and οἰκουμένη, meaning an inhabited district, 14 times. Of these two additional words, the latter has no bearing upon the present consideration; but the former, when referring to the present age, carries with it the important disclosure that this age is *evil* in character. It was the reprehensible sin of Demas (2 Tim. 4:10) not only that he forsook the Apostle, but that he loved the age that now is. His love was not going out to a period of time as such, but to the evil which characterizes that time (cf. Gal. 1:4; Rom. 12:2; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:2; 6:12).

In his second Epistle, the Apostle Peter mentions three phases of the world or earth—(a) the world before the flood, or “the world that then was” (3:5–6); (b) “the heavens and the earth, which are now” (3:7); and (c) the “new heavens and a new earth” that are yet to be (3:13). The *cosmos* of the New Testament concerns only the world that now is.

Lexicographers agree that *cosmos* means ‘order, regularity, disposition, and arrangement,’ and that, as Exodus 33:4–6 and Isaiah 49:18, etc. are translated by the LXX, the meaning is extended to imply ornamentation. The idea of order and arrangement inheres in the Hebrew text of Genesis 1:1, God having created a perfect order or *cosmos*, which for some unrevealed cause became *chaos*—the opposite to *cosmos* (cf. Isa. 34:11; Jer. 4:23). Investigation will prove that the LXX, though employing *cosmos* as a translation of the idea of ornamentation (and once in the New Testament—1 Pet. 3:3), never uses *cosmos* to translate the thought of world. The translation of ‘world’ by *cosmos* is peculiar to the New Testament and presents a wholly new revelation in the progress of doctrine. The etymological development is from that which represents *order* in the arrangement of things to the contemplation of humanity in its relation to those things, and, following the fall, as separate from, and foreign to, God, being under

authority which is antigod. An attentive consideration of the 186 uses of *cosmos*, where it is translated ‘world,’ will reveal that in every instance where moral values are involved, the sphere of satanic influence and authority is indicated. The New Testament conception of *the world* is that it is opposed to God as worldliness is opposed to spirituality. Though he may have a vague notion that so-called *worldliness* is contrary to God, the inattentive Bible reader apparently thinks of the world, as mentioned in the Scriptures, as merely a place of abode, a planet whereon both good and evil are equally at home. The truth that the great portion of instances where *cosmos* is used in the New Testament invests that which the term represents with an antigod character, cannot but be a surprise to many. They, as are all the world, being under the delusion of Satan’s deception, are unaware of the revelation which the word *cosmos* conveys. The darkness of the *cosmos* is implied when Christ said, “I am come a light into the world” (*cosmos*—John 12:46). Thus, likewise, it is promised of the Spirit that He would “reprove the world” (*cosmos*—John 16:8). To the believer it is said, “In the world [*cosmos*] ye shall have tribulation” (John 16:33). And, again, “They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world” (*cosmos*—John 17:14). Thus equally definite is the word of Christ, “The world [*cosmos*] hath not known thee” (the Father—John 17:25). Similarly, “My kingdom is not of this world” (*cosmos*—John 18:36). Certain other short phrases are most expressive: “Sin entered into the world” (*cosmos*—Rom. 5:12); “That ... all the world [*cosmos*] may become guilty” (Rom. 3:19); “The world [*cosmos*] by wisdom knew not God” (1 Cor. 1:21); “The fornicators of this world” (*cosmos*—1 Cor. 5:10); “That we should not be condemned with the world” (*cosmos*—1 Cor. 11:32); “Without God in the world” (*cosmos*—Eph. 2:12); “Keep himself unspotted from the world” (*cosmos*—James 1:27); “The corruption that is in the world” (*cosmos*—2 Pet. 1:4); “Escaped the pollutions of the world” (*cosmos*—2 Pet. 2:20).

The *cosmos* is a vast order or system that Satan has promoted, which conforms to his ideals, aims, and methods. It is civilization now functioning apart from God—a civilization in which none of its promoters really expect God to share, who assign to God no consideration in respect to their projects; nor do they ascribe any causativity to Him. This system embraces its godless governments, conflicts, armaments, jealousies, its education, culture, religions of morality, and pride. It is that sphere in which man lives. It is what he sees, what he employs. To the uncounted multitude it is all they ever know so long as they live on this earth. It is properly styled *the satanic system*, which phrase is in

many instances a justified interpretation of the so-meaningful word, *cosmos*. It is literally a *cosmos diabolicus*.

A vital revelation is presented by the words, “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world [*cosmos*], that we might live through him” (1 John 4:9). It is further revealed that this great mission on the part of the Son is due to the truth that “God so loved the world [*cosmos*], that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16). In this passage, as almost no other, a restricted use of the term *cosmos* is presented; not restricted, as the Limited Redemptionist demands, to the elect of this age, but restricted to humanity itself apart from its evil institutions, practices, and relationships. God loved the lost people who make up the *cosmos* and this love was great enough to move Him to give His only begotten Son, in providing a way of salvation through Him so complete that by believing on the Son as Savior the lost of this *cosmos* might not perish but have everlasting life. It is also true that the spiritual Christian will experience this divine compassion for a lost *cosmos* in so far as, by the Spirit, the love of God is shed abroad in his heart.

Over against this revelation concerning a worthy divine love for the *cosmos*, is the instruction given to Christians relative to their love of the *cosmos*. It is written: “Love not the world [*cosmos*], neither the things that are in the world [*cosmos*]. If any man love the world [*cosmos*], the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world [*cosmos*], the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” (*cosmos*—1 John 2:15–16). A disagreement is apparent. God loves the *cosmos*, yet if the believer loves the *cosmos* the love of the Father is not reproduced in him. Naturally, the solution of the problem is found in the precise meaning of the word *cosmos* as thus employed. While, as has been stated, God’s love is for humanity apart from its evil institutions, the believer is warned not to love the institutions which are wholly evil in God’s estimation and are not, therefore, loved by Him. This evil *cosmos* is the very thing from which the Christian has been saved. No restriction is imposed in 1 John 2:15–16 that would preclude the child of God from loving nature, or that which has not come under the satanic authority. James writes most clearly when he says, “Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world [*cosmos*] is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world [*cosmos*] is the enemy of God” (James 4:4).

Satan has created nothing. The order and system of God’s material creation

are involved in the *cosmos* only as Satan has been permitted to assume authority and is misdirecting it. The *cosmos* manifestations are almost wholly those which arise from misguided, Satan-governed humanity in their blind subscription to principles of life and action which are outworkings of the original *lie*. Creation itself is affected by the fall (Rom. 8:19–23), but it retains the character which God gave it and is never the property of another. In this same connection it is noteworthy that the present age, as referred to in Matthew 13:11, is the kingdom in its “mystery” form. Any rule of God at any time is *kingdom* in its character. He is now ruling only to the extent that those things which are termed *mysteries* and which constitute the peculiar features of His own purpose in this age are being realized. More of this important subject will appear under Eschatology.

It is significant that of the 187 uses of *cosmos* in the New Testament, Christ employed the term more than all others together. The word occurs 68 times in John’s Gospel and 23 times in his first Epistle. Christ used the word *cosmos* 41 times in His Upper Room Discourse and 19 times in His priestly prayer as recorded in John, chapter 17. It is as though the reality of the essential character of the *cosmos* is made emphatic in ratio to the exalted point from which it is viewed and by the holy character of the One who views it. If, as has been suggested, the Upper Room Discourse corresponds to the holy place in the temple and the priestly prayer to the holy of holies, it is not only noticeable that the Holy One is conscious of the real meaning of the word *cosmos*, but, as the revelation of truth is intensified, the disclosures concerning the opposing satanic system are multiplied. To Christians who are taught of God and who, to some extent, have the mind of Christ, the *cosmos diabolicus* should appear in its essential, evil character to be the outworking of that lie which moves in independence of God and is opposed to the purposes of God. The whole truth regarding the nature and extent of this satanic *cosmos* or system, is found in the Scriptures wherein this system is mentioned. This revelation is subject to certain divisions:

I. Satan’s Authority Over the *Cosmos*

Startling and almost incredible statements are made in the New Testament relative to Satan’s rights and control over the *cosmos*. This disclosure is foreign to the popular mind. Even the believer who is amenable to the Scriptures finds himself confronted with statements which seem impossible, were they not written down by the hand of God. It may be assumed that Satan will do all in his

power to avoid a worthy understanding of these stupendous truths on the part of any human being. Certain major passages should be examined with due attention:

Luke 4:5–7. This passage, taken from the record of the threefold temptation of Christ by Satan, reads thus: “And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine.”

The method Satan employed in bringing the panorama of the earthly kingdoms in a moment of time before Christ is most arresting. At once the entire procedure advances beyond the realms of humanity’s experiences and resources, and functions in the realities of another sphere. Seeing all the kingdoms of the world from one mountain and in a moment of time connotes things supernatural. There is room for thought, also, in the assertion that Satan took the Lord anywhere and for any reason. There are forces at work here which the mind of man cannot comprehend. Yet the amazing feature of this revelation is the declaration by Satan, which declaration Christ did not brand as an untruth, that the kingdoms of this *cosmos* (cf. Matt. 4:8 for the specific use of *cosmos*) are delivered unto Satan and to whomsoever he wills he gives them. It is predicted that at some future time the world-rule will be conferred by Satan on the man of sin, which fact tends to strengthen Satan’s claim to the disposition of these kingdoms. It has been a rather common method of dealing with this Scripture to say that Satan presented to Christ no more than the territory of Palestine; but at that time Palestine was a very minor portion of the government of Rome and could not itself answer to the kingdoms of this world. Likewise, it has been assumed that this offer on Satan’s part is but one of Satan’s falsehoods; but had it been an untruth there would have been no temptation in the offer to the One from whom no deception could ever be hidden. Nor, had it been an untruth, would the answer of the Son of God have been confined to Satan’s shocking request that worship be given by the Son of God to a creature of His own hand. It should not be forgotten in this connection that all authorities and powers in spirit-realms were created by the very One to whom Satan was speaking (Col. 1:16). Whether it be consonant with human reason or not, the plain word of inspired truth lends full support to the idea that earthly governments are in the hands of Satan. History records many instances where it is not difficult to believe that Satan was guiding the action and destiny of certain governments. It

is more a problem how to accept this satanic claim in connection with governments which are commendable in the eyes of men; but Satan's method is not one of eliminating all that is good. It is evidently true that all human governments, however they appear to men, are run in independence of God.

Satan's assertion in this passage is twofold: (a) the dominion of the whole *cosmos* is delivered unto him, which must mean that divine permission is given to this end, and (b) Satan gives the kingdoms to whomsoever he wills. Doubtless this last assertion is true from Satan's own point of view, but it is as certain, also, that every such bestowment is within the sovereign purpose of God. It still remains true that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1). As elsewhere, God is seen to be sovereign over all, and yet the creature is permitted to go on in willful and evil ways and to become guilty thereby.

John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11. The revelation that Satan is in authority over the *cosmos* does not rest alone upon his own claim. Christ referred to Satan as the *prince of this cosmos*. The record reads: "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John 12:31); "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me" (John 14:30); "Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:11). Again, by the authority which belongs to all Scripture, the Apostle writes of Satan as "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. 2:2), and as "the god of this world" ('age'—2 Cor. 4:4). To the same end, the Apostle, when writing of the Christian's conflict against evil powers (Eph. 6:12), states that this warfare is against—not *the rulers of the darkness of this world* as in the Authorized Version, which statement would confine them only to such darkness as exists—*age-rulers of this darkness*, implying that this age is all darkness in itself and has over it specific evil rulers. Thus faithfully the inspired Word of God directs all its testimony to the one truth that the *cosmos* is ruled by evil powers. Bearing the same message, the ascended Lord spoke to the church in Pergamos: "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat ['throne'] is" (Rev. 2:13). While the extent of Satan's authority is not defined in this passage, it does state that Satan occupies an earthly throne. Lastly, when magnifying the superior power of the Holy Spirit, who indwells every believer, as in contrast to Satan's power, the Apostle John declares: "Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (*cosmos*—1 John 4:4). The specific phrase, *in the world*, identifies the sphere of the exercise of Satan's power. Much added light as to the relationship between

Satan and the *cosmos* is also gained from the following passage:

1 John 5:19. This decisive passage reads, “And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” The world here mentioned is *cosmos*—the entire *cosmos*. The two members of this sentence comprehend the whole human family. “We are of God” is a recognition of the truth that Christians are *in* the world, but not a part of that which pertains to it. The point in view, however, is discovered in the second averment, namely, *The whole world* [entire *cosmos*] *lieth in the wicked one*. The translation of πορνῆα by *wickedness*, as in the Authorized Version, is unsatisfactory. The translation of this word as used in 1 John 2:13–14; 5:18 demands the same in 5:19. The same correction is demanded in John 17:15. The identity is clear, being none other than *diabolos*, to whom direct reference is made in 1 John 3:8, 10. That the entire *cosmos lieth in* the wicked one is a revelation which is both unusual and far-reaching. The words “lieth in” convey the truth that the *cosmos* is both located in, and under the power of, the evil one. Dean Alford states: “*The wicked one* is as it were the inclusive abiding-place and representative of all his, as, in the expressions ‘*in the Lord*,’ ‘*in Christ*,’ ‘*in Christ Jesus*,’ ‘*we are in the true One*,’ ver. 20, the Lord is of His. And while we are *from God*, implying a birth and a proceeding forth and a change of state, the *world*, all the rest of mankind, *lieth in the wicked one*, remains where it was, in, and in the power of, *the wicked one*. Some Commentators have been anxious to avoid inconsistency with such passages as ch. 2:2, 4:14, and would therefore give **the world** a different meaning here. But there is no inconsistency whatever. Had not Christ become a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, were He not the Saviour of the whole world, none could ever come out of the world and believe on Him; but as it is, they who do believe on Him, come out and are separated from the world: so that our proposition here remains strictly true: the *world* is the negation of faith in Him, and as such lies in the wicked one, His adversary” (*New Testament for English Readers*, new ed., Vol. II, Pt. II, pp. 917–18). It is likewise the teaching of Pope and Moulton in Schaff’s Commentary that the wicked one “holds the entire world, so far as the new life has not transformed it, in his power. It is not said that the world is ‘of the wicked one.’ ... The men of the world are ‘in him that is false’; but the ‘in’ is not used in its bare simplicity, but ‘lieth in,’ a phrase nowhere else occurring, and to be interpreted according to the tenor of the Epistle. The ‘whole world’ is not, however, the men of the world only; but its entire constitution, its entire economy, its lusts and principles and motives, and course and end; all that is not ‘of God’ lies in the power and bondage of the wicked one. This the apostle adds

as an old truth, never so fearfully expressed as here” (cited by Gerhart, *Institutes*, p. 708). The conclusion in this passage, as in all others bearing on the relationship indicated, is that the whole *cosmos*—from which some have been saved—is located in, and under the power of, *diabolos*.

Isaiah 14:12, 16–17; Job 1:13–19; 2:7. Turning to the sixfold indictment against Satan recorded in Isaiah and the fivefold record chronicled in Job concerning Satan’s influence upon, and ascendancy over, mundane things, it will be seen that the divinely permitted exercise of his power results in accomplishments too vast for the human mind to grasp. These eleven stupendous achievements of Satan are to be considered apart from those more remote manifestations of Satan’s power recorded in Revelation 12:4, 15, and of the exercise of his power through the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:9–10), and through the two beasts of Revelation 13:1–17.

It is written in Isaiah, chapter 14, that Satan, under the title of *Lucifer, son of the morning* and with reference to a yet future time when his mighty deeds will have been accomplished, (1) did *weaken the nations*. In the Word of God the nations, as such, are seen to be opposed to God (Ps. 2:1–3), and especially as in contradistinction to the one elect nation, Israel. These nations form the essential factor in the *cosmos*. What they might have been, had they not embraced the satanic ideals, none can estimate but God alone. Whatever their brute strength may be as self-measured, they are before God as “a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance” (to be blown away). “All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him as less than nothing, and vanity” (Isa. 40:15, 17). Thus, also, it is written in Isaiah 14:16–17: (2) that Satan, at the end of his evil career, will have *made the earth to tremble*; (3) he will have *shaken kingdoms*; (4) he will have *made the world a wilderness*; (5) he will have *destroyed the cities thereof*; and (6) he will have hindered the benefits of humanity to the extent that he has *not opened the house of his prisoners*. Imagination fails to follow these undertakings and can add nothing to what is here set forth. The sum total of all the evil Satan will have wrought is beyond estimation. With the same disclosure in view, it is written that, when having secured the permission of Jehovah concerning Job, Satan displayed a fivefold power over creation in the exercise of his evil purposes: (7) he caused the raiding Sabians to destroy Job’s oxen and asses and to kill Job’s servants with the sword; (8) he caused fire to descend from heaven and to burn up the sheep and the servants who tended them; (9) he caused the Chaldeans to rob Job of his camels and to kill the servants; (10) he caused the death of all of Job’s children

by a wind from the wilderness which crushed the house in which they were assembled; and (11) he smote Job with the most grievous bodily suffering he could impose. To this he doubtless would have added death for Job, had not Jehovah restrained him. That he was told by Jehovah *not* to destroy Job, is evidence that he both *could* have done so and *would* have done so had this restraint been lifted. At this point the entire field of revelation with respect to Satan's power over the physical welfare of human beings is naturally introduced, which theme cannot be pursued here.

II. The *Cosmos* is Wholly Evil

This is indeed a hard saying. Though it be true, it calls for elucidation. Satan does incorporate into his vast system certain things which are good in themselves. Many humanitarian ideals, morals, and aspects of culture are consonant with spiritual realities, though resident in the *cosmos*. The root evil in the *cosmos* is that in it there is an all-comprehensive order or system which is methodized on a basis of complete independence of God. It is a manifestation of all that Satan can produce as a complete exhibition of that which enters into the original lie. It is the consummating display of that which the creature—both angelic and human—can produce, having embarked on an autonomous career. The *cosmos* is not a battleground whereon God is contending with Satan for supremacy; it is a thing which God has permitted, that the lie may have its fullest unveiling. It is reasonable to suppose that the *cosmos* represents the supreme effort of the supreme creature, and that as it began with the repudiation of God, it has maintained its intended segregation from the will and purpose of God. That things good in themselves are included in this great system is doubtless the occasion for many deceptions. The fundamental truth that “whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23; cf. Heb. 11:6) is not recognized or believed in the *cosmos*. *The lie* must run its course that it may be judged, not as a mere hypothesis or incipient venture, but in the complete and final exhibition of its antigod character. It began with the repudiation of God by angel and man and maintains that distinctive trait until Antichrist appears and is destroyed. The humanitarian enterprises, the culture, the laws, and religious forms of the *cosmos* constitute no evidence that God is recognized in His true position or honored. This is a Christ-rejecting *cosmos*. Its princes “crucified the Lord of glory” (1 Cor. 2:8), and apart from the restraining power of God they would crucify Him again and destroy His witnesses. They evince no penitence for their climactic racial

crime—the Savior, as such, is still disowned and rejected. Social ideals are borrowed from His teachings. His purity and grace are held forth as a pattern of life, but salvation through His blood is spurned. The independent, self-centered, self-satisfied, autonomous *cosmos* asks for no redemption since it recognizes no need. It is the embodiment of the philosophy of which Cain is the archetype. What God sees on the human side of the *cosmos* is described in Romans 3:9–18. Here the divine charge against fallen men is infinitely accurate and decisive: “As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one” (3:10–12). Certainly God is not deceived as to Satan’s purposes. Did He not uncover those secrets at the beginning (Isa. 14:13; Ezek. 28:15)? A *cosmos* which crucifies its Redeemer, hates those who are redeemed as it hates the Savior (John 15:18–19), and loves darkness rather than light, will hardly delude or outwit the Almighty. It is to be judged and destroyed completely. No attempt will be made to salvage anything out of it when its day of demolition arrives. The following passages are a sufficient testimony to the evil character of the *cosmos*: “Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world [*cosmos*]” (2 Pet. 1:4); “For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world [*cosmos*] through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning” (2 Pet. 2:20); “Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world” (*cosmos*—James 1:27); “Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world [*cosmos*] is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world [*cosmos*] is the enemy of God” (James 4:4); “For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world” (*cosmos*—1 John 5:4); “Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world [*cosmos*] cometh, and hath nothing in me” (John 14:30); “And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world” (*cosmos*—1 John 4:3). In like manner, the believer is said to have been delivered from the present evil age (Gal. 1:4) and “delivered ... from the power of darkness” (Col. 1:13), and is not to be conformed to this age (Rom. 12:2).

III. Satan's Undertakings in the *Cosmos*

This extensive theme reappears in a later division of satanology and therefore is curtailed here. He who began with the purpose to be “like the most High,” has never abandoned that ideal. That in some respects Satan attempts the works of God becomes but one more feature of his great deception. The works of the satanic order are clearly outlined in several descriptive passages, which also present that which is highest in ideal, and deepest in motive in the Satan-energized mass of humanity. One passage, alone, contains the entire revelation: “For all that is in the world [*cosmos*], the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world” (*cosmos*—1 John 2:16). The satisfaction of these same cravings was the temptation placed before Eve in the Garden: “And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat” (Gen. 3:6). The real nature of these cravings is easily recognized as being wholly self-centered and without thought of God.

All “wars and fightings” (James 4:1) among men are only a natural result of the evil qualities of this great federation. Jesus said to Pilate: “My kingdom is not of this world [*cosmos*]: if my kingdom were of this world [*cosmos*], then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence” (John 18:36). It is a noticeable fact that the governments of the world depend upon physical power and a display of armament to maintain their position and authority, and the superior law of love is not adapted to, or understood by, the elements that make up the *cosmos*.

IV. The Things of the *Cosmos*

All earthly property is of the satanic order, which property the believer may use, but must not abuse: “But whoso hath this world’s good [*cosmos*] and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?” (1 John 3:17). “And the cares of this world [lit., ‘age’], and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful” (Mark 4:19). “But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world [*cosmos*], as not abusing it” (1 Cor. 7:29–31).

James writes: “Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world [*cosmos*] rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?” (James 2:5). Here a needed change in translation reveals much. James did not say *the poor of this cosmos*, but rather *the poor as regards the cosmos*—all and whatever constitutes the *cosmos*, or that which it has to offer. This poverty is most honorable and should be the estate of every Christian.

V. Though Detained Here, Christians are Not of the *Cosmos*

Twice in His priestly prayer, Christ asserts of His redeemed ones, “They are not of the world [*cosmos*], even as I am not of the world” (*cosmos*—John 17:14, 16). Thus He declares again, “If the world [*cosmos*] hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world [*cosmos*], the world [*cosmos*] would love his own: but because ye are not of the world [*cosmos*], but I have chosen you out of the world [*cosmos*], therefore the world [*cosmos*] hateth you” (John 15:18–19). And the Apostle John states: “Marvel not, my brethren, if the world [*cosmos*] hate you” (1 John 3:13). Christians are sent into the *cosmos* (John 17:18) as those who have no relation to it other than to be His witnesses to it. They are *ambassadors* (2 Cor. 5:20), *strangers and pilgrims* (1 Pet. 2:11), and *citizens of heaven* (Phil. 3:20) with respect to this world system. Thus it is that God sees the Christian in relation to the *cosmos*.

Though Job belonged to a remote age, his experience presents a vivid illustration of Jehovah’s care over His own in respect to the attacks of Satan. In this narrative, Job is represented, not as one who needs to be punished for evil—that conception constituted the error of Job’s three friends, which error Jehovah so severely condemned at the end of Job’s trial—but as one who three times is declared by Jehovah to be “perfect” and “upright” (1:1, 8; 2:3). Satan’s complaint regarding Job is twofold: (a) Job is so completely protected that Satan cannot reach him, and (b) Job does not really love Jehovah. A salary is paid Job by Jehovah, Satan asserts, to hire Job to pretend that he loves Jehovah. Putting this challenge to an experimental test, Jehovah releases Job to the power of Satan. Until that time, as pointed out by Satan, Job is safe in Jehovah’s hand. The transfer from Jehovah’s hand to Satan’s hand is not without drastic limitation which Satan can in no wise overstep. To Job was given the privilege and honor of proving that Jehovah is worthy of all adoration, apart from His

benefits. The lie of Satan was completely exposed, to the glory of God.

VI. The Impotency of the *Cosmos*

The impotency and limitations of the world-order are most evident. Its leader, though mighty, is inferior to Christ: “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (*cosmos*—1 John 4:4). Its knowledge and understanding are limited: “Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world [*cosmos*] knoweth us not, because it knew him not” (1 John 3:1, R.V.). “Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man” (1 Cor. 2:14–15, R.V.). “There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God” (Rom. 3:11). “And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that perish: in whom the god of this world [marg., ‘age’] hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them” (2 Cor. 4:3–4, R.V.). “They are of the world [*cosmos*]: therefore speak they as of the world [*cosmos*], and the world [*cosmos*] heareth them” (1 John 4:5, R.V.).

VII. The End of the *Cosmos*

This specific theme pertains to Eschatology and will be attended more fully under that division of Systematic Theology. The fact that the *cosmos* comes to a complete termination and destruction is the testimony of both Testaments.

Psalms 2. In the prediction which this Psalm presents, the nations are seen in their last and diabolical rejection of Jehovah and His Messiah (cf. Rev. 16:13–14); yet, in spite of their combined resistance, Jehovah places His King upon David’s throne in Jerusalem, for such is the “holy hill of Zion.” The Son takes the government from the Father’s hand and dashes the nations in pieces like a potter’s vessel and with a rod of iron. Kings and rulers are admonished to secure right relations with the Christ before His awful judgments begin.

Daniel, chapters 2 and 7. In these prophecies concerning the course and end of the Gentile nations, God reveals the truth that they will be crushed and blown away as “the chaff of the summer threshingfloors,” and the King of kings will then reign over all the earth.

Matthew 25:31–46. The nations, wholly unable to resist the sovereign power of the King, are seen to assemble before Him, at which time He determines their destiny—one part to enter His earthly kingdom and the other consigned to the lake of fire prepared for the devil and his angels.

2 Thessalonians 1:7–10. The distinctive message of this passage is the utter destruction of all that enters into the *cosmos*.

Revelation, chapters 14–22. A right understanding of this extensive Scripture is imperative. Nothing here recorded could have been fulfilled in past history. The description enters more into detail as it sets forth, not a new theme, but that previously introduced in the Word of God. False religious pretense and apostasy from the truth of God along with the *cosmos* itself must come into final judgment, before the King takes His throne to reign in righteousness over the whole earth. Revelation 18:24 alone serves to identify this final destruction as the judgment of God on the whole *cosmos* and all it has ever wrought.

Most assuredly, then, that which God now tolerates for wise purposes is doomed to complete destruction. This is directly asserted: “For the fashion of this world [*cosmos*] passeth away” (1 Cor. 7:31); “And the world [*cosmos*] passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever” (1 John 2:17); “But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up” (2 Pet. 3:10).

Chapter VIII

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S MOTIVE

WHATEVER MAY have been the motive which has actuated Satan from the beginning of his career, there is a more fundamental problem which lies back of all the evil in the universe. It is the motive that has actuated God in permitting evil to be present at all. That He could have hindered it needs no defense, being, as He is, the Absolute One—Creator and Promoter of all that the universe comprises. Various suggestions have been advanced as solutions to this problem. Doubtless there is truth in all of them, and when all are assembled and accepted it is even more probable that the aggregation is no more than a fraction of all that actuates God. One of the obvious motives of God which has been advanced has immediate application to the theme in hand, namely, that, as seen in the various dispensations and in instances of personal relation to God, He evidently, and as a general rule of procedure, puts the propositions which the creature proposes to an experimental test. This Jehovah did in the case of Satan's assertion that Job, under sufficient stress, would repudiate Jehovah. This claim could have been denied, for Jehovah knew it to be untrue of Job. However, Satan was given authority to put the untruth to an experimental test. This method cost much indeed, but none will doubt that the victory gained was abundantly worth the price that was paid. It is possible that Job serves as a type or representation of the larger issues now being brought to consummation in the entire *cosmos*. This theme is extensive and proffers much light to the one who will follow it through the entire Bible.

Granting the truthfulness of the claim that God does put the creature's assumptions to an experimental test, it becomes clear that Satan's determination—which constituted his initial sin—to build a vast structure of independent relationships around himself as the center and wholly autonomous with respect to the Creator to whom all allegiance and obedience rightfully belong, was permitted of God to be tested experimentally to its bitter end. As for the wisdom of such a stupendous procedure on the part of God, no creature could ever be placed in a position where he could possess a sufficient number of related facts, or attain to a perspective, on the basis of which he could sit in judgment. The observable actualities point in but one direction: Satan did propose such a course; God could have hindered him, but He rather allowed Satan to take the course he desired to follow, and to allow that course to become, in the end, the

ground of its own universal condemnation. When Satan and his theory come up for final judgment and execution, “every mouth will be stopped” and all will be guilty—not alone in the light of God’s ideals, but as those who are absolutely guilty in the light of the colossal failure of the whole enterprise. The lie will be conceded to be a lie. How could willful, deluded, free-moral agents be brought to such a recognition apart from a demonstration which left no room for as much as one voice to be heard which might claim that the lie would have been proved to be the truth had it been allowed to demonstrate its own philosophy? Even strong delusion must be imposed upon men, it is said, to the end that they will carry the lie to its final consummation (2 Thess. 2:9–12). Not only will every mouth be stopped, but the whole world (*cosmos*) will become guilty before God (Rom. 3:19). A *guilty cosmos*, proved to be such to the extent that every mouth is stopped—even that of Satan himself—is a stupendous achievement. What such a conclusion may contribute to the felicity of the universe in eternity to come, none would attempt to declare. The lie incorporates all forms of creature rebellion against God, and the complete disillusionment of all fallen creatures and their judgment cannot but be an achievement which will contribute much to the peace and blessedness of future ages. Of Christ it is said that “he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” Even *death*, the penalty of the first human sin, will be destroyed, and to the end that “God may be all in all” (1 Cor. 15:24–28). In one instance, at least, the end will justify the means, and no creature of time may wisely offer a judgment on the *means*, when he is, of necessity, wholly incapable of comprehending the *end*.

The presence of sin and suffering in the world is too often looked upon as though here were strange intrusions into God’s perfect order, and God is often challenged for these intrusions. J. M. E. McTaggart says it is a “depressing and revolting belief that the destiny of the universe is at the mercy of a being who, with the resources of omnipotence at his disposal, decides to make the universe no better than this” (*Some Dogmas on Religion*, p. 220). Over against this is the revelation that all that is in the *cosmos* is of satanic origin and that God intrudes only as a Restrainer until the day of His judgment arrives, to take out of the *cosmos diabolicus* those whom His sovereign elective purpose chooses to redeem. The presence of sin and suffering is not God’s failure. They are the inevitable default and bankruptcy of the lie. Though its ramifications seem to reach out to infinity, there is but one lie. God either rules over His universe, or He does not. The lie declares that He does not; the *truth* declares that He does. Such a prodigious issue could not be treated with indifference. Its judgments are

sure.

In tracing through this one reason for the presence of sin and suffering in the *cosmos*, it is recognized that other reasons exist, which present even greater evidential value with respect to the righteousness of God in permitting sin to intrude. These are due to be attended under hamartiology.

Both the motive and the method of Satan are reflected precisely in the attitude and action of the man of sin, whom Satan will inspire, and through whom Satan expresses his own designs. In 2 Thessalonians 2:4 it is stated of the man of sin that he “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.” Satan’s purpose is to thwart the divine undertakings—especially the divine purpose to save the lost—and to exalt himself above God. It is implied that in his ambition Satan would attempt to seize upon the authority which belongs to God alone and that he would seek to be worshiped as God is, and should be, worshiped.

The central passage bearing on Satan’s motive is Isaiah 14:12–14. As has been observed, the five *I will*’s of Satan, though each has a specific objective, all converge in the last of the five, namely, *I will be like the most High*. The other four assert Satan’s intention to exalt himself in various ways, but only to the one end that he may be like the most High. As before demonstrated, there is but one way in which any creature—angel or man—may attempt to be like God, and that is to seek to be independent as God is independent. To do this, all divinely intended dependence of the creature on the Creator must be repudiated, and the one who thus acts must be committed to a career which self has devised and which self must maintain in complete separation from God until that course of action is ended. In all such enterprises, self-exaltation is paramount, and opposition to God is pursued only that the way may be clear for self to be glorified. Scripture distinctly states that it was self-esteem, or pride, which incited this greatest of all angels to launch out upon an independent course of action (Ezek. 28:17; 1 Tim. 3:6). It would seem to be indicated that he does not lose faith in his enterprise until that yet future time when he is cast out of heaven. Of Satan at that time it is written, “Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time” (Rev. 12:12).

The enormous project which was born in Satan’s mind and inspired by his self-exalting pride was, of necessity, confined to heavenly spheres until the creation of man. In those previous ages, it may be believed, Satan “trafficked” (cf. Ezek. 28:18) among the lesser angels to secure their allegiance to his

philosophy of freedom from, and independence of, the Creator. Upon the creation of man, there was opened to Satan the possibility of a vast demonstration in this new realm of his power to design and execute. The present *cosmos* is that which Satan proposed and which God is permitting him to execute to its tragic end.

Four milestones mark the way of Satan's course in willfulness:

(a) He said, "I will be like the most High." Of this, the origin of all wickedness, nothing further need be added at this point.

(b) He said to Adam and Eve, *Be as gods (Elohim)*, Gen. 3:5). How many angels had heard and heeded this suggestion none on earth may know. His advice was received and acted upon by the progenitors of the human race. By their own choice they incurred the penalty which the gracious warning of God had placed before them. He had said, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die (dying thou shalt die)*. No word of God can ever fail. Thus every form of death came upon these sinful creatures. Death in any form was an unknown intruder into this universe. It was not the divine penalty upon the sinful angels, but it fell upon man. A grievous aspect of this penalty is spiritual death which means separation of the human soul and spirit from God. This estate of the first parents has become the inheritance of all their children in all their generations. They belong to the *cosmos diabolicus*. Until they are redeemed by infinite grace, they share not only the works of the *cosmos*, but its satanic spirit of independence of God. Should one of this degenerate race desire to be in right relation to God, the first step is not merely to evince a willingness to be obedient to God in a general way, but it is required of him that he *obey* the gospel of divine salvation (Acts 5:32; Rom. 2:8; 2 Thess. 1:8; Heb. 5:9; 1 Pet. 4:17). Back of this requirement is the essential truth that a right relation to God is more than a repentance followed by divine forgiveness. Satisfaction to outraged holiness must be secured. This Christ has provided in His death, but it is not provided elsewhere and thus it is that Christ is the Way and the only Way to God from the hand of the evil one. The divinely provided cure is perfect beyond measure; for upon believing on Christ there is peace with God, forgiveness, regeneration with its imparted gift of eternal life, imputed righteousness, and justification. There is also the sure word of promise that the saved one will soon experience complete conformity to God the Son in glory. The satanic lie, "Ye shall be as gods (*Elohim*)," is proved to be a hideous deception, while the offers of divine grace present the assurance of final and lasting oneness with God and complete correspondence to all that God is and all that He desires. The lie becomes the

antipode of the truth to the last degree of reckoning. The lie ends in eternal ruin for those who pursue it; the truth ends in eternal felicity and rightness with God for the one who rests his all in Christ. It is a marvel of infinite grace that even one soul is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love (Col. 1:13). How tragic, indeed, is the present life and destiny of any human being who, though born into the lost estate, refuses divine grace and willfully continues to cast in his lot with the *antigod cosmos*—*cosmos diabolicus*—and goes on to share the doom of the enemy of God in the lake of fire!

But the plan of becoming as *Elohim* by merely assuming independence of God originated with Satan, and its proposal to Adam marks the course of Satan's unchanging purpose.

(c) When meeting the last Adam in the wilderness, Satan did not say, as he did to the first Adam, *Ye shall be as Elohim*; for Satan knows with no uncertainty that Jesus Christ is *God*. However, his master passion to be himself *like the most High* was expressed in the words, "Worship me." The wicked and presumptuous character of that request cannot be duplicated in the history of the universe, nor will it ever be duplicated in future ages. It is probable that at no place does the lie come into such manifestation of its false and wicked character as here, where it addresses itself directly to the One who is Truth. It was audacious beyond measure for Satan to solicit the cooperation of angels and man; but who will estimate the wickedness of the one who suggests that God the Creator become a suppliant at the feet of a creature of His own hand? Pride had evidently befogged the mind of this being to the point of angelic insanity, yet not an insanity which bespeaks irresponsibility. Out of and above all the experiences of the threefold temptation in the wilderness, the one truth is disclosed, namely, that Satan purposes to be *like the most High*.

(d) It is far from accidental that the last manifestation of Satan's lie is the man of sin—who is said to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, and who comes according to the energizing of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness—who is ever distinguished by the blasphemous assumption that he is God. In the first or earliest record of him he is described by these words: "Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God: ... Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD: Because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God; Behold, therefore I will bring strangers

upon thee, the terrible of the nations: and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness. They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the deaths of them that are slain in the midst of the seas. Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? but thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that slayeth thee” (Ezek. 28:2, 6–9). Twice this incarnation of Satan is referred to in Daniel (Dan. 7:8; 9:27). In the former passage he is characterized as the one with “a mouth speaking great things,” and in the latter passage he is said to be the one who causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease. This is precisely the testimony of the Apostle, who states of this one that he “sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (2 Thess. 2:4). Evidently the worship of Jehovah is terminated by this man of sin in order that he himself may be worshiped. Of this same person John writes: “And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev. 13:3–8). It is, therefore, to be expected that the blasphemous claim to be God and the demand that he be worshiped as God shall constitute the last chapter in the drama of iniquity; and it is that, according to the Apostle’s account recorded in 2 Thessalonians, chapter 2. It is equally as reasonable that Christ should indicate to the Jews that the appearance of this one “in the holy place” constitutes the sign of the end of their age and a signal to the Jews to flee for their safety (Matt. 24:15–22).

It is no greater mystery that God allows Satan to pursue his lie to its full consummation with his man of sin—the federator of nations—blaspheming to the extent that he claims to be God and requires, on the penalty of death, the worship of himself, which worship belongs to God alone, than that He allows the lie to have its beginning at all.

In pursuing the deeper aspects of all that may enter into Satan’s motive, it is suggested that, as has been presented, he is moved, first, by pride which is the

impelling cause of his unholy ambition. Second, Satan may be offended that a plan of salvation has been put into action by which his victims can be rescued and lifted to heights of glory to which no angel will ever attain. Dr. William Cooke quotes the following from Plutarch: “‘It was a very ancient opinion, that there are certain wicked and malignant demons, who envy good men, and endeavour to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers at least of greater happiness than they enjoy’” (*Christian Theology*, 5th ed., p. 628). That there is no redemption for himself or any other fallen angel, cannot but create jealousy and offense, and engender hatred on Satan’s part toward God and His saints. And, third, Satan apparently cannot recognize any other basis of relationship on the part of the creature to God than that of personal merit, which basis was that upon which all creatures stood at the beginning. The issue of personal merit formed the very ground of Satan’s authority in his defense of the throne of God. The whole operation of divine grace became an intrusion into, if not an encroachment upon, that principle upon which Satan was originally appointed to act. That otherwise doomed creatures may, by faith in a crucified and risen Savior, be constituted righteous to the degree of the perfect righteousness of God, which Christ is, must be most disconcerting and obnoxious to Satan. His ideal is ever reflected in his ministers who are said to be “ministers of [personal] righteousness” (2 Cor. 11:13–15). It is concerning this gospel of grace by which lost men may be saved, that Satan has cast a veil over the minds of all unregenerate human beings “lest the light of the glorious gospel ... should shine unto them” (2 Cor. 4:4). Every observing soul-winner is sooner or later impressed with the more than natural inability of the unsaved to comprehend the offer of salvation apart from human merit and by faith alone. Writing specifically of the veil which Satan casts over the minds of men, F. C. Jennings states: “He so weaves the course of this age: its religious forms, ceremonies, external decencies, respectabilities, and conventionalities as to form a thick veil, that entirely hides ‘*the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus*, ’ which consists in righteous mercy to penitent sinners only. This veil is not formed by evil-living, depravity, or any form of what passes as evil amongst men; but by cold formality, heartless decency, proud self-complacency, highly esteemed external respectability, and we must add, church-membership—all without *Christ*. It is the most fatal of all delusions, the thickest of all veils, and the most common. It is the way that because it *is* religious, respectable, decent ‘*seems right unto a man but the end thereof is death*’; for there is no Christ, no Lamb of God, no Blood of Atonement in it” (*Satan*, pp. 29–30).

It yet remains to be seen more fully that, in his opposition to God, Satan enters into things religious.

Chapter IX

SATANOLOGY: SATAN'S METHOD

AT THE BEGINNING of this division of satanology it should be restated with emphasis that Satan's dominant purpose is not, as the popular impression supposes, one of attempting to be *unlike* God. Satan has explicitly asserted concerning himself, as recorded in Isaiah 14:14, that his transcendent objective is to be *like* the Most High. In a previous phase of this discussion Satan's design has been traced through history and prophecy and the conclusion of this record is that there can be no reasonable question but that, from his earliest intention to its last manifestation—when the man of sin, the son of perdition asserts that he is God—Satan is impelled by but one intention. How essential in Satan's estimation the worship of the man of sin will be, may be seen from the revelation that the man of sin will demand the worship of the people of the earth on the penalty of death (Rev. 13:15).

The unregenerate masses of humanity are said to be deceived by Satan. Their delusion is both tragic and pitiable. They are imposed upon by Satan's subterfuge, treachery, and fraud. There is no abiding substance in any objective upon which they set their hopes. With discriminating recognition the Scriptures declare that Satan's deceptions affect merely the human element in the *cosmos*, and not the entire system of things which the *cosmos* embraces. Thus the word *cosmos* is not employed in connection with these deceptions. The term οἰκουμένη, meaning the inhabitants of the earth, or the designation, *the nations*, is used. It is written of the inhabited earth in Revelation 12:9, "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world ['inhabited earth']: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." Likewise, in Revelation 13:14 the deceptions are said to reach "them that dwell on the earth." Then, also, in Revelation 20:3, 8, 10, Satan's deceptions are said to reach to all nations—including all people of the earth—excepting such individuals as are saved. To the same end it is written again of Satan's power as exercised by the man of sin, that it will be "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them [all of them] that perish" (2 Thess. 2:10). In this dark picture there is no hope, within themselves, of a fallen, Christ-rejecting race. Speaking of the future of fallen men, it is written: "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (2 Tim. 3:13). In the light of all this disclosure, the dreams of religious guides who

predict a transformed, regenerated *cosmos* as a result of human effort in Christian service are seen to be without foundation. Satan's deceptions continue until he is bound and consigned to the abyss. But who will bind Satan and place him in that prison? In the interest of divine righteousness, the dissolution of the *cosmos* and the disillusion of the lie must reach the ends predicted when all will be destroyed in the zenith of its wickedness. It is only then that the King shall reign and prosper. It is then, and only then, that righteousness and peace shall cover the earth as waters cover the face of the deep. What form of deception has seized good men that they should fail to see the uncomplicated teaching of the Bible with respect to the course and end of evil? The stupendous realities represented in the *cosmos diabolicus* are not said to be transformable. When God declares, as He does, that the *cosmos diabolicus* is to continue with increasing deception and to continue to the embodiment of the lie until it is crushed by the infinite power of the returning King, there is little ground for any attempts to save it or to transform it. Indeed, Christians are exhorted to be instant in season and out of season in the saving of *individuals*; but that is far removed as an objective from the attempted rescue of that which God has doomed to destruction and that which by its very nature is antigod.

Next to the lie itself, the greatest delusion Satan imposes—reaching to all unsaved and to a large proportion of Christians—is the supposition that only such things as society considers evil could originate with the devil—if, indeed, there be any devil to originate anything. It is not the reason of man, but the revelation of God, which points out that governments, morals, education, art, commercialism, vast enterprises and organizations, and much of religious activity are included in the *cosmos diabolicus*. That is, the system which Satan has constructed includes all the good which he can incorporate into it and be consistent in the thing he aims to accomplish. A serious question arises whether the presence of gross evil in the world is due to Satan's intention to have it so, or whether it indicates Satan's inability to execute all he has designed. The probability is great that Satan's ambition has led him to undertake more than any creature could ever administer. Revelation declares that the whole *cosmos-system* must be annihilated—not its evil alone, but *all* that is in it, both good and bad. God will incorporate nothing of Satan's failure into that kingdom which He will set up in the earth. The *cosmos diabolicus* must be “broken in pieces” and become like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors which the wind carries away, and all this *before* the Smiting Stone—Christ in His return to earth—will set up a kingdom which shall fill the whole earth (Dan. 2:34–35, 44–45). The

New Testament predicts the same consummation, saying, “And the world [*cosmos*] passeth away, and the lust [‘desire,’ or ‘purpose’] thereof” (1 John 2:17). The one and only thing that will survive this great cataclysm, this text goes on to state, is “he that doeth the will of God”; he “abideth for ever.” *The lie* is expanded to the point where its manifestation embraces all that is in the *cosmos*, and is built on the one original idea which characterizes it all, namely, *independence of God*. To do the will of God is to *do* the truth; to act apart from God is to *do* the lie. *The truth*, which is the will of God, and those who do the truth, abide forever. There should be no surprise at this termination of the entire fabric of Satan’s weaving; yet those of the *cosmos* are influenced not at all by God’s Word, nor are *cosmos-Christians* much impressed with the solemn truth God has spoken. Such is the far-reaching effect of the satanic deception. Satan’s original independence of God which permeates the whole order, his deceptions about himself, about his purpose, and about the extent of his enterprise, constitute the primary aspects of Satan’s *method* in the *cosmos*.

Since in pursuing his determination to exalt himself above God Satan must oppose the divine undertakings, his opposition naturally will be exerted where God is acting at a given time. Since God has no present program which He is following along lines of reformation, education, or civilization (and any record that such undertakings are in God’s present purpose will be sought in vain), there is no conflict or satanic resistance in those spheres. The present relation of God to the *cosmos*, beyond His sovereign permission and restraint of it, is to save out of it an elect people for His heavenly glory. On the other hand, Satan’s twofold objective—to exalt self, and to oppose God—is the key by which much may be known that otherwise would be unknown. It is still further disclosed that the enmity of Satan is not only toward the Person of God from whom he has everything to fear, but also toward every true child of God. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on this fact. Satan has no controversy or warfare with his own, unregenerate people, but there is abundant Scripture to prove that he makes unceasing effort to mar the life and service of the Christian. The motive for this effort is all-sufficient: they have partaken “of the divine nature” (2 Pet. 1:4), and afford, therefore, a possible opportunity for Satan to thrust his fiery darts at the divine Person who indwells them. Thus the believer becomes a medium of connection between the divine Person and the satanic order, for it is also true that God literally loves the unsaved through the believer (Rom. 5:5). On the other hand, the prince of the satanic system is seeking an opportunity for a thrust through the believer at the Person of God. Several important passages on the

latter point may here be noted: “These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world” (John 16:33); “Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution” (2 Tim. 3:12); “Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you” (1 John 3:13); “Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you. Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist stedfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world” (1 Pet. 5:7–9); “Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles [‘artifices’] of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places” (Eph. 6:10–12, R.V.). The teaching of these passages clearly indicates the satanic enmity toward the believer, and the believer’s utter helplessness apart from the divine sufficiency. They also reveal a degree of enmity which would result in the believer’s life being crushed out, were it not for the evident answer to the prayer of Christ: “I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world [*cosmos*], but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one” (John 17:15, R.V.). Certainly there is abundant reason for the believer to expect the fiercest opposition from Satan and Satan’s host in all his life and service, and faith alone insures his victory over the world (*cosmos*).

The believer is also the object of the satanic attack because of the fact that unto the child of God is committed the great ministry of reconciliation, that by his testimony both in life and word, and by his prayers, the truths of redemption may be given to the world. If Satan can cripple the believer’s service he accomplishes much in resisting the present purpose of God. No other explanation is adequate for the dark pages of church history, the appalling failure of the church in world-wide evangelism, her present sectarian divisions and selfish indifference, or her final estate as pictured in Revelation 3:15–17. This blighting, satanic opposition may be detected in every effort for the salvation of the lost. It may be seen in the fact that no personal appeal is ever made to the vast majority even in this favored land; moreover, when an appeal is made, it is easily distracted or diverted into the discussion of unimportant themes. The faithful pastor or evangelist is most sorely assailed, every device of Satan being used to distort the one all-important message of grace into something which is not vital. The evangelist’s call for decisions is often cumbered with that which is

misleading or is a positive misstatement of the terms of salvation; thus the appeal is lost and the whole effort fails. Again, the opposing power of Satan may be seen in the matter of Christian giving. Millions are given without solicitation for education, culture, and humanity's physical comfort, but real worldwide evangelization must ever drag on with its shameful limitations and debts. This warfare of Satan is even more noticeable in the believer's prayer life. This, being his place of greatest usefulness and power, is subject to the severest conflict. In this connection it may be stated safely that there is comparatively little prevailing prayer today, yet the way is open and the promises are sure. If the believer cannot be beguiled into indifference or a denial of Christ, he is often tempted to place an undue emphasis upon some minor truth, and, in partial blindness, to sacrifice his whole influence for good through the apparent unbalance of his testimony.

Satan's warfare against the purpose of God is still more evident in his direct hindering of the unsaved. Not only are they constantly blinded to the gospel, but, when the Spirit would draw them, their minds are often filled with strange fears and distorted visions. Their inability to cast themselves upon Christ is a mystery to themselves, and nothing but the direct illuminating power of the Spirit in conviction can open their eyes and deliver them from their gross darkness.

Satan has always adapted his methods to the times and conditions. If attention has been gained, a complete denial of the truth has been made, or, when some recognition of the truth is demanded, it has been granted on the condition that that which is vital in redemption should be omitted. This partial recognition of the truth is required by the world today. For, while the direct result of the believer's testimony to the *cosmos* has been toward the gathering out of the Bride, there has been an indirect influence of this testimony upon the world, which has led them to see that all that is good in their own ideals has been already stated in the Bible and exemplified in the life of Christ. Moreover, they have heard that every principle of humanitarian sympathy or righteous government has been revealed in the Scriptures of Truth. Thus there has grown a more or less popular appreciation of the value of these moral precepts of the Scriptures and of the example which Christ presents. This condition has prevailed to such a degree that any new system or doctrine which secures a hearing today must base its claim upon the Bible, and include, to some extent, the Person and teachings of Christ. The fact that the world has thus partly acknowledged the value of the Scriptures is taken by many to be a glorious victory for God, while, on the contrary, fallen humanity is less inclined to accept

God's terms of salvation than in the generations past. It is evident that this partial concession of the world to the testimony of God has opened the way for counterfeit systems of truth, which, according to prophecy, are the last and most-to-be-dreaded methods in the satanic warfare. In this connection it must be conceded that Satan has really granted nothing from his own position, even though he be forced to acknowledge every principle of truth save that upon which salvation depends. Rather is he advantaged by such a concession; for the value and delusion of a counterfeit are increased by the nearness of its likeness to the real. By advocating much truth, in the form of a counterfeit system of truth, Satan can satisfy all the external religious cravings of the world, and yet accomplish his own end by withholding that on which man's only hope depends. It is, therefore, no longer safe to subscribe blindly to that which promises general good, simply because it is good and is garnished with the teachings of the Bible; for good has ceased to be all on the one side and evil all on the other. In fact, that which is evil in purpose has gradually appropriated the good until but one issue distinguishes them. Part-truth-ism has come into final conflict with whole-truth-ism, and woe to the soul that does not discern between them! The first, though externally religious, is of Satan, and leaves its followers in the doom of everlasting banishment from the presence of God, while the latter is of God, "having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

It is also noticeable that the term "infidel" has, within a generation, disappeared from common usage, and that that manner of open denial of the truth has been almost wholly abandoned. Yet the real Church has by no means lost her foes, for they are now even more numerous, subtle, and terrible than ever before. These present enemies, however, like the unclean birds in the mustard tree, have taken shelter under her branches. They are officiating at her most sacred altars and conducting her institutions. These vultures are fed by a multitude, both in the church and out, who, in satanic blindness, are committed to the furtherance of any project or the acceptance of any theory that promises good to the world if it is apparently based upon Scripture, little realizing that they are often really supporting the enemy of God.

A counterfeit is Satan's most natural method of resisting the purpose of God, since by it he can realize to that extent his desire to be *like* the Most High. Every material is now at hand, as never before, for the setting up of those conditions which are predicted to appear only in the very end of the age. In 2 Timothy 3:1–5 one of these predictions may be found: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous,

boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.” Every word of this prophecy is worthy of most careful study in the light of the present tendency of society. The fifth verse is especially important in connection with the subject of counterfeits of the truth: “Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.” Here it is stated that in these last days forms of godliness shall appear which, however, deny the power of God, and from such the believer is warned to turn away. The important element in the true faith which is to be omitted in this “form” is defined elsewhere in the Scriptures: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek” (Rom. 1:16); “But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God” (1 Cor. 1:23–24). Therefore, that which is omitted so carefully from these forms is the salvation which is in Christ. This is most suggestive, for “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,” and it is by salvation alone that any deliverance can be had from the power of darkness. Without this salvation Satan can still claim all his own. It is perhaps necessary to add that, judging from all his writings, this salvation of which Paul confesses he was not ashamed was no less an undertaking than regeneration by the Spirit; and whatever other theories may be advanced, this is the teaching of the Spirit through the Apostle Paul. This prophecy concerning conditions in the “last days” ends with an injunction which is addressed only to the believers who are called upon to live and witness during those days. To them it is said: “from such [a form of godliness which denies the power thereof] turn away.” As certainly as the “last days” are now present, so certainly this injunction is now to be heeded, and the Lord’s people are called upon to separate from churches and institutions which deny the gospel of God’s saving grace through the substitutionary blood-redemption of the cross. To support institutions or ministries which “deny the power thereof,” is to lend aid to Satan—the enemy of God. With no less force it is stated in 2 Peter 2:1, “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction.” In the

same manner, according to this passage, the denial falls not on the *Person* of Christ, but rather on His redeeming *work*—“the Lord that bought them.” It therefore follows that one feature of the last days will be a form of godliness which carefully denies the power of God in salvation.

Again, Satan is “in the latter times” to be the promoter of a system of truth or doctrine: “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron” (1 Tim. 4:1–2). These predicted satanic systems are here accurately described. Their offers will be so attractive and externally so religious that into them will be drawn some who “shall depart from the faith,” they being enticed by seducing spirits. No reference is made here to personal faith by which one may be saved. It is “the faith”—a body of truth (cf. Jude 1:3) which is first seen to some extent, and then rejected. This a regenerate person will never do. These attractive systems are not only from Satan, but are themselves “lies in hypocrisy,” being presented by those whose conscience has been seared with a hot iron. No more illuminating terms could be used than these. A lie covered by hypocrisy means, evidently, that they are still attempting to be counted among the faithful; and the conscience seared would indicate that they can distort the testimony of God and blindly point other souls to perdition, without present remorse or regret. The doctrines of devils are again referred to in Revelation 2:24, R.V. as “the deep things of Satan,” and this is Satan’s counterfeit of “the deep things of God” which the Spirit reveals to them that love Him (1 Cor. 2:10). Thus there are predicted for the last days of this age both a form of godliness which denies the power of salvation that is in Christ, and a system known as “the deep things of Satan” or “doctrines of devils,” speaking lies in hypocrisy. Can there be any doubt that these two Scriptures describe the same thing, since they also refer to the same time? The lies of one can be but the covered denial of salvation in the other.

Again, Satan has his assembly, or congregational meeting, which is his counterfeit of the visible church. This assembly is referred to, both in Revelation 2:9 and 3:9, as the “synagogue of Satan,” an organized assembly being relatively as important for testimony in the deep things of Satan as it has been in the things of God. In Matthew 13 the tares appear *among* the wheat and their appearance is said to be after the sowing of the wheat. So, also, the “children of the wicked one” appear and are often included and even organized within the forms of the visible church. The assembly of Satan, calling itself a part of the visible church,

is to have its ministers and teachers. This is stated in 2 Corinthians 11:13–15: “For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.” Here is a remarkable revelation of the possible extent of the satanic counterfeit— “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ” and “ministers of righteousness”; yet these are shown to be only agents of the great deceiver, Satan, who is himself transformed into an angel of light. It is evident that the method of this deception is to imitate the real ministers of Christ. Certainly these false apostles cannot so appear unless they gather into their message every available “form of godliness” and cover their lies with the most subtle hypocrisy. Evil will not appear on the outside of these systems; but they will be announced as “another gospel” or as a larger understanding of the previously accepted truth, and will be all the more attractive and delusive since they are heralded by those who claim to be ministers of Christ, who reflect the beauty of an “angel of light,” and whose lives are undoubtedly free from great temptation. It should be noted, however, that these false ministers do not necessarily know the real mission they have. Being unregenerate persons of the *cosmos*, and thus blinded to the real gospel, they are sincere, preaching and teaching the best things the angel of light, their energizing power, is pleased to reveal unto them. Their gospel is one of human reason, and appeals to human resources. There can be no appreciation of divine revelation in them, for they have not come really to know God or His Son, Jesus Christ. They are ministers of righteousness, which message should never be confused with the gospel of grace. One is directed only at the reformation of the natural man, while the other aims at regeneration through the power of God. As all this is true, how perilous is the attitude of many who follow attractive ministers and religious guides only because they claim to be such and are sincere, and who are not awake to the one final test of doctrine by which alone the whole covert system of satanic lies may be distinguished from the truth of God! In this connection John writes the following warning: “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed” (2 John 1:10).

False teachers are usually sincere and full of humanitarian zeal; but they are *unregenerate*. This judgment necessarily follows when it is understood that they deny the only ground of redemption. Being unregenerate, it is said of them: “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are

foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned” (1 Cor. 2:14). Such religious leaders may be highly educated and able to speak with authority on every aspect of human knowledge; but if they are not born again, their judgment in spiritual matters is worthless and misleading. All teachers are to be judged by their attitude toward the doctrine of the blood redemption of Christ, rather than by their winsome personalities, their education, or their sincerity.

Since the blood redemption of the cross is the central truth and value of the true faith, it being the “power of God unto salvation” (Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 1:23–24), any counterfeit system of doctrine which would omit this essential, must force some secondary truth into the place of prominence. Any of the great Scriptural subjects which are of universal interest to humanity, such as physical health, life after death, morality, unfulfilled prophecy, or religious forms, may be substituted in the false systems for that which is vital. And while those subjects are all found in their proper relations and importance in the true faith, the fact that people are universally inclined to give attention to them furnishes an opportunity for Satan to make a strong appeal to humanity through them, using these subjects as central truths in his false and counterfeit systems. Many are easily led to fix their attention upon the secondary things, and to neglect wholly the one primary thing. Especially is this true since the secondary things are tangible and seen, while the one essential thing is spiritual and unseen; and Satan has blinded their eyes toward that which is of eternal value. A system of doctrine may be formed, then, which includes every truth of the Scriptures save one: exalting the *Person* of Christ, but not His *work*, and thereby emphasizing some secondary truth as its central value. This system will be readily accepted by blinded humanity, though the real power of God unto salvation has been carefully withdrawn. Naturally it would be supposed that such Satan-inspired systems would have no value or power, since there could be no divine favor upon them. Such a supposition would be possible only because of the prevailing misunderstanding with respect to the real power of Satan. If the description given of him in the Scriptures is accepted, he will be seen to be possessed with miraculous power, able to perform such marvels that the whole world is led to wonder and then to worship. He is free also to bestow this miraculous power upon others (Rev. 13:2). So it is no marvel if his ministers, who appear as the ministers of righteousness, are able to exert superhuman power when it is directly in the interest of the satanic projects. The great power of Satan has doubtless been active along these lines during all the ages past; for it is

impossible that humanity should have worshiped other gods blindly without some recompense, and it is Satan himself who has been thus worshiped (Lev. 17:7; 2 Chron. 11:15; Rev. 9:20).

It is not final evidence, therefore, that a system of doctrine is of God simply because there are accompanying manifestations of superhuman power, nor is it final evidence that the Almighty has responded simply because any form of supplication has been answered. The divine movements are, of necessity, limited by the laws of His own holiness; and access into His presence is by the blood of Christ alone, by a new and living Way which was consecrated for us through His flesh (Heb. 10:19–20). Assuming to come before God in prayer but ignoring this truth is but to insult with pollution Him who is infinitely holy and pure. Surely the Satan-ruled world does not come before God by the blood of Christ.

Churches sometimes fall an easy prey to forms of doctrine—“deceivableness of unrighteousness”—which Satan originates. Sad is the spectacle of churches meeting week after week to be beguiled by the philosophy of men, and raising no voice in protest against the denial of their only foundation as a church, and the individual’s only hope for time and eternity! Far more honorable were the infidels of the past generation than those who minister in these churches. They were wholly outside the church. But now, behold the inconsistency! Men who are covered by the vesture of the church, ministering its sacraments, and supported by its benevolence, are making an open attack upon that wisdom of God which made Christ Jesus the only ground for all righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. The predictions for the last days are thus not only being fulfilled by false systems and doctrines, but they are found in the visible church itself. “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables” (2 Tim. 4:3–4). Great religious activities are possible without coming into complication with saving faith. It is possible to fight against sin and not present the Savior, or to urge the highest Scriptural ideals and yet offer no reasonable way of attainment. There is a strange fascination about these undertakings which are humanitarian, and are religious only in form and title. And there is a strange attractiveness in the leader who announces that he is not concerned with the doctrines of the Bible, because the helping of humanity is his one passion and care; yet all his passion is lost and his care is to no real end unless coupled with a very positive message of a particular way of salvation, the true understanding of which demands a series of most careful distinctions.

Who can be the god of these systems? the energizing power in these people? and the answerer of their prayers? Surely not the God of the Scriptures who cannot deny Himself, and whose Word cannot be made to pass away! Revelation sets forth but one other being who is capable of these undertakings; and it not only assigns to this being a great and sufficient motive for all such activity, but clearly predicts that he will thus “oppose” and “exalt himself” in this very day and age. Much of the secondary truth is the present inheritance of the child of God. However, if there is a choice to be made, the deepest wisdom will perceive that all the combined secondary values which Satan can offer are but for a fleeting time, and are not worthy to be compared with the eternal riches of grace in Christ Jesus.

Certain religious systems which are in no way related to the Bible and have continued for millenniums—including the ancient pagan systems and spiritism—have held the devotion of uncounted millions and bear every evidence of being inspired by Satan. The moral problem, which is felt to some degree by every human being, is seized upon by almost every unscriptural system. The idea that man will stand on a basis of personal worthiness has been the chief heresy, opposing the central doctrine of grace, from the time of Christ’s death to the present hour. It so permeates the church that few who preach are able to exclude it from their attempts at gospel preaching. It is safe to say that wherever the element of human merit is allowed to intrude into the presentation of the plan of salvation, the message is satanic to that extent. The ministers of Satan proclaim personal righteousness as the ground of the individual’s right relations to God (2 Cor. 11:13–15). No sphere of profession has been more confused and befogged by the intrusion of human merit than has the Church of Rome.

As has been observed, cults are now multiplying and their appearance is restricted to very recent times. These cults cover a variety of ideas all the way from Christian Science to Buchmanism. The latter as completely ignores the blood redemption of Christ as the former. While the former substitutes bodily health for the salvation of the soul, the latter substitutes consecration to God for a new birth by the Spirit. No less misleading is the modern doctrine that salvation is through faith plus consecration. Probably no religious movement is more bold than the *I AM* cult of recent months. It unblushingly announces by its blasphemous name that it freely embraces all that belongs to the original *lie*. Its title would have been equally appropriate had it been, *I will be like the most High*. Space cannot be claimed for an enumeration and analysis of all these systems, ancient and modern. No one can anticipate the number that will yet

appear or the confusion of doctrine they will engender; but for each and all there is but one acid test, namely, What place does it give to the redeeming grace of God made possible only through the death and shed blood of Christ?

Conclusion to Satanology

In the light of that which has been written in preceding divisions of satanology, it may be concluded that, by creation, Satan is the highest of all angels and that he fell into sin, being befogged by the distortion of sanity which pride engenders. His sin took the form of an assumption to act in independence of the Creator—an undertaking which, of necessity, became a concrete embodiment of *untruth* as certainly as God is *Truth*. According to the divine method of dealing with creature assumption, as seen in all past history, Satan is allowed—if not required—to put his scheme of independent action to an experimental test, and its present development, though manifesting even now its corrupt nature, is yet incomplete. The inerrant, prophetic Scriptures carry the stupendous enterprise on to the unavoidable, irrational, incomprehensible spiritual bankruptcy which characterizes the consummation of this gigantic experiment. During these terrible ages of trial, Light is pitted against darkness, and Truth against falsehood. Little attention can have been given to Scripture on the part of men who propose to account for the evil one as a mere influence in the world. Of such wicked inattention to revelation, Dr. Gerhart writes: “In the history of Jesus the fact of the deadly hatred of Evil to the ideal Good, of fiendlike wickedness toward spotless Virtue, no one can deny. Those who choose to ascribe such appalling inhumanity and diabolism exclusively to Jews and Gentiles, (instead of referring it to a mighty personal evil spirit, as its background,) do not get rid, as they suppose, of a devil. Then man is himself resolved into a *devil*; for he is invested with a kind and degree of *malice* which dehumanizes human nature, turns earth into pandemonium, and history into an interminable war of incarnated fiends” (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, I, 697). Perhaps both things here stated are true. Not only are Satan and his angels to be seen in their true light as fiends of darkness, but humanity as allied with them is evidently seen by God to be wholly evil, if not diabolical. It is such who, having cast in their lot with the satanic lie, must, if not saved out of it, share the lake of fire which originally was prepared only for “the devil and his angels” (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10). It is to these fallen, God-repudiating human beings that the gospel of eternal redemption and heavenly glory is to be preached. How

matchless is the grace of God toward these enemies (Rom. 5:10)! And how incomprehensibly blessed are the words of Christ, "... should not perish, but have everlasting life"!

Chapter X

DEMONOLOGY

UNAVOIDABLY, MUCH that enters into this great theme has been anticipated in preceding pages. It remains, however, to contemplate more specifically the truth disclosed concerning the fallen angels who are properly styled *demons*. Some evidence has been advanced to demonstrate that these beings are angels who followed Satan in his rebellion against God. It is not without significance that these beings are called Satan's own angels (cf. Matt. 25:41; Rev. 12:9), not, indeed, to imply that Satan created them, but rather that he is responsible—so far as influence could go—for their demonic character. The voice of God in the garden tracing the sin of the man to the woman and the sin of the woman to the serpent (Gen. 3:12–13), could be extended on from a fallen race of the earth to a host of fallen spirits in heavenly spheres, and to the end that all original responsibility for sin in the universe belongs to the first of all sinners—Satan. In like manner, it is not without significance that more Scripture is employed to elucidate the truth concerning Satan than is employed to elucidate the truth concerning all the fallen angels together. Mighty indeed is the archangel who is over all fallen angels! He is the *strong man* of Matthew 12:29 who is yet to be bound, and whose “house” will yet be destroyed.

The Scriptures declare that Satan is king over two realms: that of fallen spirits whose number is legion (Mark 5:9, 15; Luke 8:30), and that of the *cosmos*. The authority which Satan exercises over the hosts of demons is asserted or implied in many portions of the Bible and in none more clearly than Matthew 12:22–30, which reads: “Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; self; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and

then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” The titles *principalities* and *powers*, when referring to fallen spirits, indicate these mighty angels over whom Satan rules supreme.

With reference to Satan’s authority over the *cosmos*, the statement is direct and final. He is said to be the *god of this age* (2 Cor. 4:4), “the prince of this world” (*cosmos*), the one who energizes the children of disobedience, the one rightly styled *the power of darkness*, and *the wicked one* in whose authority the whole *cosmos* resides. In like manner, it is said of Satan’s throne—the throne of the earthly sphere—that it is on the earth (cf. Rev. 2:13). The same satanic authority is declared in Ephesians 6:12. Thus it is written: “For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places” (R.V.).

That the demons do the will of their king is everywhere assured in the Scriptures. It is also revealed that they render wholehearted and willing cooperation in the satanic project. To this they were evidently committed when they left their first estate as unfallen angels (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 1:6). This service apparently reaches out to the universe wherever Satan’s authority extends. Satan, though proposing to supersede the Almighty, is not omnipotent; but his power and the extent of his activity are immeasurably increased by the cooperation of his host of demons. Satan is not omniscient; yet his knowledge is greatly extended by the combined wisdom and observation of his sympathetic subjects. Satan is not omnipresent; but he is able to maintain an unceasing activity in every locality by the loyal obedience of the satanic host.

In his book, *The Spirit World* (p. 23), Clarence Larkin distinguishes between the fallen angels that are bound and those that are free. Quoting Jude 1:6–7, which reads: “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire,” and relating this with Genesis 6:1–4, which reads, “And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an

hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown,” Mr. Larkin draws the conclusion that the fallen angels that are in chains are under sentence because of immoral relations with women of the human race. The “strange flesh” and “fornication” of Sodom and Gomorrha suggest to Mr. Larkin that the text (Jude 1:6–7) aims to reveal that this is the sin of these angels that are bound.

The whole discussion regarding the “sons of God” mentioned in Genesis 6:1–4 (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7), should be included rightfully in demonology. Whether, as many believe, the reference is to men of the line of Seth cohabiting with women of the line of Cain, or whether it asserts that angels cohabited with women of the earth, as Mr. Larkin and others believe, probably will never be determined to the satisfaction of all concerned. Mr. Larkin’s argument, which contemplates much that is involved on both sides of the contention, is as follows:

Who are these angels? They are not Satan’s angels, for his angels are free, and like him roam about, but these angels are in “prison,” “in darkness,” and “reserved in chains” for judgment. The place of their confinement is not Hell, but Tartarus. What was their sin? It was “fornication,” and fornication of an abnormal character, the unlawful sexual intercourse of angelic beings with “*strange flesh*,” that is with beings of a different nature. When was this sin committed? The text says in the “days of Noah,” and that it was the cause of the Flood. ...

Who were these “*sons of God*”? Some claim that they were the Sons of “*Seth*,” and that the “Daughters of *men*” were the daughters of “*Cain*,” and that what is meant is that the Sons of the supposedly godly line of Seth, intermarried with the godless daughters of Cain, the result being a godless race. That the “Sons of God” were the descendants of Seth is based on the assumption that the descendants of Seth lived apart from the descendants of Cain up to a time shortly before the Flood, and that they were a pure and holy race, while the descendants of Cain were ungodly, and their women irreligious and carnal minded, and possessed of physical attractions that were foreign to the women of the tribe of Seth. Such an assumption has no foundation in Scripture. Be sure it says in Gen. 4:26, that after the birth of Enos, a son of Seth, that men began to call upon the Lord, but it does not follow that those men were limited to the descendants of Seth, nor that all the descendants of Seth from that time were righteous. As in the early days of the race it was necessary that brothers and sisters and near relatives should marry, it was very unlikely that the descendants of Seth and Cain did not intermarry until some time before the Flood, and stranger still that when they did marry their offspring would be a race of “giants” or “Mighty Men.” It is worthy of note that nothing is said of giantesses, or “Mighty Women,” which would have been the case if it were simply a union of the sons of Seth, and the daughters of Cain. As both the descendants of Seth (except 8 persons) and of Cain were destroyed in the Flood, it is evident that they were not separate tribes at that time and were equally sinners in the sight of God. If the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain were meant why did not Moses, who wrote the Pentateuch, say so? It is not sufficient to say that the men of Moses’ time knew what he meant. The Scriptures are supposed to mean what they say. When *men*, we are told, began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, the “Sons of God” saw the “daughters of *men*.” The use of the word *men* signifies the whole Adamic race, and not simply the descendants of Cain, thus distinguishing the “Sons of God”

from the descendants of Adam. There is no suggestion of contrast if the “Sons of God” were also men.

Four names are used in Gen. 6:1–4. “*Bne-Ha-Elohim*, ” rendered “Sons of God”; “*Bnoth-Ha-Adam*, ” “daughters of men”; “*Hans-Nephilim*, ” “giants”; “*Hog-Gibborim*, ” “Mighty Men.” The title “*Bne-Ha-Elohim*, ” “Sons of God,” has not the same meaning in the Old Testament that it has in the New. In the New Testament it applies to those who have become the “Sons of God” by the New Birth (John 1:12; Rom. 8:14–16; Gal. 4:6; 1 John 3:1–2). In the Old Testament it applies exclusively to the angels, and is so used five times. Twice in Genesis (Gen. 6:2–4) and three times in Job, where Satan, an angelic being, is classed with the “Sons of God” (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). A “Son of God” denotes a being brought into existence by a creative act of God. Such were the angels, and such was Adam, and he is so called in Luke 3:38. Adam’s natural descendants are not the special creation of God. Adam was created in the “likeness of God” (Gen. 5:1), but his descendants were born in his likeness, for we read in Gen. 5:3, that Adam “begat a son in *his own likeness, after his image*.” Therefore all men born of Adam and his descendants by natural generation are the “*sons of men*, ” and it is only by being “*born again*” (John 3:3–7), which is a “*new creation*, ” that they can become the “*sons of God*” in the New Testament sense. That the “Sons of God” of Gen. 6:1–4 were *angels* was maintained by the ancient Jewish Synagogue, by Hellenistic Jews at, and before, the time of Christ, and by the Christian Church up until the Fourth Century, when the interpretation was changed to “sons of Seth” for two reasons. First, because the worship of angels had been set up, and if the “Sons of God” of Gen. 6:1–4 were angels and fell, then angels might fall again, and that possibility would affect the worship of angels. The second reason was, that Celibacy had become an institution of the Church, and if it was taught that the angels in heaven did not marry, and yet that some of them seduced by the beauty of womanhood came down from heaven to gratify their amorous propensities, a weakness of a similar kind in one of the “earthly angels” (Celibates) might be the more readily excused. In the Eighteenth Century the “Angelic Interpretation” was revived, and is now largely held by Biblical scholars.—Pp. 23–27

Mr. Larkin also claims that Satan is to have an actual seed in the person of the man of sin. This argument is based on an arbitrary interpretation of Genesis 3:15, which assumes that the man of sin is the seed of Satan in an actual sense. If followed to its reasonable conclusion, all unsaved persons must be deemed to be actual offspring of Satan since Christ refers to them as children “of your father, the devil” (John 8:44). This theory also places the mortal combat between the two seeds of Genesis 3:15 at the time when the man of sin is destroyed at Christ’s second coming. According to 2 Thessalonians 2:8, the man of sin is vanquished indeed, which might correspond to the bruising of Satan’s head; but there is nothing in that event which corresponds to the bruising of Christ’s heel.

Evidently, demons have always been active in the world from the dawn of human history; but, as occasion may arise, they become more active at one time than at another. The presence in the world of the Lord of glory, their Creator and the One against whom they are in rebellion, seems to draw out a manifestation of opposition hitherto unknown. Even Satan himself, after having three times tempted the Son of God into action which would be independent of His Father, whose will He came to do, hoping thus to cause Him to share in the lie, left the

Savior only for a season. The final combat took place at the cross where his head was bruised, he who, according to prediction, was permitted to bruise the Savior's heel (Gen. 3:15).

A similar increase in the activity of demons is predicted for the close of this age and in the great tribulation. All of this will reach its consummation when Satan and his angels are cast out of heaven and confined to the earth. It is then that *woe* is pronounced upon the earth and a new joy is released in heaven. One line of demon activity is seen in the oldest *ism* of the race, which the Bible terms possession of "familiar spirits"; it is also properly called *spiritism*. This is demonism (cf. Lev. 20:6, 27; Deut. 18:10–11; Isa. 8:19, R.V.). The unqualified condemnation of God rests upon spiritism. Its bait, by which it lures those so disposed, is the natural interest of the human mind in that which is beyond the present sphere of life; especially is this interest awakened in those who are bereaved. In these latter times this ancient system has revived under the guise of *investigation* and under the patronage of scientific men. A special departure from the faith is forecast for the last days of the Church on the earth. It is recorded in 1 Timothy 4:1–3: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." The deviation from the revealed truth will, no doubt, be in manifold ways. The doctrines of demons with their seductions are also determined for the same time. The abrogation of marriage that is mentioned is none other than the breaking down of that which God has so solemnly ordained. In addition to all this, the truth of what is back of idol worship is stated in 1 Corinthians 10:20–21: "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils."

Perhaps no Scripture bearing on the spirit world is more misunderstood than that concerning King Saul and the witch of En-dor. Spiritism has turned to this incident to justify its claims, and that without recognition of the truth that the Bible everywhere condemns all that spiritists practice and teach. There is a slight distinction to be seen between the supposed contact with the spirits of departed persons and contact with fallen angels, or demons. Apart from the one instance in the experience of King Saul, there is no evidence that any contact has ever

been set up between the departed and those who remain in this life. A demon can easily impersonate a human spirit, and that, if any contact is ever formed, must account for the phenomenon. The case of the Witch of En-dor is apparently an exceptional incident intended of God to bring King Saul into judgment. The entire procedure was different than the woman expected and evidently quite foreign to any former experience on her part. She was used to the cooperation of an evil spirit, but she saw what no one else saw and it wrought terror in her whole being. It was Saul's last act of rejection of God. He had turned to the demons to gain information, which information, had he been right with God, would have been granted to him by God. Whatever is not fully explained in the account of this episode, it is essential to remember that is the only one of its kind recorded in the Bible. The experience conforms in no way to the practice of spiritism of that day, or now. The woman, seized with terror, abandons her role as *medium* and the spirit of Samuel speaks directly to Saul.

In considering the service these beings render to Satan, it is important to distinguish between demon possession, or control, and demon influence. In the one case the body is entered and a dominating control is gained, while in the other case a warfare from without is carried on by suggestion, temptation, and influence. Investigation of the Scriptures in regard to demon possession reveals:

First: that this host is made up of bodiless spirits only. The following Scriptures verify this statement: "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first" (Matt. 12:43–45); "And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them" (Mark 5:12).

Second: They are, however, not only seeking to enter the bodies of either mortals or beasts, for their power seems to be in some measure dependent upon such embodiment, but they are constantly seen to be embodied thus, according to the New Testament. A few of these passages are given here: "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick" (Matt. 8:16); "As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil. And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake" (Matt. 9:32–33); "And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing

and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed” (Acts 8:6–7); “And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying” (Acts 16:16); “And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes. And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea” (Mark 5:1–13).

Third: They are wicked, unclean, and vicious. Many passages might be quoted in proof of this statement. “And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way” (Matt. 8:28); “And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease” (Matt. 10:1). It might be added that there seem to be degrees of wickedness represented by these spirits; for it is stated in Matthew 12:43–45 that the demon, returning to his house, “taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself.”

The question is often raised whether demon possession obtains at the present time. Although the authentic records of such control are almost wholly limited to the three years of the public ministry of Jesus, it is incredible that demon

possession did not exist before that time, or has not existed since. In this connection it should be remembered not only that these beings are intelligent themselves, but that they are directly governed and ordered by Satan, whose wisdom and cunning are so clearly set forth in the Scriptures. It is reasonable to conclude that they, like their monarch, are adapting the manner of their activity to the enlightenment of the age and locality. It is evident that they are not now less inclined than before to enter and dominate a body. Demon possession in the present time is probably often unsuspected because of the generally unrecognized fact that demons are capable of inspiring a moral and exemplary life, as well as of appearing as the dominating spirit of a spiritist medium, or through the grosser manifestations that are recorded by missionaries concerning conditions which they observe in heathen lands. These demons, too, like their king, will appear as “angels of light” as well as “roaring lions,” when by the former impersonation they can more perfectly further the stupendous undertakings of Satan in his warfare against the work of God.

Demon influence, like the activity of Satan, is prompted by two motives: both to hinder the purpose of God for humanity, and to extend the authority of Satan. They, therefore, at the command of their king, willingly cooperate in all his God-dishonoring undertakings. Their influence is exercised both to mislead the unsaved and to wage an unceasing warfare against the believer (Eph. 6:12).

Their motive is suggested in what is revealed by their knowledge of the authority and deity of Christ, as well as by what they know of their eternal doom. The following passages are important in this connection: “And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?” (Matt. 8:29); “And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him” (Mark 1:23–25); “And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?” (Acts 19:15); “Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also believe, and tremble” (James 2:19).

It is in the power of demons to cause dumbness (Matt. 9:32–33), blindness (Matt. 12:22), insanity (Luke 8:26–35), personal injuries (Mark 9:18), great physical strength (Luke 8:29), and to inflict suffering and deformities (Luke 13:11–17).

There is a solemn reality in this great body of Scripture. It represents the

intrusion of fallen spirits into the *cosmos*. Such an intrusion is natural since Satan is the one who has brought the *cosmos* into its present form. No one can anticipate the relief that will come to the universe when Christ will have “put down all rule and all authority and power” (1 Cor. 15:24), and “the kingdoms of this world [*cosmos*] are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever” (Rev. 11:15).

Anthropology

Chapter XI

INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY

ANTHROPOLOGY—the science of man—is approached from two widely different angles, namely, that of human philosophy and that of the Bible. The former is extra-Biblical and avoids every feature of Scripture revelation. The latter is intra-Biblical and confines itself to the Word of God and such corroborating human experience as may give confirming witness to the truth disclosed. The one is conceived by man and, reflecting his philosophy of human life, is offered as educational discipline in secular schools of learning. The other is a revelation from God in that sense in which all Scripture originates with Him and presents a record which proud man is loathe to accept. It is indeed suggestive with respect to the attitude of modern education generally toward divine revelation that no place is accorded to revelation in its philosophies. Over against this, the Anthropology of theology, while giving due attention to that which man has asserted, embodies only such truth as God has declared in His Word. In the Bible, it will be discovered that abundant material of a positive and dependable nature is available. The Word of God presents final information on this complex theme. A still more vital distinction obtains between these widely separated anthropological disciplines. With reference to the immaterial part of man, extra-Biblical anthropology is only a penetration into the emotional and intellectual aspects of human life, or that which is psychological, while intra-Biblical anthropology enters into the deeper realms of things moral, spiritual, and eternal. Extra-Biblical anthropology assigns no place for God in matters of man's origin, career, or destiny, while intra-Biblical anthropology, being an induction of divine revelation, asserts far-reaching truths in all these fields. As a subject in modern education, anthropology, though but recently developed, claims the same importance as the kindred sciences—biology and psychology. It incorporates the theories of evolution and is materialistic in character. Aside from the underlying fact that these two anthropological disciplines deal with the study of man, there is little in common between them.

The definition of anthropology as given by *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th edition) is: “that branch of natural history which deals with the human species. ... It is thus part of biology, the science of living things in general. Indeed, it was the development of biological studies during the 19th century, chiefly due to the stimulus afforded by research into the origin of species, that brought

anthropology into being in its modern form.” This “modern form” of the doctrine of man, moves along two lines: (a) what man is—his natural evolution—and (b) what man does—his cultural history, his relation to material things, to himself, and to others.

The New Standard Dictionary defines the anthropology which is theological as “that branch of theological science which treats of man, both in his original and in his fallen condition. It embraces the consideration of man’s creation, primitive condition, probation and apostasy, original sin, and actual transgressions” (1913 Edition).

As Systematic Theology incorporates logically every other science, so Anthropology incorporates all that enters into man’s being—that which is material and that which is immaterial, and, were it wise so to extend it, various disciplines which are important branches of science would be included, among these much of biology and more of psychology. Because of the intricacies of the latter and its likeness to the realm of spirit existence, that which enters into psychology naturally receives the greater emphasis. At this point a crucial question arises, whether the Bible purports to teach the sciences as such. In spite of the fact that some earnest men have felt that an extended psychology can be constructed on the text of the Bible, the more conservative teachers are convinced that on the truth concerning God—His creation, and man in his relation to God—the Bible speaks with completeness and finality, but that on related themes it is accurate so far as it may have occasion to go. This is well illustrated by the science of history. Whatever appears in the Word of God of a historical nature is a true record, but it does not profess to be an exhaustive treatise on the history of the universe or world. The study of man must incorporate some important features of truth relative to what man was, what he is now, and what he may yet be. In all, a clear understanding of human realities is most essential. Concerning this field of investigation, the Bible is not wanting. In the field of nature, man occupies the central position according to the Bible.

Bearing on the claims of some men that a complete psychology can be drawn from the Bible, J. I. Marais writes:

The extravagant claims made by some writers for a fully developed system of Biblical psychology has brought the whole subject into disrepute. So much so, that Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*) has boldly asserted that “a system of Biblical psychology has been got together without any justification for it in Scripture.” At the outset, therefore, it must be borne in mind that the Bible does not present us with a systematized philosophy of man, but gives in popular form an account of human nature in all its various relationships. A reverent study of Scripture will undoubtedly lead to the recognition of a well-defined system of psychology, on which the whole scheme of redemption

is based. Great truths regarding human nature are presupposed in and accepted by the Old Testament and the New Testament; stress is there laid on other aspects of truth, unknown to writers outside of revelation, and presented to us, not in the language of the schools, but in that of practical life. Man is there described as fallen and degraded, but intended by God to be raised, redeemed, renewed. From this point of view Biblical psychology must be studied, and our aim should be “to bring out the views of Scripture regarding the nature, the life and life-destinies of the soul, as they are determined in the history of salvation (Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.*, 15).—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, IV, 2494–95

Some have stated that the Bible presents what is no more than the psychology of ancient Jews, and others declare that in matters of nature the sacred writers were left to such human knowledge as men possessed in the day in which the Scriptures were written. Reasonably, the conception of inspiration must be adjusted to such views. C. A. Row in his Bampton Lecture, 1877, states “that inspiration was not a general but a functional endowment, and consequently limited to subjects in which religion is directly involved; and that in those which stand outside it, the writers of the different books in the Bible were left to the free use of their ordinary faculties” (cited by Laidlaw, *Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 18). It would seem that some men feel that a writer is more free to exercise his faculties when uninspired. Such suggestions imply that the Bible is not inspired in all its parts. There is no occasion to revert to these problems. This work has offered previously conclusive proof of the infallibility of the Scriptures, and the subject under consideration is no exception. *Completeness* of statement and *accuracy* of statement are two widely different ideas. Matthew Fontaine Maury—a scientist whom the world honors as “the pathfinder of the seas”—stated in an address at the laying of the corner stone of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, in 1860 (as reported by Charles Lee Lewis in his biography of Maury):

I have been blamed by men of science, both in this country and in England, for quoting the Bible in confirmation of the doctrines of physical geography. The Bible, they say, was not written for scientific purposes, and is therefore of no authority in matters of science. I beg pardon! The Bible *is* authority for everything it touches. What would you think of the historian who should refuse to consult the historical records of the Bible, because the Bible was not written for the purposes of history? The Bible is true and science is true. The agents concerned in the physical economy of our planet are ministers of Him who made both it and the Bible. The records which He has chosen to make through the agency of these ministers of His upon the crust of the earth are as true as the records which, by the hands of His prophets and servants, He has been pleased to make in the Book of Life. They are both true; and when your men of science, with vain and hasty conceit, announce the discovery of disagreement between them, rely upon it the fault is not with the Witness or His records, but with the “worm” who essays to interpret evidence which he does not understand. When I, a pioneer in one department of this beautiful science, discover the truths of revelation and the truths of science reflecting light one upon the other and each sustaining the other, how can I, as a truth-loving, knowledge-seeking man, fail to point out the beauty and to rejoice in its discovery?

Reticence on such an occasion would be sin, and were I to suppress the emotion with which such discoveries ought to stir the soul, the waves of the sea would lift up their voice, and the very stones of the earth cry out against me.—Pp. 98–99

Over against all this, the revelation regarding man as found in the Word of God extends into many fields where a man-conceived anthropology could not enter: the true manner of creation, the original estate of man, his fall, the real cause of death in the world, the new birth, the ground of a right morality, and the resurrection of the body. Extra-Biblical anthropology will be searched in vain for any reference to these themes, yet these are realities in human life and as such become determining factors in a worthy psychology.

There is, therefore, a fine discrimination to be exercised. On the one hand, the truths taught in the Bible regarding man are not guesswork and subject to the errors of men of primitive times; nor, on the other hand, are they with respect to completeness a perfect supernatural science. It is true that the Biblical account of the origin of man is described in terms employed by men of ancient days and was immediately addressed to people of that age. It is also true that expansion of doctrine follows in the train of divine revelation, but a supernatural quality obtains from first to last which harmonizes all that is said in many centuries into one consistent narrative. Men of primitive times spoke their own language to people of primitive times. The truth revealed is elevated above the level of natural facts and discloses a fact which is divine. Science of each and every age has found these sublime Biblical teachings to be outside the range of their own restricted field of observations. The Biblical expressions of truth concerning the origin of man and his place on the earth, though formed in the age in which they were written, have served perfectly as vehicles of thought in all human history. In each age, the science of its time has imposed its ever-shifting notions relative to origin upon theology, and it has been the burden of theology in each age to rid itself of the ghosts of defunct philosophical and scientific opinions of a preceding age. It is indicated clearly that the objective before the writers of the Scriptures was not science, but it was theology. The early church was soon dragged down with Platonic philosophy and with Aristotle's doctrine of the soul. Such a situation characterized medieval centuries. It is the conceit of man which contends that the divine account of the origin of things is true only so far as it conforms to the science of his own day. If the science of today runs true to the course set for it by earlier generations—and why should it fail to do so?—it will be discarded by the scientists themselves; yet the Word of God will abide unchanged. The future of human opinion will modify the Word of God with no

more success than has the past. Literally, science may come and science may go, but the Word of God goes on forever.

Chapter XII

THE ORIGIN OF MAN

THE ANSWER to the problem of the origin of man is of immeasurable importance, for upon its answer depends the whole structure of Anthropology. Of necessity, man's nature, responsibility, and destiny are determined by the fundamental fact of his essential being as created. Two systems of thought—one a pure supposition, the other a revelation—purport to answer the question of man's origin. The supposition—the evolutionary theory—is a speculation, conjecture, and assumption, which is the best solution the unregenerate or spiritually unenlightened, finite mind can construct. The revelation embodies a series of truths which are harmonious and reasonable, if the Person, purpose, and power of the Creator are recognized. These two systems of thought should be weighed separately.

I. The Evolutionary Theory

Analysis of this hypothesis has been included in the preceding volume of this work under naturalistic theism; therefore, an extended discourse on this theme may be eliminated at this point. Had they anything which they were willing to put in its place, thinking men would not tolerate a system which offers not one proof for any claim which it advances. The act of bringing man into being is an achievement of stupendous proportions. To make man to be the result of an accidental evolutionary process springing from some supposed primordial germ—which germ itself cannot be accounted for apart from a Creator—and all this as a pure imaginative fancy without so much as a shadow of substance on which it may rest for proof, bears all the marks of mental desperation and bankruptcy of ideas. Yet these undemonstrable notions are passed over upon the world under the patronage of education and science. To the unregenerate mind, to which God is wholly lacking in reality, the problem of origin is not solved by the statement that God created man. How desperately unreal that revelation is to all such may be measured by the farcical dogma which men substitute in its place. It would be revealing to such teachers if, having aroused all the humility and sincerity that is latent in their beings, they would inquire *why* they reject God as Creator.

Evolution, considered abstractly, is presented in two different forms. It may be *naturalistic*, contending that by “natural selection” and the “survival of the

fittest” the varied forms of animate things came to be what they are as a result of fortuitous arrangement. On the other hand, theistic evolution—that system which seeks to retain some recognition of God by making Him the original cause, while embracing a supposed evolutionary process as the *method* by which God developed man from the original cell He had created—is not only unproved and unreasonable, but is a dishonor to God. God states in the Book, in which alone all conceptions of His Being have their source, the precise method He employed in the creation of man. To disregard this revelation and substitute a groundless human fiction in its place is to accuse God of untruth and to reject a plain Scripture with the liberty granted to others to reject every other page of the Bible if their unbelief so dictates. The divine method of creation is constantly reappearing in the text of the Bible and precisely in accord with that first disclosed in Genesis (cf. Matt. 19:4; Rom. 5:12–19; 1 Cor. 15:45–49; 1 Tim. 2:13). The efforts men make to explain away the works of God seem too often to be an attempt to hinder others from any belief in God. The record God has given is worthy of Him. Those who treat the record with contempt treat God with the same contempt, despising divine counsels and rejecting divine grace. The one who embraces the theory of animal ancestry dishonors both God and himself.

Beyond its insult to God and man and beyond its unpardonable and indefensible failure to offer scientific proof for its bold assertions, is the moral effect of this antigod hypothesis. It is not contended that evolution as a system teaches immorality directly; it is declared, however, that this pagan philosophy, being destitute of God who is the only source of moral ideals, cannot engender any moral impulse. As certainly as God created man, so certainly man sustains an inherent moral responsibility to be like God in conduct, as man is like God by creation. God has made a reasonable command to His human creatures: “Be ye holy; for I am holy” (1 Pet. 1:16; cf. Matt. 5:48). The human creature’s welfare is not only designed by God but is to be executed to His glory. On this ground all moral conduct is based, for there is no other basis on which it could rest. Man’s actions are right when conformed to the character of God, and wrong when not conformed to the character of God. No other basis for a distinction between good and evil exists. On the other hand, if man is the product of natural forces, then he has as much responsibility along moral lines as natural forces demand and no more. If God and His Word are eliminated, as the evolutionary hypothesis eliminates them, then men may look to tadpoles for their moral ideals, and truth is without a foundation, the holiness of angels is a fiction, and the corruption of the devil is a libel, being an advertisement of that which does not exist. It is to be

expected that animalism will creep into society and into schools where this antigod system is upheld. If society and schools retain some moral ideals in spite of their antigod philosophy, it is no more than the fast-waning moral momentum of a preceding, God-honoring generation. Off, indeed, to a poor start would the Bible with its heaven-high conceptions of conduct be, if the baseless assertions of the evolutionary hypothesis were substituted for the sublime account of creation.

Beyond the natural government of God which He exercises over material creation and over living things as parts of His orderly arrangement, there is an exercise of moral discipline which applies to rational beings, both angelic and human. These must consider the difference between good and evil. Such a difference and such a moral government are eliminated when God is eliminated.

That form of modernism which embraces human theories and rejects revelation is incapable of forming a theology, and its avowed abhorrence for things doctrinal is a witness against it. Often, indeed, must one turn to the Scripture which declares, "Let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom. 3:4).

The certitude which now characterizes those who embrace the evolutionary theory is well reflected in the opening paragraph of the article on *evolution of man* found in the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which reads:

The late Sir E. B. Tylor, writing on the evolutionary theory of man's origin, made the following statement: "In one form or another such a theory of human descent has, in our time, become part of an accepted framework of zoology, if not as a demonstrable truth, at any rate as a working hypothesis which has no effective rival." When Sir Edward Tylor made this statement in 1910 he was in his 78th year; his memory could carry him back to a time when it was believed that man had come into the world as a special creation some 4,000 years before the birth of Christ and owed no kinship to other living things. He was 27 years of age when Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published in 1859; in 1865, two years after Huxley had issued his renowned treatise on *Man's Place in Nature*, he himself published a work which threw a new light on human history, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization*. When Darwin's *Descent of Man* came out in 1871, Tylor's *Primitive Culture; Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art and Custom*, kept it company. By the end of the 19th century he had seen chair after chair in the universities of the world filled by men who were convinced that evolution was true; at his death in 1917, at the age of 85, he had seen another generation of enquirers grow up who, after applying Darwin's teaching to all departments of man's world—to his body, mind and culture—remained convinced that, as a working hypothesis, the doctrine of evolution had no rival.
—XIV, 758

Thus it is admitted by Sir E. B. Tylor that the evolutionary theory is at least a working hypothesis if it be not a demonstrable truth.

The likeness of man's physical constitution to that of the higher form of

animals is fully asserted and included in the Genesis account, but those who hold the evolutionary theory seize upon these similarities as though they belonged exclusively to that theory. This is illustrated by the first paragraph of the “summary of the evidence” included in the same article quoted above: “No matter what aspect of man the student of to-day may select for study, the conviction that evolution (*q.v.*) is true is forced on him. If he investigates the development of the child in the womb he comes across a complicated series of appearances which can be explained only if Darwin’s teaching is accepted.”

In the matter of fossil forms, the most unprovable items are set forth with a prejudice in favor of the evolutionary theory, which is wholly detrimental to the theory advanced. Under *Palaeontology* and as *evidence*, this same article asserts: “In recently formed strata of the earth fossil forms of man are found; those from the older strata are more apelike than those from the newer. In still older strata are found fossil fragments of great anthropoids; in still more ancient, the remains of small anthropoids; deeper still in the earth’s records no trace of anthropoid has yet been discovered. In these older strata occur fossil remains of small monkey-like primates. The geological records, so far as they are yet known, support Darwin’s theory of man’s origin; they are altogether against the belief that man appeared suddenly—by a special act of creation.”

Here the writer, above quoted, admits a complete contradiction of the Genesis account. So far as fossil forms go, none more impressive have been found than those of the so-called *Pithecanthropus erectus*. Of this the same writer states:

The discovery which throws most light on the evolutionary progress of man was made in Java during 1891–92 by Prof. Eugène Dubois, then a surgeon in the colonial military service, and later professor of geology in the University of Amsterdam. In a stratum which contained the fossil bones of many extinct species of animals he obtained five fragments of a strange kind of being, one of which he regarded as a transitional form between man and ape—a real missing link. He named it *Pithecanthropus erectus*, and assigned it to a separate family of primates—one lying on the borderline between anthropoids and man. ... The five fossil fragments found were: a skull cap which outwardly had the form which might be expected in a giant form of gibbon, a left thigh bone and three teeth. The most distant of the fragments were 20 paces apart. Later he added a sixth fragment—part of a lower jaw found in another part of the island but in a stratum of the same geological age. The skull cap is flat, low and has great eyebrow ridges; its characters are more simian than human, yet when Prof. Dubois succeeded in obtaining a cast from the interior of the skull cap, that cast bore on it the convolutionary pattern of the brain of *Pithecanthropus*, and that pattern proved to be altogether human. *Pithecanthropus*, the fossil man of Java, had a brain which was smaller, simpler and infinitely more primitive than that of the lowest living men.

After a section enlarging on the probable size and capacity of the brain of this supposed human being, the writer concludes:

Pithecanthropus was assigned by Prof. Dubois, on reliable evidence, to a date late in the Pliocene period; others on weighing the evidence suppose that he lived early in the Pleistocene period. If we accept the duration of the Pleistocene as 250,000 years, and regard Pithecanthropus as representing the evolutionary stage reached by mankind at the beginning of this period, then we have to conclude that man's body had become adapted to its peculiar posture and gait before the end of the Pliocene period, and that the higher development of the brain took place in the ensuing Pleistocene period. ... Are we to regard Pithecanthropus as man or as ape? The answer is that he was human because of the following reasons. In point of size and conformation, his brain attained almost the lowest limit of modern or Neanthropic man; his posture and mode of progression were human; his hands and arms were freed from locomotion; his teeth fall within range of human variation. Pithecanthropus represents one of the dawn forms of humanity, and with his discovery it became possible to affirm that man's antiquity could be carried back with certainty to the close of the Pliocene period. It is not unlikely that higher forms than Pithecanthropus were evolved before the end of the Pliocene period; the stage reached by Pilt-down man early in the Pleistocene period supports such an inference. A consideration of all the evidence leads us to expect that the fossil remains of emerging primitive man have to be sought for in strata of the Pliocene period, and those of emerging Neanthropic man in deposits of the Pleistocene.

That credulity which grasps at five or six "fossil fragments" which expose no more than a skull cap, a thigh bone, and three teeth, and these scattered apart by a distance of twenty paces, or sixty feet, and which declares this to be "the discovery which throws most light on the evolutionary progress of man" can hardly be taken seriously. Educated men would not try thus to stand on the shadow of a shadow were they able by any spiritual vision to enthrone God in His place as Creator. It still remains true in spite of five or six "fossil fragments" separated in their location by sixty feet (and would not that power be welcome which wrought before Ezekiel's vision when "bones came together, bone to his bone"?), that God created man in His own image. Some men evidently prefer the *image* of the ape, but there are those still who prefer the *image* of God.

II. Revelation

Man is created in the "image" and "likeness" of God and God alone is equal to this stupendous task. In His Word, God does not impose puerile and absurd notions upon man's credulity. He assigns a sufficient and reasonable Cause for all things when He declares that He is the Creator. A marvelous array of harmonious truth is compressed into the first two chapters of the Bible. Here is a record from God declaring the existing relationship between the Creator and the human creature. No other literature in the world is so replete with direct revelation which is calculated to inform the mind of man and to guide scientific research as are these first pages of the Bible. This portion of the Scriptures has drawn out an incomparable body of literature both constructive and critical, yet

the text abides unchanged and is now as satisfying to the devout mind as ever it has been.

The fact that the creation of man is given in two narratives—one in each of the two opening chapters of Genesis—has caused much discussion. Again a strong emphasis is imposed by a second rehearsal and on a theme that, in the light of human unbelief, doubtless demands this pronounced amplification. Certain variations, however, are to be seen in these accounts, and, as so often in the Bible, both accounts are needed to complete the record. The first is general; the second introduces details which, had they been incorporated into the first, would have marred its majestic rhythm and symmetry. According to the first account, the man and the woman are alike the direct creation of God (1:26–27); but in the second account, it is stated that the man was first brought into being, having been formed from the dust of the ground, and the woman is taken from the man by a special divine arrangement which resulted in the same completeness of being (2:7, 21–25). According to the first narrative, man in his creation is closely related to the animals which are of three classes—“the beast of the earth,” “cattle,” “and every thing that creepeth upon the earth”—but, in the second account, no more is said of these than that they are true to their kind. However, of man it is three times stated in one verse and as a part of the first account that God created man (1:27). This tremendous emphasis follows immediately upon the solemn and formal declaration that it was God’s *purpose* to create man (1:26). The emphatic nature of repetition is to be seen again in the fact that man is three times said to be made in the *image* of God (1:26–27). Language, as employed in the Word of God, can be no more insistent than it is when it asserts three times that God created man directly, and three times that He created man in His own image. Any human philosophy which denies these determining averments is not choosing one of two doubtful opinions about what God has said; it cuts squarely through the most emphatic truth God has ever revealed to man and implies that God is untrue to that degree. Though such wickedness be sustained by all the pseudo-scholarship of the world, it is still false to the final degree and belongs to the bold antigod character of the one who first contradicted God by saying, “Ye shall not surely die” (cf. Gen. 2:17 with 3:4). The first record of man’s creation chronicles with sublime simplicity a most difficult theme, namely, that man shares the animal existence and yet in a special sense is made in the likeness of God, and it is in every instance said to be the triune *Elohim* who thus creates. In the added detail which characterizes the second record, it is declared that man and woman are alike on the physical side,

having been made either directly—as in the case of the man—or indirectly—as in the case of the woman—from the dust of the ground. At this point the science of chemistry as represented in the human body is introduced. Macdonald in his *Creation and the Fall*, p. 326, states: “It is well known that the animal body is composed, in the inscrutable manner called *organization*, of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, lime, iron, sulphur, and phosphorus, substances which in their various combinations form a large part of the solid ground” (cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 280). It is probable, also, that this earthly origin of man’s body accounts for the fact that he is named *Adam*, which may be from *ādḥāmāh*, meaning ‘ground.’ A more distinguishing feature of man’s being, as recorded in connection with his creation, is the truth that God breathed into him the breath of lives (lit., plural). Of this F. Delitzsch writes: “It is not merely the general life principle imparted to the world which individualizes itself in man, but that God breathes directly into the nostrils of man the fulness of His personality, ... that in a manner corresponding to the personality of God, man may become a living soul” (cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 283). Out of all these facts so simply stated in these two chapters, almost endless doctrinal truth has been developed.

The general comparison of the two creation narratives is summed up by John Laidlaw in *The Bible Doctrine of Man* (Cunningham Lectures, pp. 35–37) thus:

At all events, the relation of the two accounts becomes very clear when we place them side by side. The first may be called cosmical, the second physiological. The former is the generic account of man’s creation—of man the race, the ideal; the latter is the production of the actual man, of the historic Adam. The former spoke of the creative *fiat* which called man into existence; this speaks of the plastic process through which the Creator formed both man and woman—him from the dust of the ground, her from the bone and flesh of man. The former spoke of them as to their type—in the image of God; this, of the element in which that type was realized—a material frame, informed by a divinely-inbreathed spirit. The former spoke of mankind at the head of the creatures, ruling over the earth and them; this speaks of the home provided for him, the work committed to him, the relationships formed for him, and, finally, of the moral law under which he was placed in his relation to God. And no unbiassed reader can see anything but unity in these two accounts—a real and reasonable harmony, as distinguished from literal or verbal dovetailing; nor can we doubt that the master hand which knit into that marvellous whole—the book of Genesis—various paragraphs of precious tradition, enshrining the highest spiritual truth, has placed these two accounts of the creation of man side by side for the mutual light which they shed on each other without absolute contact, and certainly without contradiction. The results of this twofold biblical account of man’s becoming are clear, definite, and intelligible. His origin is not emanation, but creation—formation out of existing materials on the one side of his nature, out of the blessed fulness of the divine life on the other. His becoming is in the line of the natural order of animated beings, but at its climax. His position among them is central and supreme, but his nature stands distinguished from them all in that it is formed after the divine image.

According to this and all other parts of the Bible, Adam is as real a person as any that ever lived on earth, and is in no way an inferior man. Huxley stated that the oldest human skeleton could easily be the remains of a philosopher, and Dana admitted human speculation was without evidence for its foundation. Thus, also, Darwin said that the gap between the animal world and man was amazing.

The one and only “workable theory” for the origin of man is that advanced by the Creator Himself and this event in creation need not be restricted with respect to its date to the time which accepted chronology has fixed. The history of man on the earth may easily be more than the supposed six thousand years and with no violence to the testimony of the Sacred Text. Whether it be at one time or another, it remains true that God created man immediately and directly. On this premise all Scripture advances and apart from it the testimony of the Creator is abjured.

III. The Time of Man’s Origin

Regarding the time of man’s origin, various groups of scientists are properly challenged: the historian with his concern for facts relative to early peoples and nations, the distinction between races and the possibility of a common origin; the philologist with his problem of the origin of language in the light of its present varied forms; the archaeologist and the geologist with the evidence they offer for the antiquity of man. What these men assert about the age of the human family varies to such a degree that all claims to infallibility are shattered. Disagreement among authorities has no tendency to engender belief or to establish dependable data. A general contention arises which claims that man has lived much longer on the earth than the date 4004 B.C., estimated by Archbishop Usher. These imperative demands of modern scientists deserve candid consideration on the part of theologians. The question may be asked whether conservative theology is committed to the dates which are based on the Usher chronology. On this problem of chronology, Dr. Miley has written:

It is well known that biblical chronology remains, as it ever has been, an open question. Individuals may have been very positive respecting the exact years of the great epochal events in the world’s history, but there is no common concurrence in such a view. The profoundest students of the question find different measures of time, not varying so widely as between scientists, yet sufficiently to be of value in the adjustment of the seeming issue with facts of science. The leading views are well known and easily stated. The origin of man preceded the advent of our Lord by 4,004 years, as reckoned by Usher on the ground of the Hebrew Scriptures; by 5,411 years, as reckoned by Hales on the ground of the Septuagint Version. Here is a margin of 1,407 years, which might cover many facts of science respecting the presence of man in the world, and bring them into

harmony with biblical chronology. The acceptance of this reckoning requires no cunning device. While through the Vulgate Version the shorter period gained ascendancy in the Western Church, in the Eastern the longer period prevailed. With the whole Church it has been quite as common; and, while a lower estimate than that of Usher has rarely been made, a longer reckoning than that of Hales has not been rare. The uncertainty of biblical chronology is of special value in its adjustment to the reasonable claims of science respecting the time of man's origin. That uncertainty is no recent assumption, no mere device which the exigency of an issue with science has forced upon biblical chronologists, but has long been felt and openly expressed. The many different and widely varying results of the most careful reckoning witness to the uncertainty of the data upon which that reckoning proceeds. The tables of genealogy are the chief data in the case, and their aim is to trace the lines of descent, not to mark the succession of years. Hence the line of connection is not always traced immediately from father to son, but often the transition is to a descendant several generations later—which answers just as well for the ruling purpose, however it may perplex the question of time. “Thus in Gen. 46:18, after recording the sons of Zilpa, her grandsons and her great-grandsons, the writer adds, ‘These are the sons of Zilpa, ... and these she bare unto Jacob, even sixteen souls.’ The same thing recurs in the case of Bilha, verse 25, ‘*she* bare these unto Jacob: all the souls were seven.’ Compare verses 15, 22. No one can pretend that the author of this register did not use the term understandingly of descendants beyond the first generation. In like manner, according to Matt. 1:11, Josias begat his grandson Jechonias, and verse 8, Joram begat his great-grandson Ozias. And in Gen. 10:15–18, Canaan, the grandson of Noah, is said to have begotten several whole nations, the Jebusite, the Amorite, the Girgasite, the Hivite, etc. Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than that, in the usage of the Bible, ‘to bear’ and ‘to beget’ are used in a wide sense to indicate descent, without restricting this to the immediate offspring” (Green: *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*, p. 132). It would be easy to give many other instances of a like presentation of facts. Such facts justify the prevalent uncertainty respecting biblical chronology. Indeed, the tables which furnish the chief data for its construction are purely genealogical, and in no proper sense chronological. With such uncertainty of data, no biblical chronology can have either fixed limits or doctrinal claim. It follows that the usual reckoning may be so extended as to meet any reasonable requirement of scientific facts respecting the time of man's origin, without the perversion of any part of Scripture or the violation of any law of hermeneutics. Such are the views of theologians thoroughly orthodox in creed and most loyal to the Scriptures.—*Systematic Theology*, I, 359–61

With respect to his beginning, man is the most recent of all creatures; and in spite of the fact that scientists are wont to talk in terms of vast ages when dealing with the problem of human life on the earth—especially the evolutionist whose assumption depends so completely on the whole matter of origin being buried in the oblivion of an incomprehensible past—the reasonable extension of human history back several thousand years beyond the dates proposed by Usher—which extension does not conflict, as before stated, with the Biblical record—allows sufficient time for all justified contentions of the historian, the geologist, the archaeologist, and the philologist.

When considering the claims of the geologist and the archaeologist, Dr. Miley (*op. cit.*, I, 363–65) quotes at length from a scientist of his day to whose findings no material facts have been added in this generation. The quotation is reproduced here in full:

The calculations of long time based on the gravels of the Somme, on the cone of the Tinière, on the peat-bogs of France and Denmark, on certain cavern deposits, have all been shown to be more or less at fault; and possibly none of these reach further back than six or seven thousand years which, according to Dr. Andrews, have elapsed since the close of the bowlder-clay deposits in America. ... Let us look at a few facts. Much use has been made of the "cone" or delta of the Tinière, on the eastern side of the Lake of Geneva, as an illustration of the duration of the modern period. This little stream has deposited at its mouth a mass of *débris* carried down from the hills. This being cut through by a railway, is found to contain Roman remains to a depth of four feet, bronze implements to a depth of ten feet, stone implements to a depth of nineteen feet. The deposit ceased about three hundred years ago, and, calculating 1,300 to 1,500 years for the Roman period, we should have 7,000 to 10,000 years as the age of the cone. But before the formation of the present cone another had been formed twelve times as large. Thus for the two cones together a duration of more than 90,000 years is claimed. It appears, however, that this calculation has been made irrespective of two essential elements in the question. No allowance has been made for the fact that the inner layers of a cone are necessarily smaller than the outer; nor for the further fact that the older cone belongs to a distinct time (the pluvial age already referred to), when the rainfall was much larger, and the transporting power of the torrent greater in proportion. Making allowance for these conditions, the age of the newer cone, that holding human remains, falls between 4,000 and 5,000 years. The peat-bed of Abbeville, in the north of France, has grown at the rate of one and a half or two inches in a century. Being twenty-six feet in thickness, the time occupied in its growth must have amounted to 20,000 years; and yet it is probably newer than some of the gravels on the same river containing flint implements. But the composition of the Abbeville peat shows that it is a forest peat, and the erect stems preserved in it prove that in the first instance it must have grown at the rate of about three feet in a century, and after the destruction of the forest its rate of increase down to the present time diminished rapidly almost to nothing. Its age is thus reduced to perhaps less than 4,000 years. In 1865 I had an opportunity to examine the now celebrated gravels of St. Acheul, on the Somme, by some supposed to go back to a very ancient period. With the papers of Prestwick and other able observers in my hand, I could conclude merely that the undisturbed gravels were older than the Roman period, but how much older only detailed topographical surveys could prove; and that taking into account the probabilities of a different level of the land, a wooded condition of the country, a greater rainfall, and a glacial filling of the Somme valley with clay and stones subsequently cut out by running water, the gravels could scarcely be older than the Abbeville peat. ... Taylor and Andrews have, however, I think, subsequently shown that my impressions were correct. In like manner, I fail to perceive—and I think all American geologists acquainted with the prehistoric monuments of the western continent must agree with me—any evidence of great antiquity in the caves of Belgium and England, the kitchen-middens of Denmark, the rock-shelters of France, the lake-habitations of Switzerland. At the same time, I would disclaim all attempt to resolve their dates into precise terms of years. I may merely add that the elaborate and careful observations of Dr. Andrews on the raised beaches of Lake Michigan—observations of a much more precise character than any which, in so far as I know, have been made of such deposits in Europe—enable him to calculate the time which has elapsed since North America rose out of the waters of the glacial period as between 5,500 and 7,500 years. This fixes at least the possible duration of the human period in North America, though I believe there are other lines of evidence which would reduce the residence of man in America to a much shorter time. Longer periods have, it is true, been deduced from the delta of the Mississippi and the gorge of Niagara; but the deposits of the former have been found by Hilgard to be in great part marine, and the excavation of the latter began at a period probably long anterior to the advent of man.—Dawson, *Story of the Earth and Man*, pp. 292–96

Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., in his book *The Pentateuch Vindicated*, page 128, says:

It must not be forgotten that there is an element of uncertainty in a computation of time which rests upon genealogies as the sacred chronology so largely does. Who is to certify us that the antediluvian and ante-Abrahamic genealogies have not been condensed in the same manner as the post-Abrahamic. If Matthew omitted names from the ancestry of our Lord in order to equalize the three great periods over which he passes, may not Moses have done the same in order to bring out seven generations from Adam to Enoch, and ten from Adam to Noah? Our current chronology is based upon the *prima facie* impression of these genealogies. This we shall adhere to until we shall see good reason for giving it up. But if these recently discovered indications of the antiquity of man, over which scientific circles are now so excited, shall, when carefully inspected and thoroughly weighed, demonstrate all that any have imagined they might demonstrate, what then? They will simply show that the popular chronology is based upon a wrong interpretation, and that a select and partial register of ante-Abrahamic names has been mistaken for a complete one.— Cited by A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, p. 297

The philologist, beginning with the supposition that man originated his own language, contends that vast ages are required to accomplish this end and adds to this even more ages for the development of language into its present varied forms. This theory ignores the Biblical account. There is the best of reason for believing that man was created with the ability to speak and to understand speech. Adam was created as mature in mind as he was in body. That he employed language from the beginning of his consciousness is indicated in the Genesis account. The Genesis account also records that, after a period in which man had but one language on the earth, God directly and purposely confounded all language with its attending results to this day (Gen. 11:5–9). If these records are accepted, the claims of the philologist are unimportant.

Similarly, the argument of the historian concerning the extended time required for the development from one original stock of peoples and nations of widely different physical features, fails to consider the divine record. The variation in nations led Agassiz to contend that each division of the race was separately created. This theory held by Agassiz, though without a basis, does aim at the solution of a problem which science has never solved. The Biblical record asserts that, whatever may have been the drift of human characteristics before the flood, the race was reduced to one family and from that limited stock the present population of the earth sprang. The testimony of Genesis 10:32, which reads, “These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood,” is exceedingly clear about the origin of nations. God caused heads of nations to be born of Noah’s line. To what extent this may have gone, no

information is given. It is enough to know that, according to the Word of God, the problem of different nations emerging from a common stock is accounted for in this passage. That God could found races from individual men is proved in the more recent case of Abraham and the Hebrew people. Originally Abraham was of the common stock of the citizens of Ur, yet from him God caused the most identified race of the earth to come forth, to say nothing of Ishmael and the distinctive people he engendered.

In addition to such racial features as it has pleased God to establish by direct control, is the truth that human types and characteristics are ever changing under the force of various influences; but above all this, the human family is unchangeable. It retains its unity and physical structure, exhibiting the same capacities, the same moral and religious nature. Parts of the race may sink into heathenism, or go the way of the highest revelation; yet the facts and forms of human reality cannot change. There are no hybrid restrictions between the most distant races. This alone asserts the unity of the human family. Neither *polygenism*—which contends that there have been separate creations for each of the distinct species—nor *pre-adamitism*—which asserts that humanity existed before Adam and that he was the head only of a specific stock—has any support in the Scriptures.

When men reject the Bible and seek to find their way through the problems of human life, their gropings are of little value, though they may be sincere. The Bible discloses that which God would have man know. “Through faith we understand” (Heb. 11:3).

Chapter XIII

THE MATERIAL PART OF MAN AT CREATION

HAVING GIVEN some consideration to the controversy between the two systems which essay to solve the problem of human origin, this work proceeds on the assured ground that man came from the hand of his Creator in precisely the manner that is set forth in the infallible Oracles of Truth. There is therefore another consideration to be attended, namely, man's estate at creation. Here no complications arise other than the right understanding of the Sacred Text. The evolutionary theory is unable to give any worthy record of man's first estate. In that system supposed interminable ages are depended upon to create an oblivion from which nothing definite could be expected. It is logical enough, having begun with nothing, to end with nothing. If the idea of man's endless existence be borrowed from the Bible, it must be asserted that it is only the man whom God has created that endures forever. The man of supposed natural origin has no more worthy destiny than his assumed beginning. Concerning him there is no dependable information. The system which by its arrogation brands God as a liar in matters of human origin, should find a logical destiny for its fictitious characters without drawing upon revelation. Systematic Theology is concerned only with the truth which the Bible records, and with respect to man the Bible presents a wide field of harmonious facts to be considered and from these, definite conclusions may be drawn.

The twofold nature of man's being—that which is material and that which is immaterial—is determined in the very way in which man was created. It is written: "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils [*i.e.*, face] the breath of lives [lit., plural]; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). Thus the material part of man was formed in all its completeness from the dust of the ground, lacking only that from God which gave life. That breath from God was a rational soul and spirit, which was as far removed from other forms of life that are in the world as God is removed from His creation. This inbreathing was an endless life—a life not subject to death, even though, as a penalty for sin, the body dies. Such is the character and duration of God-breathed human life. This inbreathed life is not to be confused with "the gift of God [which] is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23). The latter is the inbreathing of regeneration and is freely bestowed upon all who believe to the saving of the soul. The Word of God records three

divine inbreathings: (a) that by which man became a living soul with an eternal existence, whether it be in weal or woe; (b) the inbreathing into the disciples of the Holy Spirit by the resurrected Christ (John 20:22); and (c) the inbreathing of the Word of God, which is its inspiration (2 Tim. 3:16).

The truth respecting man's being may be divided somewhat naturally into seven main divisions, namely, (a) the material part of man, (b) the immaterial part of man, (c) the environment of the first man, (d) the responsibility of the first man, (e) the moral qualities of the first man, (f) the tempter of the first man, and (g) the temptation of the first man.

Combining in himself that which is material—a physical body—and that which is immaterial—a soul and spirit—man is thus related in two directions—to substance and to spirit existence. Animals, it is true, partake of similar dual factors; but their immaterial part is but a form of created life, and in their material part, while similar in many respects to man—possessing flesh, bones, nerves, brain, blood, vital organs, and powers of procreation—the refinements of the human body are lacking. The body of a brute is adapted to the activities of the brute, while the body of man is adapted to his participation in art, science, literature, and mechanics. It is evident that the human body provides a medium for sensation, ecstasy, and pain corresponding to the exalted character of human nature, as in contrast to the less exalted requirements of animal life. Much that is germane to the present phase of this discussion has been considered earlier under the anthropological argument for the existence of God. The body of man and the body of the animal exhibit the thought and design of the Creator; but the body of man, being more delicate and refined, is an imposing and impressive manifestation of the divine purpose.

I. The Structural Character of the Human Body

With its incomparable, sublime simplicity, the Word of God declares that God formed man's body from the dust of the ground. Chemically, this is true. One scientific authority states that sixteen elements of the soil are represented in the human body. These he enumerates as follows: calcium, carbon, chlorine, fluorine, hydrogen, iodine, iron, magnesium, manganese, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, potassium, silicon, sodium, sulphur. The vital minerals are calcium, iron, potassium, magnesia, sodium, and silicon. All of these minerals are present in organic form and compose nearly six per cent of the body, the remainder being of water, carbon, and gases. Though no mineral in its inorganic form can

be assimilated by the human body, when transformed from inorganic to organic form by their absorption into vegetation or being broken down by chemical action, they are then prepared to take their place in the human body. Thus it may be seen that the testimony of science reiterates the Biblical disclosure that the human body is “of the earth, earthy” (1 Cor. 15:47–49), and the spirit of man, like a “treasure,” is contained in “earthen vessels” (2 Cor. 4:7).

By a marvelous function of the human body, which belongs to the process of life, the body of a normal living person is constantly casting off and taking on its own elements. The child grows and the body of a mature person is sustained by unceasing appropriation of new materials which come directly or indirectly from the dust of the ground. To some degree, the growing and sustaining of the body is a continuation of the first creative undertaking when God formed the body from the dust of the ground.

Of solemn import are the words which assert that man’s body returns to the dust from which it was originally derived. Of this dissolution it is written: “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return” (Gen. 3:19).

So adapted is the body to the purposes and functions of the immaterial man that he in no wise becomes conscious of any separation between the body and the soul. All ecstasy, pain, sensation, or ability which expresses itself in and through the body is identified as one’s own person and as belonging to one’s own self. In a most exceptional spiritual experience, the Apostle declares of himself, “Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth” (2 Cor. 12:2).

Though material and immaterial parts of man are often set over against each other and reference is made to them as component parts of man’s being, man is, nevertheless, a unity—one being—and the material and immaterial can be separated only by physical death. There is a psychology which treats man as an integer, a monad, and asserts that the immaterial part of man is not the man, nor is the material part the man; but that he is the *tertium quid* of both elements united. Naturally, there is a ground on which this thesis might rest, but the Bible definitely and constantly separates these two factors in man’s being. The logical conclusion of this psychology is that death is the end of man’s existence since the body so obviously ceases to function and decays, and that man’s immaterial part, being, as supposed, inseparable from the body, must suffer the same fate. Over against this, the Scriptures teach with clearness that man, though a unity, is

composed of separable parts. While the immaterial part of man resides in the body, the sense of unity is all that man experiences. At death these elements are separated for a season, only to be reunited in God's appointed time and way. It is thus demonstrated that those two parts are separable.

J. B. Heard in his book *Tripartite Nature of Man* (pp. 58–59) declares:

We are advancing in the right direction when we maintain the separate existence of the mind and body, and yet regard the former as perfectly pervading the latter, nay, as being the formative principle by which it is constructed and adapted to our nature and use. The goal to which modern research is tending is the point where the old dualism between mind and body will not disappear, but combine instead under some higher law of unity which we have not as yet grasped. Physiology and psychology will not stand contrasted then as they do now, but rather appear as the two sides of the same thing seen in its outward and inward aspect. The resurrection of the body, which at present is a stumbling-block to the spiritualists and foolishness to materialists, will then be found to be the wisdom of God as well as the power of God, and so the Scripture intimations of the unity of man's true nature in one person will be abundantly vindicated. According to Scripture, the body is neither the slave of the soul nor its prison-house, as philosophy, with its dualistic views of body and mind, has constantly taught. The relation of the two may be described as sacramental; the body is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual mind. The mind is not seated in one part of the body, but in the whole; it does not employ one class of organs only, but all. Hence the well-known Hebraism, "All my bones shall praise Thee;" and the other expression, "Naphshi," which we render as "My soul," but which might be better expressed "Myself." The entire nature of the mind breathing through the entire body.—Cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, pp. 303–4

In 1876 St. George Mivart wrote in *Lessons From Nature*:

The lesson, then, concerning man, which we seem to gather from nature as revealed to us in our own consciousness and as externally observed, is that man differs fundamentally from every other creature which presents itself to our senses. That he differs absolutely, and therefore differs in origin also. Although a strict unity, one material whole with one form or force (not made of two parts mutually acting, according to the vulgar notion of soul and body), yet he is seen to be a compound unity in which two distinct orders of being unite. He is manifestly "animal," with the reflex functions, feelings, desires, and emotions of an animal. Yet equally manifest is it that he has a special nature "looking before and after," which constitutes him "rational." Ruling, comprehending, interpreting, and completing much in nature, we also see in him that which manifestly points above nature. We see this, since we know that he can conceive mind indefinitely augmented in power, and devoid of those limitations and imperfections it exhibits in him. Manifestly a contemplation of nature must be futile indeed which neglects to ponder over those ideas of power, wisdom, purpose, goodness, and will which are revealed to him in and by his own nature as he knows it to exist, and therefore as conceivably existing in a far higher form in that vast universe of being of which he is a self-conscious fragment.—Pp. 190–91, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 305

The fact that the Old Testament contains no distinctive word for the body of man suggests the limitations in earlier revelations on that doctrine. This, however, is in harmony with the progress of doctrine observable along many specific lines. The Old Testament does refer to the soul as a particular part of man and to portions of the body as members in particular. James asserts that "the

body without the spirit is dead” (2:26), but this implies that these features—body and spirit—are capable of being separated. So the Apostle states: “Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: ... We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord” (2 Cor. 5:6–8). The Apostle also likens the body to that which is “outward” and the soul and spirit to that which is “inward.” He writes: “For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day” (2 Cor. 4:16). And Peter’s personal testimony is as definite: “Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance” (2 Pet. 1:13–15). Christ gave an arresting warning which incorporates the same truth: “And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” (Matt. 10:28). By these and many similar Scriptures the proof is offered that man is a unified *ego* while he is “at home” in the body; yet not so unified that his essential elements cannot be identified, or, under certain circumstances, be separated.

The human body was injured by the fall. To what extent it is now injured, none can fully estimate. It became a dying, death-doomed body. The fact that, as it was originally created, it possessed vital organs and was self-sustained as the body is now sustained, indicates that, apart from such protection and support as God may have provided, the original or unfallen body was capable of death. Death was not then inevitable, though it was possible. God imposed the sentence of death—death in all its forms—upon the first man and through him upon the race (Rom. 5:12) as a penalty for sin. As first created man was not subject to death; yet, because of sin, man became a dying creature. Though life is ever constructing the body, death is ever destroying and with the certainty in view, apart from those who experience the rapture and thus do not die, that death will win the conflict. “It is appointed unto men once to die” (Heb. 9:27).

II. The Future of the Human Body

Though too often unobserved, the Word of God declares that in every instance, whether of the unsaved or of the saved, the human body will be raised from the dead. The following words by Christ are incapable of any other interpretation: “For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son

to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:26–29). The fact that Daniel 12:2–3 is somewhat restricted would indicate, as the context asserts, that it is only Daniel’s people, or Israel, who are in view. Having made reference to the incomparable trial that is predicted for Israel, the prophet declares, “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” (Dan. 12:2). The restriction is to be noted in the words “many of them,” which is clearly not *all* that sleep in the dust of the earth. Doubtless those not raised at that time are the unregenerate Gentiles of whose resurrection there is specific revelation (cf. John 5:28; Rev. 20:12). Still another lucid passage states the universality of resurrection for all human bodies: “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:22–26), the one exception mentioned in this context being of those saints who do not “sleep”; yet their bodies are to be changed. It is written: “Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (1 Cor. 15:51–53). And thus, also, in reference to universality the Apostle says: “And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust” (Acts 24:15).

A full description of the character of the believer’s resurrection body is to be gained by an induction of all the disclosures which the New Testament affords of Christ’s resurrection body: “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. 3:20–21). This, however, pertains only to the body of those who, being saved, are raised at the coming of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:23). With respect to the nature of the

resurrection body of the unsaved in which they “stand” before the great white throne (Rev. 20:12), little may be determined. There can be no doubt about the *fact* of their resurrection at the time and place divinely appointed.

What is ever a question of engaging interest, namely, “How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?” (1 Cor. 15:35), is answered by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 15:36–44. The problem of a literal or actual reappearance of the believer’s body by resurrection after its dissolution in the grave, or after an immediate destruction of the elements, is one about which many theories have been propounded. Most determining is the truth that in His resurrection—the pattern of the Christian’s resurrection—Christ left nothing of His material body in the tomb. Over against this disclosure is the statement of the Apostle that the resurrection body will be related to the present body as the harvest is related to the seed from which it germinates—which seed must always decay. Even in the existence of the present body there is difficulty in identification of its parts over any period of time. The constant flux of its substance is such that the entire body is dissolved and rebuilt at least every seven years. It is, therefore, hardly a matter of identity of particles or of the resurrection of relics any more than the harvest is the reappearing of the actual matter which was contained in the decaying seed. In the case of Christ, the remaining of a vestige of His body in the tomb would have established the error that He did not rise from the dead. A very evident mystery is involved. There is no ground for doubt regarding the truth that the individual personality in its organic unity of spirit, soul, and body is not only redeemed with eternity in view, but that the body is raised and shares its own specific redemption along with the soul and spirit of man (Rom. 8:19–23), reuniting the body with the soul and spirit. It is the present body that is raised, but in the sense that its identity is utterly merged into, and deposited within, the new body. A complete identity is assumed—that which is sown is raised (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42–44). Human speculation is useless with respect to specific particles which identify any body in this life or the life to come.

Having declared the fact that there is variety in the flesh of creatures and having stated that the resurrection body is related to the present body as the harvest is related to the seed, the Apostle asserts that the present body is *sown*. Of this he writes: “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body” (1

Cor. 15:42–44). Here by four mighty transformations—corruption to incorruption; dishonor to glory; weakness to power; and the natural, or that adapted to the soul, to spiritual, or that adapted to the spirit—is displayed the extent of the change through which the believer’s body, having experienced death, will pass.

Two vital words are employed in this whole context and with softened effect—*sown* (vs. 42) and *sleep* (vs. 51). The former is used in place of the more familiar word *bury*. In the use of either word the thought of interment is indicated, but there is no resurrection hope implied in the word *bury* as is implied in the word *sown*. And while *sleep* is a New Testament term meaning *death* (John 11:11–14; 1 Cor. 11:30), it is that peculiar aspect of death belonging only to the Christian, from which his body will be awakened by the trumpet of God at the coming of Christ (1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:52). The time of this resurrection is given only to the extent that it occurs in connection with the coming of Christ to receive His own—those who are saved in this age. Earlier in this chapter, this event is set forth. The passage states: “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming” (vss. 22–23). Thus, to the same end, it is written: “But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words” (1 Thess. 4:13–18; cf. Phil. 3:10–11, 20–21; Titus 2:11–13).

An exception to this clear teaching on the universality of the resurrection of bodies of Christians is the abrupt statement that “we shall not all sleep” (1 Cor. 15:51), that is, not all Christians are to experience death. By these arresting words a hitherto unrevealed purpose of God, here termed a *mystery*, is disclosed. As elsewhere declared, some will be alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord (1 Thess. 4:15–17); but these do not enter heaven in the present body of limitation. For these, this body will be changed, and that “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye” (vss. 51–52). The change here indicated is not with respect

to residence, though such a change is determined (1 Thess. 4:17), but rather the change is one of the nature of the body itself. It has just been stated that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, “neither doth corruption inherit incorruption” (1 Cor. 15:50). “The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed” (vs. 52). Including himself as one who might not die, the Apostle draws the sharp contrast between those who are raised incorruptible and those who are changed from the living state to the body of glory and without death. “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (vs. 53). Those to whom these promises are addressed have, when saved, “put off” the old man and “put on” the new man (Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9–10), but now they are said to “put on” either *incorruption* or *immortality*; all of which implies that corruption and mortality will be put off. Incorruption is that estate of body which is attained through resurrection from the dead and is described in previous verses (vss. 35–50), and is the *usual* experience of believers; while immortality is that estate of body which is attained by an immediate change, apart from death, and is an exception since it is only for those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord. The final consequence is identical in either case, being, as it will be, a body like unto the glorious body of Christ (Phil. 3:20–21).

The theological usage of the word *immortality* as referring to the endless existence of the soul, must be called into question. *Mortality* is wholly a physical term and its opposite, *immortality*, is no less so. The phrase, “the immortality of the soul,” cannot but mislead and is without the slightest Biblical warrant.

Christ is the one exception to the otherwise universal human program in which either incorruption or immortality is attained. Though He died, He did not see corruption and His present estate is not that of incorruption, but it is an immortal one. Psalm 16:10 predicts both Christ’s death and the truth that He would not see corruption. This text reads: “For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.” And the Apostle Peter brings forward the same truth in his Pentecostal sermon (cf. Acts 2:25–31). The reference, Peter asserts, cannot be to David since David had already seen corruption. It is therefore accurately declared of Christ in relation to His present bodily estate in heaven: “who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen” (1 Tim. 6:16). The specific fact that Christ alone hath immortality will be understood only in the light of the truth that all who “sleep in Jesus” await the hour of His return as the appointed time when

their experience of change from corruption to incorruption will take place, and the mortal, or those yet living, await the same hour of their experience of change from mortal to immortal. Thus Christ only has entered into the glory of the immortal body. He is the display of resurrection's story and the "firstfruits" of them that slept (1 Cor. 15:20, 23).

Death is consistently presented in the Bible as a thing which is abnormal, a judgment upon man because of sin. In all faithfulness the warning was given to Adam that, as a result of his disobedience, *dying thou shalt die* (lit., Gen. 2:17). As created, Adam was free from death. In the face of this warning, he disobeyed God and the impending penalty fell. The larger treatment of this event belongs to hamartiology and under that division will be taken up again. Suffice it to indicate here that all three forms of death—physical, spiritual, and the second death—became the portion of the head of the race through his sin. Physical death is universal for all of Adam's posterity and *immediate* on the ground that they, as present in Adam the federal head, partook in the death-imposing sin. They shared in the sin, being "in the loins" of their father Adam (cf. Heb. 7:9–10). No other interpretation of Romans 5:12 will carry through the explanatory verses which follow (13–21). The fact of man's physical death is accounted for in the Bible on no other basis than this share in Adam's sin. In Adam's case the experience of physical death was deferred for many years, though, as death worketh in all men, Adam began to die physically even on the day that he sinned. In the sphere of spiritual death, Adam died at the moment he transgressed and by a conversion downwards became a different kind of being than God had created. He became possessed with a fallen nature which is itself spiritual death, and this he transmitted *mediately* to his posterity by the laws of generation. Since Adam, being fallen, could propagate only after his kind, the race is as fallen as its federal head. The second death, being the unavoidable eternal character of spiritual death, is experienced by all who do not come by faith in Christ under the regenerating power of God (Rev. 20:12–15).

The promise with reference to physical death is twice asserted, with certainty that death shall be destroyed and be no more. Enumerating the mighty things Christ will accomplish during His kingdom reign, the Apostle declares, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:24–26). Thus, also, in Revelation 21:4, where the future estate of the redeemed on earth is disclosed, it is written, "There shall

be no more death.” The abrogating of death is no less than a repeal of the sentence that was given in Eden, except for the abiding spiritual aspects of death; and is brought about not only by a divine decree which determines its end, but by a universal resurrection or reversal of all that physical death hath wrought. This reference to the cessation of the reign of death, as presented in 1 Corinthians 15:26, is in connection with the *end* or final resurrection-event which closes the whole program of resurrection which began with Christ’s resurrection and includes the resurrection of those that are Christ’s at His coming and includes, also, this, the end resurrection when the remaining dead will “stand” before the great white throne (Rev. 20:12). No disposition of physical death could be more complete and effectual than that all who have ever lived on earth are raised out of death to live forever in conscious existence. From that time none can ever die, for death will not exist. It is clearly predicted that many, having no right relation to God, must abide in separation from God and from blessings which are the portion of the redeemed. “And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still” (Rev. 22:10–11).

The Word of God is uncomplicated in its testimony to the truth that the believer’s body is as eternal in character as the soul and spirit. As has been observed, the term *immortality* refers only to the future of the redeemed body and not at all to the soul, and whatever reality this great word asserts applies only to the body. Though structural changes are in store, since flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15:50), the body that now is shall be raised from the estate of death, leaving naught behind, and shall experience those changes which are divinely determined. The last of the four physical transformations described in 1 Corinthians 15:42–44 is especially far-reaching and illuminating. The truth declared is that the present body is adapted to the soul, being σῶμα ψυχικόν, while the body that is yet to be is adapted to the spirit, being σῶμα πνευματικόν. The measure of this distinction corresponds with the difference which obtains between the human soul and spirit—a difficult problem in metaphysics indeed! The implication that so extensive a difference obtains between the Christian’s soul and spirit as these two bodies represent should go far to correct theories which contend that soul and spirit are identical. Since the resurrection body or changed body is to be like Christ’s glorified body and since that body is adapted to the spirit, it follows that the spirit of man covets those

indescribable refinements which characterize the glorified body of Christ. The present body is said to be one of humiliation or limitation (1 Cor. 15:43; Phil. 3:20–21), but the body that is to be will satisfy every desire of the spirit. On this engaging theme, Laidlaw has written as follows:

It is not wise for us to attempt to say much as to when or how the spiritual body comes. We know that it shall be the fitting garb of a ransomed and glorified spirit. We know that it shall be itself a pledge and trophy that of all Christ got from the Father He has lost nothing. It shall represent the dust redeemed, the body ransomed from the grave. How it is woven in the hidden secret of the life after death, we may not venture to surmise. If we have watched how the body, even here, puts on a likeness and correspondence to the real man, to the life within, it will not be difficult to think that for the ripening Christian his future body is being prepared by the Spirit of Christ dwelling already in this mortal frame, and quickening within it that which is to live for ever. It will be open to us to believe that the process is being perfected for the spirits of the just in an unseen world, and that all these things shall be made plain when they shall appear with Christ at His coming, when the sons of God shall shine forth an exceeding great army, in the day of the adoption, that is, the redemption of their body. “Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.” “Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.”—*Op. cit.*, pp. 260–61

Not a few have interpreted 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 as a special disclosure that there is an intermediate body to be occupied in the period between the believer’s death and the coming of Christ. The passage states: “For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

The thought here expressed is that the redeemed do not desire a disembodied state, which state is inevitable if there be no intermediate body. The body described in this passage is said to be “from heaven,” rather than from the grave. Being of heavenly origin, it belongs to those realities which are eternal. That it belongs to things eternal does not require that it be employed forever. Certainly, the final body of glory is secured only at the coming of Christ. And, as certainly, the body of 2 Corinthians 5:1–8 is provided that there may be no moment of disembodiment. These two facts seem to compel the conclusion that there is an

intermediate body.

In the notes in his *Reference Bible*, Dr. C. I. Scofield has presented an exhaustive summary of the whole doctrine of resurrection. There it is written:

(1) The resurrection of the dead was believed by the patriarchs (Gen. 22:5 with Heb. 11:19; Job 19:25–27), and revealed through the prophets (Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2, 13; Hos. 13:14), and miracles of the dead restored to life are recorded in the O.T. (2 Ki. 4:32–35; 13:21). (2) Jesus Christ restored life to the dead (Mt. 9:25; Lk. 7:12–15; John 11:43, 44), and predicted His own resurrection (John 10:18; Lk. 24:1–8). (3) A resurrection of bodies followed the resurrection of Christ (Mt. 27:52, 53); and the apostles raised the dead (Acts 9:36–41; 20:9, 10). (4) Two resurrections are yet future, which are inclusive of “all that are in the graves” (John 5:28). These are distinguished as “of life” (1 Cor. 15:22, 23; 1 Thes. 4:14–17; Rev. 20:4), and “of judgment” (John 5:28, 29; Rev. 20:11–13). They are separated by a period of one thousand years (Rev. 20:5). The “first resurrection,” that “unto life,” will occur at the second coming of Christ (1 Cor. 15:23), the saints of the O.T. and church ages meeting Him in the air (1 Thes. 4:16, 17); while the martyrs of the tribulation, who also have part in the first resurrection (Rev. 20:4), are raised at the end of the great tribulation. (5) The mortal body will be related to the resurrection body as grain sown is related to the harvest (1 Cor. 15:37, 38); that body will be incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and spiritual (1 Cor. 15:42–44, 49). (6) The bodies of living believers will, at the same time, be instantaneously changed (1 Cor. 15:50–53; Phil. 3:20, 21). This “change” of the living, and resurrection of the dead in Christ is called the “redemption of the body” (Rom. 8:23; Eph. 1:13, 14). (7) After the thousand years the “resurrection unto judgment” (John 5:29) occurs. The resurrection-body of the wicked dead is not described. They are judged according to their works, and cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:7–15).—P. 1228

III. Various Uses of the Word *Body*

Consideration should be given to various uses of the word *body* as employed in the New Testament.

Body of Sin (Rom. 6:6). This phrase, found in Romans 6:6, affords no warrant for the ancient philosophy which teaches that the body is the seat of evil and must therefore be weakened and despised. Such a view contradicts all Biblical testimony concerning the human body. Sin did not begin with the body, but is rather a rebellion of the will against God, and it ever continues the same. The body of the Christian bears unmistakable marks of honor and dignity. It is for the Lord and the Lord is for the body (1 Cor. 6:13); it is a temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:15, 19); its members are to be yielded properly unto God as instruments of righteousness (Rom. 6:13); and it is to be presented unto God a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1). If the body is the seat of sin, it should be abandoned rather than redeemed; but the Spirit is said to “quicken” these mortal bodies. In the midst of abnormal suffering a person may welcome liberation from this body, but the normal attitude is to nourish and cherish it (Eph. 5:29). Most conclusive is the fact that Christ possessed a normal human body, yet without sin. It is never intimated that His body was the source of any solicitation

whatever. A distinction arises here between the *body*, σῶμα, and the *flesh*, σάρξ, to which consideration will be given in due time.

The phrase, *the body of sin*, is used in Romans 6:6 to describe the “old man,” or the nature to sin. As the human body expresses the life of man, so the power of sin to express itself may be disannulled by the greater power of the Spirit. *The body of sin* is, therefore, none other than sin’s power to express itself.

Body of This Death (Rom. 7:24). Again the nature to sin is in view, or that in the flesh, σάρξ, which is opposed to God. Paul’s strife, as witnessed in this context (Rom. 7:15–25), is between the saved self—hypothetically considered—and his flesh—ethically considered. He cries out for deliverance from that which he likens to a dead body ever present with him. The same Apostle wrote of himself that he buffeted his body, that he might bring it into subjection (1 Cor. 9:27), but the physical body was only a means of reaching the lethargy of his soul.

Our Vile Body (Phil. 3:21). Here the translation is wholly at fault. Nothing God has made is *vile*. The Authorized text would favor the heathen notions regarding the human body. The Revised Version renders this “the body of our humiliation,” which is sustained by all exegetes. Equally as misunderstood is the phrase “It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory” (1 Cor. 15:43), where the contrast is drawn between the present body—especially as it sees corruption—and the body that is to be. The word *dishonor* implies no moral failure. It is a declaration that this body is not a body of glory as it yet will be.

IV. The Body of Christ

The phrase *the body of Christ* sustains a twofold meaning. It may refer to His own human body, or to the mystical Body composed of those who are saved over whom Christ is Head.

In view of the fact that as antitype of all Old Testament sacrifices and as Lamb of God actual blood must needs be shed as the ground of redemption, it became the Son of God when entering the world to speak a word of gratitude to His Father thus: “But a body hast thou prepared me” (Heb. 10:5). Though His was an actual human body uninjured by the fall, it became a body of priceless distinction, being the body of the Son of God. It is that body which, as no other has done, has put on immortality and become a body of surpassing glory. Its present unique distinction could not be estimated by any in this world.

As for the mystical Body which is the Church, no figure setting forth the

relationship which exists between Christ and the Church is more often employed than that of the head and the body with its many members. Two underlying thoughts inhere in this figure, namely, that of manifestation and that of service. As the inner life is manifest through the body, so the Body of Christ serves to manifest Christ in this world, and is His medium of activity through the Spirit.

Conclusion

With reference to the human body, it may be concluded that it is by creation a product of the dust of the earth; it is sustained by the elements which are derived from the dust; and it returns to dust. It is death-doomed because of the fall. It is subject to resurrection or translation, and is as eternal as the soul and spirit of man.

Chapter XIV

THE IMMATERIAL PART OF MAN AT CREATION

I. The Origin of the Immaterial Part of the First Man

HAVING GIVEN some consideration to the doctrine of the material part of man and recognizing that the most important revelation concerning man as created is declared in the words which state that man is made in the *image* and *likeness* of God and that this resemblance is featured in the immaterial and not the material part of man, it is now in order to investigate the truth God has disclosed regarding the immaterial part of man. On his material side, man is said to be the direct and immediate creation of God and to have been made from existing matter. It is written: “And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground” (Gen. 2:7); but of the immaterial part of man it is not said that it is divinely created or made of any existing material, but that man became a living soul as a result of the divine inbreathing into the earthen vessel of the breath of lives (lit., plural). “And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul” (Gen. 2:7); “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them” (Gen. 1:26–27). These statements introduce facts and forces quite beyond the range of human understanding. It is clear, however, that the immaterial part of man originates not as a creation, but as a transmission. Some element of creation may have been present and active, but it is evident that the “living soul” which man became by the divine inbreathing is more uncreated than created. It is an impartation from the Eternal One. Angels are created beings (Col. 1:16), and, since they are immaterial, it follows that their beings, in all their features, are a direct creation quite apart from preexisting matter. Nor is any record given that they were constituted what they are by the breath of God. Man seems to be exalted to a place of surpassing dignity and honor. Being by divine appointment the lord of the little part of the universe in which he lives and being the means of instruction to angelic beings, it is reasonable that man should be highly ennobled. In whatever spheres the angels may excel, it is essential that among the creatures of earth there shall be

one who, being rational, may stand preeminently above all that is mundane.

Immeasurable, indeed, are the implications in the fact of a divine inbreathing with respect to prominence and permanence and with respect to lofty and solemn grandeur of the beings thus engendered. The human soul and spirit thus are originated and that, as before indicated, by *Elohim*, which title implies that all three Persons of the Godhead have shared—and each as sufficient in Himself—in securing this crowning work of *Elohim*'s productive powers.

II. The Divine Image

Having thus noted the incomparable origin of the immaterial part of the first man, it is now pertinent to inquire what is declared when the Scriptures state that man was made in the *image* and *likeness* of God. These words are not only accurate representations of facts, but they convey all that language may impart about that which is paramount and supreme in the range of human understanding. No divine creation or production could be inaugurated on a higher plane than that the thing thus formed should be conformed to the *image* and *likeness* of God. These two words reappear in subsequent Scriptures and confirm the truth that the entire Bible is in harmony with the Genesis account of creation. Much has been written with a view to demonstrating some vital difference between the meaning of these two words. Such efforts have failed to establish any clear distinctions, though distinctions may exist. It is not the way of Bible writers to multiply words where no distinction exists. In what, then, does this *image* and *likeness* consist? Little space need be assigned at this point to refute unworthy notions. One of these is the effort some have made to connect the image and likeness with Ecclesiastes 7:29 where it is said that “God hath made man upright,” and from this it is argued that the upright posture of the body of man reflects the posture of God and that *image* and *likeness* refer to that posture. But God, being incorporeal, is neither perpendicular nor horizontal in His posture. With the same attending inefficiency, it is claimed by others that the idea of image and likeness is exhausted in the fact that man, like God, has a sphere of dominion. To this it may be replied that man must exist before dominion can be invested in him and that man has authority because of the truth that he is made in the image and likeness of God. The authority is not the cause of the image or likeness, but the image and likeness is the ground of the authority. It is probable that it is equally unavailing to attempt to restrict the idea of image and likeness to any one feature in God. The Apostle declared on the

broadest of conceptions, “Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God” (Acts 17:29), which conception would hardly consist in but one bond of similarity. That the resemblance reaches beyond material things and beyond specific things and involves realities in God which man may not comprehend is well stated by John Howe, when he says that “we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure, as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind or thinking power?” (cited by Watson, *Institutes*, II, 10).

Of His creation, God had said it was *very good*. It fulfilled not only His purpose completely, but was a supreme satisfaction to Him. Wherein moral issues were involved—as in the case of man—there could be no exception. Perfect holiness found no fault with that which He had wrought. This may not imply a dominant righteousness on the part of the first man, but it does signify a true and satisfying innocence of evil. Two New Testament passages serve to bring into view three features which belong to those who have “put on” Christ and these may have been lost in the fall. They are certainly gained under saving grace. It is written: “And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:24); “And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3:10). The regeneration of the New Creation, with all that accompanies it, secures *righteousness*, *true holiness*, and *knowledge*. While these passages assert directly only that which is wrought in salvation, the language fairly implies that man was originally constituted in the divine image. No more than such implication is to be drawn from these notable texts. That which is best in the creature is evidently no more than a miniature of that which the Creator is to an infinite degree. The two ideas—that which is true of God and that which is true of redeemed men—may be the same in nature though these could never be the same in extent. In any case that which is unlike God could never have been a part of a being who is made in the likeness of God.

With reference to the original *knowledge* which Adam possessed, Richard Watson writes:

The “*knowledge*” in which the Apostle Paul, in the passage quoted above from Colossians 3:10, places “the image of God” after which man was created, does not merely imply the faculty of the understanding, which is a part of the natural image of God; but that which might be lost, because it is that in which the new man is “*renewed*.” It is, therefore, to be understood of the faculty of knowledge in the right exercise of its original power; and of that willing reception, and firm retaining, and hearty approval of religious truth, in which knowledge, when spoken of morally, is

always understood in the Scriptures. We may not be disposed to allow, with some, that he understood the deep philosophy of nature, and could comprehend and explain the sublime mysteries of religion. The circumstance of his giving names to the animals is certainly no sufficient proof of his having attained to a philosophical acquaintance with their qualities and distinguishing habits, though we should allow the names to be still retained in the Hebrew, and to be as expressive of their peculiarities as some expositors have stated. No sufficient time appears to have been afforded him for the study of their properties, as this event took place previous to the formation of Eve; and as for the notion of his acquiring knowledge by intuition, it is contradicted by the *revealed* fact, that angels themselves acquire their knowledge by observation and study, though, no doubt, with greater rapidity and certainty than we. The whole of the transaction was supernatural; the beasts were “brought” to Adam, and it is probable that he named them under a Divine impulse. He has been supposed to be the inventor of language, but the history shows that he was never without language. He was from the first able to converse with God; and we may, therefore, infer that language was in him a supernatural and miraculous endowment. That his understanding was, as to its capacity, deep and large beyond any of his posterity, must follow from the perfection in which he was created, and his acquisitions of knowledge would, therefore, be rapid and easy. It was, however, in moral and religious truth, as being of the first concern to him, that we are to suppose the excellency of his knowledge to have consisted. “His reason would be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible” (Watts). The best knowledge would, in him, be placed first, and that of every other kind be made subservient to it, according to its relation to that. The apostle adds to knowledge, “righteousness and true holiness,” terms which express not merely freedom from sin, but positive and active virtues.—*Theological Institutes*, II, 14–15

Concerning Adam’s moral qualities, Dr. Isaac Watts has stated:

A rational creature thus made, must not only be innocent and free, but must be formed holy. His will must have an inward bias to virtue: he must have an inclination to please that God who made him; a supreme love to his Creator, a zeal to serve him, and a tender fear of offending him. For either the new created man loved God supremely or not. If he did not he was not innocent, since the law of nature requires a supreme love to God. If he did he stood ready for every act of obedience: and this is *true holiness of heart*. And, indeed, without this, how could a God of holiness love the work of his own hands? There must be also in this creature a regular subjection of the inferior powers to the superior sense, and appetite and passion must be subject to reason. The mind must have a power to govern these lower faculties, that he might not offend against the law of his creation. He must also have his heart inlaid with love to the creatures, especially those of his own species, if he should be placed among them: and with a principle of honesty and truth in dealing with them. And if many of those creatures were made at once, there would be no pride, malice, or envy, no falsehood, no brawls or contentions among them, but all harmony and love.—Cited by Watson, *ibid.*, p. 15

Here the Socinians and their successors have imposed the opinion that holiness can exist only as a result of the individual’s concurrence and cooperation. In other words, it is claimed, holiness is a product of living, an experience of life; but this confounds two different things, namely, the *habit* of holiness and the *principle* of holiness. The habit of holiness will not be formed until there is that principle within which may exercise itself to that end. Jonathan Edwards has written in his work on *Original Sin*:

I think it a contradiction to the nature of things as judged of by the common sense of mankind. It is agreeable to the sense of men, in all nations and ages, not only that the fruit or effect of a good choice is virtuous, but that the good choice itself, from whence that effect proceeds, is so; yea, also the antecedent food, disposition, temper, or affection of mind, from whence proceeds that *good* choice is virtuous. This is the general notion—not that principles derive their goodness from actions, but—that actions derive their goodness from the principles whence they proceed; so that the act of choosing what is good, is no farther virtuous than it proceeds from a good principle or virtuous disposition of mind. Which supposes that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice; and that, therefore, it is not necessary there should first be thought, reflection, and choice, before there can be any virtuous disposition. If the choice be first, before the existence of a good disposition of heart, what is the character of that choice? There can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self love, ambition, or some animal appetites; therefore, a virtuous temper of mind may be before a good act of choice, as a tree may be before the fruit, and the fountain before the stream which proceeds from it.—Cited by Watson, *ibid.*, p. 17

A clear understanding relative to the early estate of man, engendered by observation and meditation, is manifest in the following quotation from Richard Watson:

The *final cause* of man's creation was the display of the glory of God, and principally of his moral perfections. Among these, benevolence shone with eminent lustre. The creation of rational and holy creatures was the only means, as it appears to us, of accomplishing that most paternal and benevolent design, to impart to other beings a portion of the Divine felicity. The happiness of God is the result of his moral perfection, and it is complete and perfect. It is also specific; it is the felicity of knowledge, of conscious rectitude, of sufficiency, and independence. Of the two former, creatures were capable; but only rational creatures. Matter, however formed, is unconscious, and is, and must for ever remain, incapable of happiness. However disposed and adorned, it was made for another, and not at all with reference to itself. If it be curiously wrought, it is for some other's wonder; if it has use, it is for another's convenience; if it has beauty, it is for another's eye; if harmony, it is for another's ear. Irrational animate creatures may derive advantage from mere matter; but it does not appear that they are conscious of it. They have the enjoyment of sense, but not the powers of reflection, comparison, and taste. They see without admiration, they combine nothing into relations. So to know, as to be conscious of knowing, and to feel the pleasures of knowledge; so to know, as to impart knowledge to others; so to know, as to lay the basis of future and enlarging knowledge, as to discover the efficient and the final causes of things; and to enjoy the pleasures of discovery and certainty of imagination and taste,—this is peculiar to rational beings. Above all, to know the great Creator and Lord of all; to see the distinctions of right and wrong, of good and evil in his law; to have, therefore, the consciousness of integrity and of well ordered and perfectly balanced passions; to feel the felicity of universal and unbounded benevolence; to be conscious of the favour of God himself; to have perfect confidence in his care and constant benediction; to adore him; to be grateful; to exert hope without limit on future and unceasing blessings; all these sources of felicity were added to the pleasures of intellect and imagination in the creation of rational beings. In whatever part of the universe they were created and placed, we have sufficient reason to believe that this was the primitive condition of all; and we know, assuredly, from God's own revelation, that it was the condition of man. In his creation and primeval condition, the "kindness and love of God" eminently appeared. He was made a rational and immortal spirit, with no limits to the constant enlargement of his powers; for, from all the evidence that our own consciousness, even in our fallen state, affords us, it appears possible to the human soul to be

eternally approaching the infinite in intellectual strength and attainment. He was made holy and happy; he was admitted to intercourse with God. He was not left alone, but had the pleasure of society. He was placed in a world of grandeur, harmony, beauty, and utility; it was canopied with other distant worlds to exhibit to his very sense a manifestation of the extent of space and the vastness of the varied universe; and to call both his reason, his fancy, and his devotion, into their most vigorous and salutary exercises. He was placed in a paradise, where, probably, all that was sublime and gentle in the scenery of the whole earth was exhibited in *pattern*; and all that could delight the innocent sense, and excite the curious inquiries of the mind, was spread before him. He had labour to employ his attention, without wearying him; and time for his highest pursuits of knowing God, his will, and his works. All was a manifestation of universal love, of which he was the chief visible object; and the felicity and glory of his condition must, by his and their obedience in succession, have descended to his posterity for ever. Such was our world, and its rational inhabitants, the first pair; and thus did its creation manifest not only the power and wisdom, but the benevolence of Deity. He made them like himself, and he made them capable of a happiness like his own.—*Ibid.*, pp. 17–19

It is possible, as many contend, that the term *likeness*, as used in Genesis 1:26 (cf. 5:1), refers to that in the original, unfallen man which was lost by the fall, which held vast potentialities for the original man, and which is more than realized through redemption. The supposition that Adam unfallen was God's supreme work and purpose and that redemption is an attempt to salvage upon a lower plane something from the wreckage it has wrought, is far removed from the truth. In his *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Müller states: "It cannot be proved that the new creation in Christ is nothing more than the restoration of the state wherein Adam was at first created. There is, indeed, a relationship between the two; the divine image wrought by Christ's redemption is the only true realization of the image wherein man was at first created. Man was originally given the one, in order that he might attain the other, if not directly, by continuing faithful in obedience and fellowship with God, yet indirectly after his fall by means of redemption. But it is evident that from the very nature of this relationship the two are not identical" (cited by Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*, p. 135). Present salvation is not into the estate of unfallen Adam, but is rather a conformity to the glorified Last Adam. To this end it is written: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29); "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:21); "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1 John 3:2). Whether this contemplation of man's original likeness to God be according to all that is true or not, the

Scriptures declare with great emphasis that by sin man has “come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23), that unregenerate men are now “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2:1), “under sin” (Rom. 3:9), “having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12), and living “in the evil one” (1 John 5:19, R.V.). Whatever of man’s original estate is preserved under these conditions remains to be identified with exceptional care. To this end attention may be given more specifically to that which is indicated by the word *image*.

Whatever may be the force of the word *likeness*—whether it speaks of features in the original man which were lost or injured in the fall, or whether it be only an emphasis by way of repetition, or whether it be that, as G. F. Oehler contends, which is the original pattern and is ever reproduced in man—the word *image* is that term which the Scriptures employ freely. In Genesis 1:26–27 both words, *image* and *likeness*, appear, but the word *image* occurs three times while the word *likeness* occurs but once. The latter reappears in Genesis 5:1–3, along with the word *image*, and with great force of meaning. This passage declares: “This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.” Here, again, it is to be observed that there is no apparent effort made to assign specific and varied meanings to these important terms. The passage serves to establish a vital truth, namely, that Adam, made in the image of God, generates Seth in that image. What became of the line of Cain the Bible does not fully reveal. It is not traced in subsequent sacred history. Three New Testament passages serve to record what may be known of Cain outside the historical account given in Genesis — Hebrews 11:4; 1 John 3:12; Jude 1:11 (cf. Luke 3:38). This important passage (Gen. 5:1–3) is to be recognized primarily by the truth there asserted, which is that the *image* of God, whatever may be true relative to the term *likeness*, is transmitted by physical generation and describes that which is true of all in the human family. Due consideration will be given later to the injury which the fall imposed; but the fact abides, as everywhere witnessed in the Word of God, that unregenerate, fallen man bears the image of his Creator. The importance of this disclosure could hardly be overestimated. There is no implication that man is not fallen or that he is not lost apart from redemption. It is rather that redemption is provided because of what man is. The truth that man bears the image of God enhances the reality both of his lost estate and of his final doom if unsaved. The

sublime and majestic record is that God created man, not a mere unidentified order of beings. His individuality is paramount and he is supreme among all creatures of the earth. He is made in the similitude of God. There could hardly be a doubt that Genesis 9:6 and James 3:9 contemplate man in his present estate. The passages declare: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man." "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God." To sin against man either by murder or by slander is reprobable on the ground of the divine image being resident in man. A sacredness appertains to human life. Man must respect his fellow man, not on the ground of kinship, but on the ground of the exalted truth that human life belongs to God. To injure man is to injure one who bears the image of God.

Man's exalted character is especially indicated in Psalm 8 wherein his greatness is seen in his littleness; for "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." In this Psalm man is said to be made, or placed, a little lower than the angels. The Hebrew is *Elohim*, and the reference is specifically to Christ (cf. Heb. 2:9), who was for a little time made lower in estate than *Elohim* that He might suffer death. The more general application (cf. Heb. 2:6–8) refers to man, who is thus said to be crowned with rightful authority to rule over the whole earth. With this same exalted position of man in view the Apostle says "forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God" (1 Cor. 11:7). It is unimportant at this point to decide what calls forth this great statement—great, indeed, for nothing more laudable could be said of man outside those new positions into which the redeemed are brought who are *in Christ*.

Of the passages cited above, it may be observed that all, save Genesis 1:26–27; 2:7, refer to man in his present estate. Though much is said throughout the Bible of man's sinfulness and of the depths to which he has descended, it is not said that he has lost the image of God. In fact, as has been declared, the Bible directly teaches that fallen man retains that image and that it is this reality which determines the extent of his degradation.

The following passages advance a strong suggestion of what the original manifestation of the divine image was: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48); "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (Luke 6:36); "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Pet. 1:15–16). With reference to these passages it may be

observed that here, to some degree of completeness, is described that original man in whom the Creator found satisfaction.

Two exceedingly important truths emerge from the vast array of theological writings regarding that image in which man was created, namely, (a) that fallen man bears the inalienable image of God, and (b) that man is injured by the fall to the extent that only redeeming grace can rescue him. Both of these truths are deeply embedded in the Scriptures regardless of any seeming contradictions they may present. Neither truth may be modified or surrendered. It would be easy for uninstructed minds to declare this whole discussion concerning the image a mere battle of words and quite void of practical value; but it is here that the true ground is discovered for Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The vital part which the doctrine of man as made in the image of God takes in each of these major divisions of theology is too patent to need elucidation. The basis of distinction between various systems is to a large degree determined at this point. Both Lutherans and Calvinists subscribe to the highest view of man in his unfallen estate, and to the darkest picture of man in his fallen estate. Romanists, Socinians or Remonstrants, and modern liberals take the lower view of unfallen man and the more flattering view of fallen man. This does not mean that Augustinians—both Lutherans and Calvinists—vilify human life and that the liberals exalt that life. There could be no higher conception of man than that which is held by Lutherans and Calvinists. The whole field of truth is characterized far too much by dogmatic presuppositions. This, no doubt, is due to the exceedingly brief statement which the Scriptures present. There is much room where God has not spoken for theologians to fill in large portions wholly agreeable to their way of thinking; then, in later developments of their system, they draw out of their own creation precisely what they have prepared and need. In the light of this analysis, it is interesting to read the material men have prepared on this theme. The student would do well to pursue these writings with attention.

In concluding the consideration of the divine image in man, it is essential to arrive at some definite convictions. A constructive doctrine should be formed which conforms to the Word of God. A full agreement may be accorded John Laidlaw when he writes: "The Scripture never speaks of the divine image in man, but always of man as formed after the divine image. And this indicates a profound principle of biblical thought. It presupposes God, to account for man. It never sets us the 'Sisyphus task' of proving God and the supernatural from man and nature. Thus, by 'the divine image,' the Bible does not mean those elements

in man from which an idea of God may be framed, but conversely those features in the Divine Being of which man is a copy. If we read what the Bible says of God in relation to the world, and what of God in Himself, we shall get leading lines for its delineation of man; always premising that of the Divine Idea man is a created copy, not, like the Logos, an essential image” (*Ibid.*, p. 118). Thus, also, G. F. Oehler declares man bears the divine image in view of the facts that (a) human nature is distinguished from that of the beast, for there was no mate for man among lower forms of creation, and man may kill the beast but not the being who is made in the image of God. (b) Man is set over nature as a free personality, since he is designed for communion with God, and is appointed to exercise divine authority in the affairs of earth (*Old Testament Theology*, I, 211–12, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 346). Jonathan Edwards summarizes thus: “The *natural image* of God consists very much in that by which God in His creation distinguished man from the beasts, viz. in those faculties and principles of nature whereby he is capable of moral agency; whereas the *spiritual and moral image*, wherein man was made at the first, consisted in that moral excellency with which he was endowed” (*On the Freedom of the Will*, pt. i, sec. 5, cited by Laidlaw, *ibid.*, p. 112).

Though somewhat extended, no more illuminating statement has been found than the following from John Laidlaw:

Advancing from the Scripture view of God’s relation to the world to its view of what He is in Himself, we find those grandly simple definitions of the Divine Being: God is “Spirit,” “Light,” “Love.” Let us see how these may find a parallel in man, the created copy.

It corresponds with all we have traced of the biblical psychology, that it is on the side of *Spirit* man should primarily exhibit an analogy with the divine nature. It is the only element in man’s constitution which is properly ascribed to God. He is Spirit. Absolutely and supremely, spiritual existence is affirmed of God. He is said, moreover, to be the Father of spirits, and the God of the spirits of all flesh; indicating that the spiritual world, including man in so far as he is spiritual, stands in a closer relation to God than the corporeal. We have already sufficiently guarded against the Platonizing form of this idea—a form given to it by some of the Greek fathers, who made *pneuma* something physical connecting man with God. This form of statement easily leads to the conclusion, that through the fall human nature has been constitutionally altered by the loss of a part or element; whereas the Bible doctrine is that man’s nature is morally lowered by the loss of its purity. The standpoint of the Bible psychology is always that of the divine origination of man. His life—animal, intellectual, moral—is spiritual, because specially in-breathed of God. The “spirit in man” is the “inspiration of the Almighty,” and man is spiritual in so far as he lives and acts according to his divine origin and basis of life. Thus does Scripture teach that the spiritual nature which man has, the spirit of man which is in him, affords a parallel or analogy to the absolute and supreme Spirit which God is.

We find, accordingly, that the Bible makes *Intellect* or *Rationality* in man—not only a function of “spirit” in him, but a function flowing from and corresponding to something in God. It is the breath of the Almighty that giveth man instruction and understanding. The scene in the garden,

when the Lord God brought the animals to Adam to be named, presents this idea in a pictorial form. That “admirable philosophy lecture,” as Bishop Bull has it, which Adam, appointed by God Himself, read on all the other animals, denotes the correspondence of divine and human intelligence: “Whatsoever Adam called any living creature, that was the name thereof” (Gen. 2:19). “I think, O Socrates, that the truest account of these matters is, that some power more than human gave the first names to things, so as to make them necessarily correct.” Similar is the ascription to the artificers of the tabernacle, of wisdom, understanding, cunning workmanship, together with the Spirit of God. Thus all scientific knowledge and artistic skill, all the results of reason, Scripture ascribes to divine assistance; not from a vague sentiment of piety, but in right of its consistent theory that the spirit in man corresponds to the Spirit of his Maker, and is sustained by it. Teaching like this is a foundation for the loftiest philosophy of man. It is at once an assertion of the preciousness of the individual and a prediction of the progress of the race. The true idea of human greatness we owe not to modern thought, but to the primary axioms of revelation.

Another point of analogy between the divine and the human spirit the Bible finds in *Self-consciousness*. “A candle of the Lord is the spirit of man searching through all the chambers of the heart.” The phrase “candle of the Lord” may assert divine origination—the light in man which the Lord has kindled—or divine possession—the light which is His, the true light which lighteth every man—or both; but the characteristic of the human spirit to which it affixes the description is its self-penetrating power, that it searches the innermost regions of the human being. With a very similar figure, moral consciousness or conscience is denoted in the New Testament as “the eye,” “the light of the body,” “the light within.” Still more explicitly is it asserted that the spirit of the man which is in him alone knows the things of the man, and is therefore analogous to the Divine Spirit, which alone knoweth the things of God. This analogy is, and yet another text, strengthened by the idea of correspondence or communication. “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God” (Rom. 8:16). It may be fairly inferred from these passages that the Bible regards self-consciousness in man as an essential feature of the divine similitude.

From self-consciousness it is a short step to *Personality*. It is a truism that self-conscious free personality is the Bible representation of God. Pervading every line of Scripture, from the first to the last, runs the assumption that God is personal. It is easy enough to call this anthropomorphism. But the Bible, as a revelation from God to man, begins with God. And its own account of its doctrine is not that it gives a God fashioned like unto man, but that God can reveal Himself to man, because man is made in the likeness of God. No wonder on this showing that man should be taught to think of God as Person, Will, Holiness, Love,—ideas of which he finds some copies in his own constitution, since that constitution is framed upon the divine model. It is not in any metaphysical formula that the Bible claims personality in man as the image of something in God, but in its profound principle of the relation between God and man, *i.e.* between God and the individual human being, as well as between God and the human race. This principle is asserted, for example, in Numbers 16:22, where the relation of God to the spirits of all flesh is pleaded as a reason for His dealing with one man who has sinned, rather than that He should punish a whole people. It is repeated in Numbers 27:16 as a reason why God should choose a particular leader for the congregation. The same argument of divine property in man is made the foundation of a splendid declaration by the prophet Ezekiel of God’s moral dealing with individuals, as contrasted with the unbroken federalism on which Israel presumed to reckon. The right of God in each soul (where *nephesh* denotes the human being, “all souls are mine”) is made the ground of the divine prerogative to exercise in each individual case both punishment and pardon. The other side of this relation is presented in those passages which speak of man as existing for God, even the Father, as sought for his worship, as redeemed to an eternal life which consists in the knowledge of the Father and the Son. Even in his present fallen condition, and under the most unfavourable forms of that condition, St. Paul represents man as being the offspring of God, to this effect, “If haply we may feel after Him, and find Him.” In this passage the entire inwardness of the resemblance between the

offspring and the great Parent is made a reason against the artistic efforts of the Greek paganism to humanize the divine. Since man is the offspring of God, he ought not to think that he can frame an outward image of God,—a far better one lies deep within. The relationship of man with God ought to be thought of not as physical, but as moral. The sentiment that we are the divine offspring is quoted to illustrate the fact that mankind has been destined to seek God, who was not far from them, *i.e.* who has made Himself cognisable and conceivable by them. Only personal beings can feel after and find a personal God, and in so doing their likeness to Him is affirmed and confirmed.—*Ibid.*, pp. 120–26

Any worthy contemplation of the doctrine of the divine image as displayed in man must give some attention to the relationship of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to this great theme. He, along with the Father and the Spirit, is said to be Creator of all things, and man is thus the product of His creative power; but He Himself is declared to be the first-born of all creation and, therefore, Lord of all. In this there appears a parallel with man who is divinely appointed as lord over earthly creatures. Of the Son it is said that He is the “express image” of God. His incarnation into His unfallen humanity detracted nothing from this sublime reality. The image which He is may be likened to a steel engraving which reproduces every feature to the finest detail. On the other hand, the image which man is may be likened to a shadow-profile; but it is all of that, which truth is in no way to be slighted. The first creation finds its archetype in *Elohim*, for man was made in the image of *Elohim*. The New Creation finds its archetype in the Son of God. It is into the image of Christ that saving grace brings those who are redeemed (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2).

III. The Derivation and Perpetuation of the Immaterial Part of Man

Attention has been given to the truth relative to the origin of the immaterial part of the first man, it being revealed that he became a living soul by the divine inbreathing of lives (lit., plural). The problem which now arises is concerned with generation or perpetuation of human life. The divine plan for humanity is that two original beings—male and female—should “be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth” (Gen. 1:28). It is thus indicated that to Adam and Eve, as to their posterity, procreative power is given which not only generates the body of their offspring, but accounts directly for the existence of their immaterial natures. Nevertheless, there are varying theories advanced—three in all—for the origin of the immaterial part of each member of the Adamic race. These theories call for consideration.

1. THE PRE-EXISTENCE THEORY. The advocates of this hypothesis claim on

rational grounds and quite apart from Biblical authority that, whatever may have been the original derivation of the immaterial part of man—whether created or eternally existent—it is subject to reincarnation or transmigration from one embodiment—extending to the lowest forms of creature life—to another. This theory, though embraced with various modifications by men who could avail themselves of Biblical truth, owes its origin wholly to heathen philosophy. It is a leading tenet of Hinduism and is represented in modern form by Theosophy. An early theory assigned a human soul to the pre-existent Christ. Of this system the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* asserts:

In theology, the doctrine that Jesus Christ had a human soul which existed before the creation of the world—the first and most perfect of created things—and subsisted, prior to His human birth, in union with the Second Person of the Godhead. It was this human soul which suffered the pain and sorrow described in the Gospels. The chief exposition of this doctrine is that of Dr. Watts (*Works*, v.274, etc.); it has received little support. In a wider form the doctrine has been applied to men in general—namely, that in the beginning of Creation God created the souls of all men, which were subsequently as a punishment for ill-doing incarnated in physical bodies till discipline should render them fit for spiritual existence. Supporters of this doctrine, the Pre-existants or Pre-existiani, are found as early as the 2nd century, among them being Justin Martyr and Origen (*q.v.*), and the idea not only belongs to metempsychosis and mysticism generally, but is widely prevalent in Oriental thought. It was condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 540, but has frequently reappeared in modern thought (*cf.* Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality*) being in fact the natural correlative of a belief in immortality.—14th edition, XVIII, 434

The contention that human life has pre-existed lends encouragement to the hope that conscious life continues after death. It thus reflects the natural desire of the human heart for unending existence. The following from Dr. William G. T. Shedd's *History of Christian Doctrine* is a clear analysis of this system: "The theory of *Pre-existence* teaches that all human souls were created at the beginning of creation,—not that of this world simply, but of all worlds. All finite spirits were made simultaneously, and prior to the creation of matter. The intellectual universe precedes the sensible universe. The souls of men, consequently, existed before the creation of Adam. The pre-existent life was Pre-Adamite. Men were angelic spirits at first. Because of their apostasy in the angelic sphere, they were transferred, as a punishment for their sin, into material bodies in this mundane sphere, and are now passing through a disciplinary process, in order to be restored, all of them without exception, to their pre-existent and angelic condition. These bodies, to which they are joined, come into existence by the ordinary course of physical propagation; so that the sensuous and material part of human nature has no existence previous to Adam. It is only the rational and spiritual principle of which a Pre-Adamite life is asserted" (3rd

ed., II, pp. 4–5).

Objections to this theory are threefold, namely, (a) the Scriptures are ignored. Though in his usual allegorizing method, Origen, who is said to be the “sunrise and sunset” of the pre-existence theory, attempted to harmonize his ideas with the Word of God, his distortions of the Bible leave little semblance of its plain teachings. (b) The doctrine of original sin is discredited, though the fact of sin is recognized. And (c) there is no proof for the theory.

2. THE CREATION THEORY. Creationism—the present theme—and traducianism—yet to be considered—are doctrines related to the origin of the immaterial part of man which, though defended by men of equal orthodoxy, are widely different even to the point of contradiction. Creationism teaches that God creates directly and immediately a soul and spirit for each body at the time of birth, and that only the body is generated by human parents. Traducianism teaches that the soul and spirit of man are generated along with the body. The question is not authoritatively determined, and when good men differ so widely it is usually due to a lack of decisive testimony from the Scriptures. It is to be observed that, in the history of the church, creationism was largely the accepted doctrine of the Eastern division while traducianism was the accepted doctrine of the Western division. The issue has always been one of personal opinion and not a basis for theological order and separation. Nevertheless, great issues are involved. At once the humanity of Christ is implicated as well as the whole field of truth relative to the transmission of original sin, and to heredity.

Of two great theologians of more modern times, Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. William Shedd—though equally committed to the Calvinistic system of theology—Dr. Hodge contends for creationism and Dr. Shedd for traducianism. The plan to be pursued in this discussion is to quote somewhat at length from each of these worthy men under the statement here given of the doctrine which they espouse. Following that, some general remarks will be in order.

Dr. Hodge writes:

The common doctrine of the Church, and especially of the Reformed theologians, has ever been that the soul of the child is not generated or derived from the parents, but that it is created by the immediate agency of God. The arguments generally urged in favour of this view are,—

1. That it is more consistent with the prevailing representations of the Scriptures. In the original account of the creation there is a marked distinction made between the body and the soul. The one is from the earth, the other from God. This distinction is kept up throughout the Bible. The body and soul are not only represented as different substances, but also as having different origins. The body shall return to dust, says the wise man, and the spirit to God who gave it. Here the origin of the soul is represented as different from and higher than that of the body. The former is from God in

a sense in which the latter is not. In like manner God is said to form “the spirit of man within him” (Zech. 12:1); to give “breath unto the people upon” the earth, “and spirit to them that walk therein.” (Is. 42:5.) This language nearly agrees with the account of the original creation, in which God is said to have breathed into man the breath of life, to indicate that the soul is not earthy or material, but had its origin immediately from God. Hence He is called “God of the spirits of all flesh.” (Num. 16:22.) It could not well be said that He is God of the bodies of all men. The relation in which the soul stands to God as its God and creator is very different from that in which the body stands to Him. And hence in Heb. 12:9, it is said, “We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?” The obvious antithesis here presented is between those who are the fathers of our bodies and Him who is the Father of our spirits. Our bodies are derived from our earthly parents, our souls are derived from God. This is in accordance with the familiar use of the word flesh, where it is contrasted, either expressly or by implication, with the soul. Paul speaks of those who had not “seen his face in the flesh,” of “the life he now lived in the flesh.” He tells the Philippians that it was needful for them that he should remain “in the flesh;” he speaks of his “mortal flesh.” The Psalmist says of the Messiah, “my flesh shall rest in hope,” which the Apostle explains to mean that his flesh should not see corruption. In all these, and in a multitude of similar passages, flesh means the body, and “fathers of our flesh” means fathers of our bodies. So far, therefore, as the Scriptures reveal anything on the subject, their authority is against traducianism and in favour of creationism.

2. *Argument from the Nature of the Soul.* The latter doctrine, also, is clearly most consistent with the nature of the soul. The soul is admitted, among Christians, to be immaterial and spiritual. It is indivisible. The traducian doctrine denies this universally acknowledged truth. It asserts that the soul admits of “separation or division of essence.” On the same ground that the Church universally rejected the Gnostic doctrine of emanation as inconsistent with the nature of God as a spirit, it has, with nearly the same unanimity, rejected the doctrine that the soul admits of division of substance. This is so serious a difficulty that some of the advocates of the *ex traduce* doctrine endeavour to avoid it by denying that their theory assumes any such separation or division of the substance of the soul. But this denial avails little. They maintain that the same numerical essence which constituted the soul of Adam constitutes our souls. If this be so, then either humanity is a general essence of which individual men are the modes of existence, or what was wholly in Adam is distributively, partitively, and by separation, in the multitude of his descendants. Derivation of essence, therefore, does imply, and is generally admitted to imply, separation or division of essence. And this must be so if numerical identity of essence in all mankind is assumed to be secured by generation or propagation.

3. A third argument in favour of creationism and against traducianism is derived from the Scriptural doctrine as to the person of Christ. He was very man; He had a true human nature; a true body and a rational soul. He was born of a woman. He was, as to his flesh, the son of David. He was descended from the fathers. He was in all points made like as we are, yet without sin. This is admitted on both sides. But, as before remarked in reference to realism, this, on the theory of traducianism, necessitates the conclusion that Christ’s human nature was guilty and sinful. We are partakers of Adam’s sin both as to guilt and pollution, because the same numerical essence which sinned in him is communicated to us. Sin, it is said, is an accident, and supposes a substance in which it inheres, or to which it pertains. Community in sin supposes, therefore, community of essence. If we were not in Adam as to essence we did not sin in him, and do not derive a corrupt nature from him. But, if we were in him as to essence then his sin was our sin both as to guilt and pollution. This is the argument of traducianists repeated in every form. But they insist that Christ was in Adam as to the substance of his human nature as truly as we were. They say that if his body and soul were not derived from the body and soul of his virgin mother he was no true man, and cannot be the redeemer of men. What is true of other men must, consequently, be true of Him. He must, therefore, be as much involved in the guilt and corruption of the apostasy as other men. It will

not do to affirm and deny the same thing. It is a contradiction to say that we are guilty of Adam's sin because we are partakers of his essence, and that Christ is not guilty of his sin nor involved in its pollution, although He is a partaker of his essence. If participation of essence involve community of guilt and depravity in the one case, it must also in the other. As this seems a legitimate conclusion from the traducian doctrine, and as this conclusion is anti-Christian, and false, the doctrine itself cannot be true.—*Systematic Theology*, II, 70–72.

3. THE TRADUCIAN THEORY. This system of belief avers that both the immaterial and material parts of man are propagated by human generation. On its general character, Dr. Shedd writes:

Traducianism applies the idea of species to both body and soul. Upon the sixth day, God created two human individuals, one male and one female, and in them also created the specific psychico-physical nature from which all the subsequent individuals of the human family are procreated both psychically and physically. ... Creationism confines the idea of species to the body. In this respect, it agrees with the theory of pre-existence; the difference relating only to the time when the soul is created. Creationism and pre-existence both alike maintain that the human soul is individual only, and never had a race-existence in Adam. The creationist holds that God on the sixth day created two human individuals, one male and one female, and in them also created the specific physical nature from which the bodies of all the subsequent individuals were procreated; the soul in each instance being a new creation *ex nihilo*, and infused into the propagated body. ... The choice must be made between traducianism and creationism, since the opinion that man as to his soul existed before Adam has no support from revelation. The Bible plainly teaches that Adam was the first man; and that all finite spirits existing before him were angels. The question between the traducianist and the creationist is this: When God created the first two human individuals, Adam and Eve, did he create in and with them the invisible substance of all the succeeding generations of men, both as to the soul and body, or only as to the body? Was the human nature that was created in Adam and Eve simple, or complex? Was it physical solely, or was it psychico-physical? Had the human nature in the first pair two sides, or only one? Was provision made for propagating out of the specific nature deposited in Adam, individuals who would be a union of body and soul, or only a mere body without a soul? The question, consequently, between the parties involves the *quantity* of being that was created on the sixth day, when God is said to have created "man." The traducianist asserts that the entire invisible substance of all the generations of mankind was originated *ex nihilo*, by that single act of God mentioned in Gen. 1:27, by which he created "man male and female." The creationist asserts that only a part of the invisible substance of all the generations of mankind was created by that act: namely, that of their bodies; the invisible substance which constitutes their souls being created subsequently, by as many distinct and separate creative acts as there are individual souls. Traducianism and creationism agree with each other in respect to the most difficult point in the problem: namely, a kind of existence that is prior to the individual existence. The creationist concedes that human history does not start with the birth of the individual man. He does not attempt to explain original sin with no reference to Adam. He maintains that the body and physical life of the individual is not a creation *ex nihilo* in each instance, but is derived from a common physical nature that was originated on the sixth day. In so doing, the creationist concedes existence in Adam, *quoad hoc*. But this race-mode of human existence, which is prior to the individual mode, is the principal difficulty in the problem, and in conceding its reality as to the body, the creationist carries a common burden with the traducianist. For it is as difficult to think of an invisible existence of the human body in Adam, as to think of an invisible existence of the human soul in him. In reality, it is even more difficult; because the body of an individual man, as we now know it, is visible and tangible, while his soul is not. And an invisible and intangible existence in Adam is more

conceivable than a visible and tangible. ... There are difficulties attending either theory of the origin of man, but fewer connected with traducianism than with creationism. If the mystery of a *complete* existence in Adam on both the psychical and physical side is accepted, the difficulties connected with the imputation of the first sin and the propagation of corruption are relieved. As Turretin says, "there is no doubt that by this theory all the difficulty seems to be removed." It is only the first step that costs. Adopting a revealed mystery in the start, the mystery in this instance, as in all the other instances of revealed mysteries, throws a flood of light, and makes all things plain.—*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 7–19

Following this portion of Dr. Shedd's treatment of this theme, he undertakes in seventy-five pages to discuss problems from three avenues of approach, namely, (a) the Scriptures, (b) theology, and (c) physiology. An attentive study of these pages is enjoined upon students who would pursue an exhaustive treatment of these far-reaching issues. No such an array of convincing argument has been presented, it is believed, by any creationist and it is doubtful whether the creation theory is capable of such a worthy expansion. As has been intimated, the problem of Christ's humanity—which included a human soul and a human spirit as well as a human body—and the problem of original sin and of heredity enter largely into this controversy. Regarding the human soul and human spirit of Christ, Dr. Hodge, influenced by his creationist views, cannot see how under the traducian theory Christ could be saved from partaking of the Adamic nature. Theologians of the traducian group have always believed that there was exercised a special divine protection against the Adamic nature being imparted to the Son from the human mother. What is termed "the immaculate conception," according to the Roman Catholic view of traducianism, secures this freedom from the taint of original sin. Speaking to Mary, the angel said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). On the other hand, it is difficult to understand that a sinful nature which is attributed to all men and traced to the sin of Adam can exist, if God creates each soul and spirit individually at birth *ex nihilo*. If, as the traducianist contends, the immaterial part of man is transmitted from father to son, the father propagating after his kind, the conveying of the Adamic nature is not only reasonable but is an inevitable consequence. When attempting to account for the universal sin nature, strange speculations have been advanced by creationists. These are to be examined later under the general discussion of imputation. It is the witness of the Bible that *sons* and not merely human bodies are generated by human parents. It is clear, also, that mental and temperamental characteristics are as much inherited as are physical likenesses.

Probably no Scripture is more revealing than Hebrews 7:9–10, “And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.” Here it is declared that Levi paid tithes—an act which could not be attributed to a mere germ of a lifeless human body —while in the loins of his great-grandfather, Abraham. It is recognized by traducianists that God accomplishes a creative act when men are regenerated and that He will yet create a new heaven and a new earth, but it is also true that that sequence of creation in which man came into being ceased with the production of the first man and as the consummation of the sixth day. It should be recognized, also, that if man is not procreated—body, soul, and spirit—he is, by so much, an exception to all other forms of created life. There would be a striking lack of real kinship between those who, perchance, are individually created *ex nihilo* at birth and all animals. Human relationship must, under those conditions, depend only on the procreation of the lifeless body. Thus the doctrine of a Kinsman-Redeemer is involved. If that immaterial part of Christ which was human was a direct and a wholly unrelated creation of God, the foundation for His service as Kinsman-Redeemer is diminished to near the vanishing point.

The conclusion is that, though the subject is shrouded in mystery—as is the fact of all life of every kind—the preponderance of evidence sustains the traducian theory.

IV. Elements Which Comprise the Immaterial Part of Man

The mystery of life is baffling and never more so than when an analysis of the immaterial part of man is undertaken. The whole reality of being is largely due to that in a living person which actuates the body, which sustains a conscious relation to all things, and without which the body is not only dead, but immediately subject to decay; but as long as that reality remains in the body, life continues, the body is preserved, and its structure renewed. It is that which thinks, which feels, which reasons, which wills. It is that enigmatic actuality which comprehends, yet itself cannot be comprehended.

When referring to the “inner man,” the Bible employs various terms —soul, spirit, heart, flesh, mind—and the query arises whether these are separate elements which might exist apart from each other, or whether they are functions or modes of expression of the one *ego*. That the latter is nearer the truth is generally believed and for worthy reasons; nevertheless, to these elements or faculties of the “inner man” reference is constantly made in the Bible and in such

a manner that anyone may be made to represent the whole of man's immaterial nature. What is specifically true of each of these elements will be discovered only as a complete induction is secured. What these terms mean as used in the Bible must be discovered from their use in the Sacred Text. The Bible is not a book of definitions. Its greatest realities are assumed to be what they are. Concerning these features of human life, it may be said that human speculation tends more to confuse than to clarify. These terms are distinctive and used in the Word of God with infinite accuracy. Of these terms, the two—*soul* and *spirit*—are given especial prominence; not that their use is numerically superior, but because of the manner in which they are employed. The entire man is said to be body, soul, and spirit, and without recognition of other features of the “inner man” which are noted above.

A question arises at this point which has engaged and divided theologians in all generations, namely, Is man a *dichotomous* being—two parts, material and immaterial, with the supposition that soul and spirit are the same—or Is he *trichotomous*—body, soul, and spirit? It would be readily conceded by all that, under any consideration, there is not the same breadth of distinction observable between *soul* and *spirit* as between *soul* and *body*, or *spirit* and *body*. Distinction—far-reaching indeed—is implied between *soul* and *spirit*, yet these terms are used synonymously. Thus the controversy is between those who are impressed with the distinctions and those who are impressed with the similarities. It would be well to recognize that, when so required, the Bible assigns to these two terms a distinctive meaning and that when no specific distinction is in view the Bible uses them as interchangeable. In other words, the Bible supports both dichotomy and trichotomy. The distinction between soul and spirit is as incomprehensible as life itself, and the efforts of men to frame definitions must always be unsatisfactory. In confirmation of what has been asserted regarding the Bible's use of these terms, it may be noted: the term *spirit* is used freely to indicate the immaterial part of man (cf. 1 Cor. 5:3; 6:20; 7:34; James 2:26); so, also, the term *soul* is used in the same manner (cf. Matt. 10:28; Acts 2:31; 1 Pet. 2:11. For a parallel use of these terms see Luke 1:46–47). Likewise the same general functions are ascribed to both soul and spirit (cf. Mark 8:12; John 11:33; 13:21 with Matt. 26:38; John 12:27. Cf. 2 Cor 7:13; 1 Cor. 16:18 with Matt. 11:29. Cf. 2 Cor. 7:1 with 1 Pet. 2:11; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 10:39. Cf. James 5:20 with 1 Cor. 5:5. Observe, also, Mark 8:36–37; 12:30; Luke 1:46; Heb. 6:18–19; James 1:21). Those departed from this life are sometimes mentioned as *souls* and sometimes as *spirits* (cf. Gen. 35:18; 1 Kings 17:21; Matt. 27:50; John 19:30;

Acts 2:27, 31; 7:59; Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:18; Rev. 6:9; 20:4). So, also, God is revealed as being spirit and soul (Isa. 42:1; Jer. 9:9; Matt. 12:18; John 4:24; Heb. 10:38).

Basing their conclusions upon these generalities, many have assumed that the Bible teaches only a dichotomy. Over against this is the truth that oftentimes these terms cannot be used interchangeably. At this point it may be observed that there is the closest relation between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit—so close, indeed, that it is not always certain to which a reference is made in the Sacred Text. The Holy Spirit works in and through the human spirit, but this is not said with respect to the human soul. “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit” (Rom. 8:16). A soul may be lost, but this is not declared of the spirit (Matt. 16:26). The three important texts which distinguish between *soul* and *spirit* are: “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body” (1 Cor. 15:44); “And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess. 5:23); “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart” (Heb. 4:12). Much has been written with a view to bringing these three passages into harmony with the dichotomous view. In this effort 1 Corinthians 15:44 is too often wholly ignored, yet it presents a field of distinction which is immeasurable. The English translation, *natural*, obscures the fact from the usual reader, that reference here is to the present body which is said to be adapted to the soul, as in contrast with that body which is future and is adapted to the spirit. The future body is to be like Christ’s glorious body and the difference, as here measured, between the present body—corruptible, dishonorable, weak, and soulish—and the resurrection body—incorruptible, glorious, powerful, and of the spirit—measures that which is the outlook and capacity of the soul as in contrast with that which is the outlook and capacity of the spirit.

Each of the elements which together comprise the immaterial part of man should be considered individually:

1. SOUL. No better analysis of both soul and spirit has been found than that by J. I. Marais in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. Concerning the human soul he writes:

Soul, like spirit, has various shades of meaning in the Old Testament, which may be

summarized as follows: “Soul,” “living being,” “life,” “self,” “person,” “desire,” “appetite,” “emotion” and “passion.” In the first instance it meant that which breathes, and as such is distinguished from *bāsār*, “flesh” (Isa. 10:18; Dt. 12:23); from *shē.ēr*, “the inner flesh,” next the bones (Prov. 11:17, “his own flesh”); from *beten*, “belly” (Ps. 31:10, “My soul and my belly are consumed with grief”), etc.

As the *life-breath*, it departs at death (Gen. 35:18; Jer. 15:2). Hence the desire among Old Testament saints to be delivered from Sheol (Ps. 16:10, “Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol”) and from *shahath*, “the pit” (Job 33:18, “He keepeth back his soul from the pit”; Isa. 38:17, “Thou hast ... delivered it [my soul] from the pit of corruption”).

By an easy transition the word comes to stand for the *individual, personal life*, the *person*, with two distinct shades of meaning which might best be indicated by the Latin *anima* and *animus*. As *anima*, “soul,” the life inherent in the body, the animating principle in the blood is denoted (cf. Dt. 12:23, 24, “Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the soul; and thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh”). As *animus*, “mind,” the center of our mental activities and passivities is indicated. Thus we read of “a hungry soul” (Ps. 107:9), “a weary soul” (Jer. 31:25), “a loathing soul” (Lev. 26:11), “a thirsty soul” (Ps. 42:2), “a grieved soul” (Job 30:25), “a loving soul” (Cant. 1:7), and many kindred expressions. Cremer has characterized this use of the word in a sentence: “*Nephesh* [soul] in man is the subject of personal life, whereof *pneuma* or *rū^{ah}* [spirit] is the principle” (*Lexicon*, s.v., 795).

This individuality of man, however, may be denoted by *pneuma* as well, but with a distinction. *Nephesh* or “soul” can only denote the individual life with a material organization or body. *Pneuma* or “spirit” is not so restricted. Scripture speaks of “spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:23), where there can be no thought of a material or physical or corporeal organization. They are “spiritual beings freed from the assaults and defilements of the flesh” (Delitzsch, in loc.). For an exceptional use of *psuchē* in the same sense see Rev. 6:9; 20:4, and (irrespective of the meaning of Ps. 16:10) Acts 2:27.

In the New Testament *psuchē* appears under more or less similar conditions as in the Old Testament. The contrast here is as carefully maintained as there. It is used where *pneuma* would be out of place; and yet it seems at times to be employed where *pneuma* might have been substituted. Thus in John 19:30 we read: “Jesus gave up his *pneuma*” to the Father, and, in the same Gospel (John 10:15), Jesus gave up His “*psuchē* for the sheep,” and in Matthew 20:28 He gave His *psuchē* (not His *pneuma*) as a ransom—a difference which is characteristic. For the *pneuma* stands in quite a different relation to God from the *psuchē*. The “spirit” (*pneuma*) is the outbreathing of God into the creature, the life-principle derived from God. The “soul” (*psuchē*) is man’s individual possession, that which distinguishes one man from another and from inanimate nature. The *pneuma* of Christ was surrendered to the Father in death; His *psuchē* was surrendered, His individual life was given “a ransom for many.” His life “was given for the sheep.”

This explains those expressions in the New Testament which bear on the salvation of the soul and its preservation in the regions of the dead. “Thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades” (the world of shades) (Acts 2:27); “Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil” (Rom. 2:9); “We are ... of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul” (Heb. 10:39); “Receive ... the implanted word, which is able to save your souls” (Jas. 1:21). The same or similar expressions may be met with in the Old Testament in reference to the soul. Thus in Psalms 49:8, AV “The redemption of their soul is precious,” and again: “God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol” (Ps. 49:15). Perhaps this may explain—at least this is Wendt’s explanation—why even a corpse is called *nephesh* or soul in the Old Testament, because, in the region of the dead, the individuality is retained and, in a measure, separated from God (cf. Hag. 2:13; Lev. 21:11).

The distinction between *psuchē* and *pneuma*, or *nephesh* and *rū^{ah}*, to which reference has been made, may best be described in the words of Oehler (*O.T. Theology*, I, 217): “Man is not spirit, but

has it: he is *soul*.... In the soul, which sprang from the spirit, and exists continually through it, lies the individuality—in the case of man, his personality, his self, his *ego*.” He draws attention to the words of Elihu in Job (33:4): “God’s *spirit* made me,” the soul called into being; “and the *breath* of the Almighty animates me,” the soul kept in energy and strength, in continued existence, by the Almighty, into whose hands the inbreathed *spirit* is surrendered, when the *soul* departs or is taken from us (1 Ki. 19:4). Hence according to Oehler the phrases *naphshī* (“my soul”), *naphsh^ekhā* (“thy soul”) may be rendered in Latin *egomet, tu ipse*; but not *rūhī* (“my spirit”), *ruhākhā* (“thy spirit”)—soul standing for the whole person, as in Genesis 12:5; 17:14; Ezekiel 18:4, etc.—V, 2837–38

2. SPIRIT. Similarly, the analysis of the human spirit by the same author is partially quoted:

Used primarily in the Old Testament and the New Testament of the *wind*, as in Genesis 8:1; Numbers 11:31; ... Hebrews 1:7 (angels, “spirits” or “winds” in margin); often used of the *breath*, as in Job 12:10; 15:30, and in 2 Thessalonians 2:8 (wicked consumed by “the breath of his mouth”). In a figurative sense it was used as indicating *anger* or *fury*, and as such applied even to God, who destroys by the “breath of his nostrils” (Job 4:9; Ex. 15:8; 2 Sam. 22:16; see 2 Thess. 2:8). Hence applied to man—as being the seat of emotion in desire or trouble, and thus gradually of mental and moral qualities in general (Ex. 28:3, “the spirit of wisdom”; Ezk. 11:19, “a new spirit,” etc.). Where man is deeply stirred by the Divine Spirit, as among the prophets, we have a somewhat similar use of the word, in such expressions as: “The Spirit of the Lord came ... upon him” (1 Sam. 10:10).

The spirit as life-principle in man has various applications: sometimes to denote an *apparition* (Matt. 14:26, AV “saying, It is a spirit”; Luke 24:37, AV “had seen a spirit”); sometimes to denote angels, both fallen and unfallen (Heb. 1:14, “ministering spirits”; Matt. 10:1, “unclean spirits”; cf. also 12:43; Mark 1:23, 26, 27; and in Rev. 1:4, “the seven Spirits ... before his throne”). The spirit is thus in man the principle of life—but of man as distinguished from the brute—so that in death this spirit is yielded to the Lord (Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; 1 Cor. 5:5, “that the spirit may be saved”). Hence God is called the “Father of spirits” (Heb. 12:9). Thus generally for all the manifestations of the spiritual part in man, as that which thinks, feels, wills; and also to denote certain qualities which characterize the man, e.g. “poor in spirit” (Matt. 5:3); “spirit of gentleness” (Gal. 6:1); “of bondage” (Rom. 8:15); “of jealousy” (Num. 5:14); “of fear” (2 Tim. 1:7 AV); “of slumber” (Rom. 11:8 AV). Hence we are called upon to “rule over our own spirit” (Prov. 16:32; 25:28), and are warned against being overmastered by a wrong spirit (Luke 9:55 AV, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of”). So man may submit to the “spirit of error,” and turn away from the “spirit of truth” (1 John 4:6). Thus we read of the “spirit of counsel” (Isa. 11:2); “of wisdom” (Eph. 1:17).

We go a step higher when we find the human spirit brought into relationship with the Divine Spirit. For man is but a creature to whom life has been imparted by God’s spirit—life being but a resultant of God’s breath. Thus life and death are realistically described as an imparting or a withdrawing of God’s breath, as in Job 27:3; 33:4; 34:14, “spirit and breath” going together. The spirit may thus be “revived” (Gen. 45:27), or “overwhelmed” (Ps. 143:4), or “broken” (Prov. 15:13). And where sin has been keenly felt, it is “a broken spirit” which is “a sacrifice to God” (Ps. 51:17); and when man submits to the power of sin, a new direction is given to his mind: he comes under a “spirit of whoredom” (Hos. 4:12); he becomes “proud in spirit” (Eccl. 7:8), instead of being “patient in spirit”; he is a fool because he is “hasty in spirit” and gives way to “anger” (Eccl. 7:9). The “faithful in spirit” are the men who resist talebearing and backbiting in the world (Prov. 11:13). In such instances as these the difference between “soul” and “spirit” appears.—*Ibid.*, V, 2841–42

In the same work and under the head of *Psychology*, the same author presents important contrasts between *soul* and *spirit*: “Gathering all together, the

Scriptural position seems to be as follows: The Divine Spirit is the source of all life, and its power is communicated in the physical, intellectual and moral sphere. That Spirit, as the *spiritus spirans*, the inspiring spirit, by its very breath makes man a living soul: 'The Spirit [or breath] of God is in my nostrils' (Job 27:3); 'Thou takest away their breath [*rū^ah*, 'spirit'], they die, and return to their dust' (Ps. 104:29). Hence God is called 'God of the spirits of all flesh' (Num. 16:22; 27:16).

"Soul, though identical with spirit, has shades of meaning which spirit has not; it stands for the individual. 'Man is spirit, because he is dependent upon God. Man is soul, because, unlike the angels, he has a body, which links him to earth. He is *animal* as possessing *anima*, but he is a reasoning animal, which distinguishes him from the brute' (Bavinck, *Ger. Dogm.*, II, 628)" (*Ibid.*, IV, 2497).

Having quoted C. A. Auberlen as saying, "Body, soul, and spirit are nothing else than the real basis of the three elements of man's being, world-consciousness, self-consciousness, and God-consciousness," John Laidlaw goes on to say:

It would be easy enough to refute each of these proposed divisions by confronting it with one or more texts which it will not cover. It is better to accept them all as evidence that a trichotomic usage in Scripture plainly there is, and that it requires recognition and explanation. Only a patient investigation of its rise will enable us to apprehend its force. That soul and spirit denote distinct natures in man, or, as Delitzsch has it, separable elements of one nature, or even, as others, distinct faculties of the inner man, implies a kind of analysis which is out of harmony with biblical thought, and will not stand upon an impartial examination of the biblical phraseology. On the other hand, that in the passages to be explained we have nothing more than rhetorical accumulation of terms, will not satisfy the facts....

When we pass from the natural to the theological use of these two terms in the New Testament, the important question arises, whether the distinction to be found between *pneuma* with its adjective on the one hand, and *psyche* with its adjective on the other, in the well-known group of texts, mainly Pauline, 1 Thess. 5:23, 1 Cor. 2:14, 15:44, Heb. 4:12, Jude 19, is identical with that of the Jewish schools, or owes its force to another and higher influence. If the Old Testament use of them, followed, as we learn from the Gospels, by our Lord and the elder apostles, was not analytic, was natural and real as opposed to philosophical, then though Paul may be said to have adopted the philosophical language of the Jewish schools, he was rather redeeming the Old Testament terms out of their hands for a new purpose. The parallel between his tripartite language and that of the Platonists and Stoics is obvious enough. But the difference is no less distinct. What he took from them was sanctioned by the usage of the Septuagint; what he added was an application of Old Testament language to express the New Testament revelation of grace. The tripartition of Plato and the Platonizing schools was part of a method for solving the problem of evil. It was intended to account for divergent moral forces in man, for the subjugation in him of what is best by what is worst; and it did so by assuming that there was in his formation a physical element eternally opposed to the divine. In the terms of the trichotomy, as derived from the Old Testament, there was no such taint. They were fitted to do a better thing than to account for man's evil—namely, to

express under the power of a new revelation the way of his recovery. They were exactly suited to express the new idea. One of them especially, “spirit” (πνεῦμα), had never been debased by ethnic or erroneous thought. It was never used in the Greek psychology. Even Plato’s highest principle is not πνεῦμα, but νοῦς and its derivatives. While, therefore, the idea of the New Testament trichotomy was suggested by the usage of the Greek and Graeco-Jewish schools, the terms themselves were biblical. The meaning was at once true to the simple psychology of the Old Testament, and enlarged with fulness of New Testament revelation. It is clear that the distinction between the psychical man and the spiritual man, the psychical body and the spiritual body, is one radical to the theology of Paul’s Epistles. But instead of being rooted in a philosophical analysis of the constituents of human nature, it is mainly born of two disclosures of advancing revealed thought. The one is the clear revelation of the personality of a third hypostasis in the Godhead, definitely and fully indicated in the New Testament by the term Spirit, Holy Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ. The other is the spiritual union of redeemed humanity with God through Christ Jesus. The new life or nature thus originated is variously called “the new man,” “a new creature,” “the inner man” and especially “the spirit” as contrasted with “the flesh.” Why this word *pneuma* should be adopted to express the new nature in believers, or the indwelling of God with man, is plain. The Third Person in the Trinity is the agent in originating and maintaining this new life, and with a rare felicity the same word (*ruach* of the Old Testament, and *pneuma* of the New) denotes the Holy Spirit of God and the heaven-derived life in renewed man. It is an instance at once of the elevating influence of revelation upon language, and of that insight into the capacity and destinies of human nature which the progress of revelation brings with it. *Pneuma* and *psyche*, with their derivatives, thus assume under the influence of New Testament theology a new and enlarged significance. Besides denoting physical life in common, yet with difference of aspect; besides denoting the inner life in general with corresponding difference of emphasis, they denote a moral and spiritual distinction. The psychical man is man as nature now constitutes him, and as sin has infected him. The spiritual man is man as grace has reconstituted him, and as God’s Spirit dwells in him. The unrenewed man is “psychical not having the spirit.” The word of God divides and discriminates between that which is psychical and that which is spiritual. The Christian is to be sanctified wholly in his three-fold life,—the physical life of the body, the individual life of the soul, the inner life of the spirit; which latter two become again the basis of the natural and of the regenerate life respectively. In the progress of redemption he shall exchange a body psychical or natural, which he has in common with all men as derived from Adam, for a body spiritual or glorified, adapted to his new nature and fashioned like unto the glorious body of his Lord; for the first head of the race was made a living *psyche*, but the second Adam is a life-giving *Pneuma*.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 66–67, 70–73

3. HEART. In its psychological sense, the term *heart* refers, alike in both Testaments, to human life with its energies exercised. The physical organ which bears this name is the distributor of the blood and the Biblical conception is that the life is in the blood (Lev. 17:11). It is thus natural that the heart should be deemed the center of human life. Similarly, the heart is the organ that reacts to human emotions and is thus as easily considered the center of sensibility. In Proverbs it is written, “The heart knoweth its own bitterness” (14:10, R.V.), and “Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life” (4:23). In this manner the Word of God relates the term *heart* to natural self-knowledge. To the same end, Isaiah 6:10—a passage six times quoted in the New Testament—and 1 Corinthians 2:9 are especially revealing. It is written: “Make the heart of

this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed” (Isa. 6:10); “But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him” (1 Cor. 2:9). It was declared of man as early in his history as the record of Genesis 6:5 that “every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” The prophet Ezekiel declares it to be Jehovah’s purpose to give Israel a “new heart” (Ezek. 36:26), and the Apostle writes of the law being “written in their hearts.” The heart is to be purified “by faith,” Peter writes of the “hidden man of the heart,” Jehovah “searches the heart.” From such passages as these it is to be seen that the term *heart* represents specific exercise of the realities of human life and may thus, to some extent, be distinguished from the soul and the spirit, though here, again, no close line may be drawn and human speculation is of little profit.

The word *heart* occurs over 600 times in the Old Testament and at least 120 times in the New Testament. The word *soul* occurs but about 400 times in the whole Bible and the word *spirit* but slightly more—including all references to the Spirit of God. The extensive use of the word *heart* in all its varied implications places it in a position of supreme importance in Biblical psychology. Closely related to the word *heart* in its psychological import is the word *reins*, which is used in the Bible fifteen times and but once in the New Testament (Rev. 2:23). In this term the kidneys seem to symbolize the innermost part of man’s being, the seat of man’s deepest emotions which God alone can fully know. Six times the word *reins* is used along with the word *heart* and evidently as an emphasis upon the emotional nature of man.

4. FLESH. This the fourth psychological term to be named which the Bible employs introduces a reality which is even more complex than any other. The word *flesh* (σάρξ) is subject to a threefold usage in the New Testament, and when these uses are distinguished, some light will fall on this easily misunderstood theme. In some instances the term *flesh* refers only to the material part of man, in which case it has no psychological implications whatever. It is equivalent to its synonym, *body* (σῶμα). In his Pentecostal sermon, Peter, referring to David’s expectation that Christ would be raised from the dead, states: “Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in

hell, neither his flesh did see corruption” (Acts 2:30–31). In both instances where this term is used in this passage the meaning is restricted to the substance of the body. In 1 Corinthians 15:39 the Apostle extends its meaning to include the substance of all forms of living creatures. The term is several times joined with the word *blood*, as “flesh and blood” and with weighty significance. Though used of the human body (Eph. 5:29) and of Christ’s body (John 1:14; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 5:7), it is in this specific use no more than a synonym of *body*.

In its second meaning it refers to humanity’s relationships and classifications. Bearing this sense the term *flesh* appears many times in the Old Testament. Quoting Isaiah 40:6–8, Peter declares: “For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you” (1 Pet. 1:24–25). This reference is to living people of the earth—not to so many bodies composed of fleshly substance, but bodies ensouled and alive. However, though this use of the word signified both the body and the life which is in it, there is no direct reference in any such use of the word to moral or ethical qualities.

The third use of the word *flesh* is that which is wholly restricted to the immaterial part of man. In approaching this specific application of this word, it will be observed that in the first instance it is seen to be restricted to the body alone; in the second instance it combines both material and immaterial, but without moral significance; while in this the third instance it is restricted to the immaterial part of man and with special moral or ethical meaning. It is an element in man which is predicated of both the unregenerate and the regenerate. It is opposed to God and godliness. Being isolated from mere substance, it may be defined as a fallen nature, a disposition to sin. It manifests self, and in that evaluation of it, the body may be indirectly included, but without any contributing import. The Apostle spoke of *himself* thus: “For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not” (Rom. 7:18). The usual expression of the flesh is through the body, but evil tendencies are not always referred to under the term *flesh*. There are evil desires of the mind (Eph. 2:3), and there is a “filthiness” of the “spirit” (2 Cor. 7:1). Some “works of the flesh,” such as “hatred, variance, emulations, heresies,” are wholly unrelated to the body. There is that which is called “fleshly wisdom” (2 Cor. 1:12)—the wisdom of men as opposed to the wisdom of God—and a “fleshly mind” (Col. 2:18) which characterizes Gnosticism. The term *flesh*, being ethical in character, is similar to

such expressions as the “old man,” “the body of sin” (Rom. 6:6), “the body of the sins of the flesh” (Col. 1:22), “law ... in my members” (Rom. 7:23), “members which are upon the earth” (Col. 3:5).

Thus it is disclosed that the term *flesh*, when sustaining an ethical significance, refers to that part of man which, because of the fall, is opposed to God and to holiness. It is a fallen nature which, though expressing itself through the deeds of the body, is, nevertheless, to be identified as that which is immaterial and related to the material only as all that is immaterial is resident in, and expressed through, the material. To the Apostle the present life is a “life ... in the flesh” (Gal. 2:20). He is in the flesh much as he is in the *cosmos*. It is the sphere of his present abode, and is therefore ever an occasion for conflict. At this point is introduced the New Testament word *carnal*, which is the English translation of σαρκικός, and indicates that which is fleshly in its character. One important passage bears directly upon this theme (1 Cor. 3:1–4), in which context this Greek word appears twice. That the Corinthians are addressed as “brethren” and are “babes in Christ” (3:1), is conclusive evidence that they are regenerate. Yet they are *carnal* or *fleshly* and because of conditions which are mentioned in the context. The term *carnal* is thus seen to be a description of the spiritual estate of a Christian who is dominated by the flesh rather than by the Spirit of God. He is one who is “walking” after the flesh. In the same context (Rom. 7:14–25) in which he declares himself to be *flesh* (7:18), the Apostle asserts, “but I am carnal, sold under sin” (7:14). This portion of the Scriptures—so personal in character—is presented by the Apostle as an example of the conflict which is developed by the presence of the flesh in the one who is saved. In this Peter concurs with an admonition to “abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul” (1 Pet. 2:11). The function of the soul is usually in a lower sphere of human life than that of the spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44); but here it is disclosed that the flesh is lower than the spirit, for its lusts are a detriment to the soul. In a similar passage (Rom. 8:5–13), the fundamental problem of whether the flesh or the Spirit of God shall dominate the believer’s life is carried to its logical end, namely, to live according to the flesh is to be in the way of death, and to live according to the Spirit is to be in the way of life with its victory over the flesh. It is not asserted that Christians are in danger of spiritual death, but it is nevertheless true that they may live in the realms in which those who are spiritually dead (cf. Eph. 2:3) live. They may indulge in the “deeds of the body.” The English word *carnal*(ly) appears in the Authorized Version of Romans 8:6–7, but the word σάρξ and not σαρκικός appears in the original. A worthy

consideration of this context cannot but impress the mind with respect to the evil character of the flesh when ethically considered, and in its determined and unrelenting opposition to the Spirit of God. Since no unregenerate person is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, the conflict here described is between what the Christian is in himself—flesh—and the Spirit of God who indwells him. Such a warfare belongs only to the child of God. In respect to this conflict, a distinction is to be seen between the *flesh* in its counterpoise to the *mind* (νοῦς, Rom. 7:23, 25), and the *flesh* in its counterpoise to the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:4–13; Gal. 5:16–26). In the former conflict, or that between the flesh and the mind, there is only defeat, though the truth is established that with the mind a Christian may serve the “law of God,” and yet with the flesh serve “the law of sin” (Rom. 7:25). In the wider conflict between the flesh and the Holy Spirit there may be victory. This possible triumph is published in two major passages, each of which is followed by a most vital explanatory portion. These passages read, “For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit” (Rom. 8:2–4); “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would” (Gal. 5:16–17). No doubt about the evil character of the flesh—ethically considered—could be entertained when upwards of twenty New Testament passages are contemplated. The quoting of five of them will suffice: “For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live” (Rom. 8:13); “And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts” (Gal. 5:24); “For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting” (Gal. 6:8); “In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ” (Col. 2:11); “And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh” (Jude 1:23).

5. MIND. In the Pauline Epistles, the word *mind* is employed as one of the elements of the immaterial part of man. It is closely related to both the Holy Spirit and the flesh. The Apostle speaks of “the mind of the Spirit,” and “the

mind of the flesh.” Obviously, the human *mind* may be related to that which is good or to that which is evil. The Apostle writes, as before indicated, that with the mind he served the law of God (Rom. 7:25). He as definitely asserts that the carnal *mind* is enmity against God (Rom. 8:7). In another place he joins *flesh* and *mind* in one phrase: “the desires of the flesh and of the mind” (Eph. 2:3), with an evil implication regarding each. The mind may be defiled (Titus 1:15), and, against this, Peter says that the mind may be “girded up” as loins are girded (1 Pet. 1:13).

A summarization of the Biblical doctrine respecting the four leading elements which comprise the immaterial part of man—*soul*, *spirit*, *heart*, and *flesh*—is presented by John Laidlaw as follows:

To sum up: no one need be at any loss to grasp the simple psychology of the Bible who keeps well in view the original signification and subsequent growth of the four leading terms SPIRIT, SOUL, FLESH, HEART. These are the *voces signatae* of the entire Scripture view of man’s nature and constitution. They are all grouped round the idea of life or of a living being. The first two, *soul* and *spirit*, represent in different ways the life itself of a living being (not life in the abstract). The last two, *flesh* and *heart*, denote respectively the life-environment and the life-organ; the former that in which life inheres, the latter that through which it acts. So much for their simple and primitive meaning. In their secondary meaning (which again in the case of the first three—*spirit*, *soul*, *flesh*—becomes the basis of a tertiary, viz. an ethical or theological meaning in the latest development of inspired thought) they are to be grouped as follows. *Spirit*, *soul*, and *flesh* are expressions for man’s nature viewed from different points. They are not three natures. Man’s one nature is really expressed by each of them, so that each alone may designate the human being. Thus man is *flesh*, as an embodied perishable creature: “All flesh is grass.” He is *soul*, as a living being, an individual responsible creature: “All souls are mine” (Ezek. 18:4); “There were added about three thousand souls” (Acts 2:41). Once more, he is *spirit*. More commonly, however, he is said to have it, as his life-principle derived from God. He is of the spiritual order—that, namely, of God and angels. But “spirits” designates men only as disembodied: “The spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:23), “spirits in prison” (1 Pet. 3:19), exactly as we read “souls under the altar” (Rev. 6:9). *Heart* stands outside of this triad, because man is never called “a heart,” nor men spoken of as “hearts.” *Heart* never denotes the personal subject, but always the personal organ. Again, they may be grouped thus: *Spirit*, *soul*, *heart*, may be used each of them to indicate one side of man’s double-sided nature, viz. his higher or inner life. Over against them stands *flesh*, as representing that nature on the lower or outer side, so that any one of the first three combined with *flesh* will express, dichotomically, the whole of man—*flesh* and *spirit*, *flesh* and *soul*, or *flesh* and *heart*. Then, looking at the first three once more, not in relation to *flesh* but in their mutual relations to “life,” we get that correct and convenient division suggested by Beck and followed by most competent inquirers since,—a clear and intelligible result, which justifies itself throughout the whole Scripture, viz. that *spirit* represents the principle of life, *soul* the subject of life, and *heart* the organ of life; definitions which will be found to apply accurately to all the three constituent lives which the human being can lead—(a) the physical, (b) the mental and moral, (c) the spiritual and religious.—*Ibid.*, pp. 91–93

V. The Capacities and Faculties of the Immaterial Part of Man

In turning from the consideration of the elements which comprise the immaterial part of man to the capacities and faculties, attention is removed from the general theme of what the immaterial part of man *is*, to what the immaterial part of man *does*. Much vital truth may be drawn from the Bible bearing on the activities of the immaterial part of man. The philosophy of Kant which classifies these activities into *intellect*, *sensibility*, and *will* is usually accepted as a working basis for thought. However, to this must be added that strange and mysterious function termed *conscience*, which might as easily be classified with those elements which make up the immaterial part of man as with the activities wrought by him. In fact, conscience stands quite alone as a monitor sitting in judgment on all else within the man. Following the Kantian divisions, each activity will be examined separately.

1. INTELLECT. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed., s.v.) alludes to the word *intellect* as “the general term for the mind in reference to its capacity for understanding.” This theme belongs properly to the science of psychology. However, when that augmented understanding which is wrought in the human mind by the power of the Holy Spirit is in view, the subject becomes theological. A supernatural illumination for the unregenerate was promised by Christ when He said, “Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:7–11). This illumination is evidently designed to overcome that incapacity described in 2 Corinthians 4:3–4, which reads, “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.” In like manner, an unlimited field of truth is made available to the regenerate by the same Spirit. Of this teaching, or enlightening, work of the Spirit Christ spoke as recorded in John 16:12–15: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take

of mine, and shall shew it unto you” (cf. John 3:3; 1 Cor. 2:9–3:4; Heb. 5:12–14; 11:3; 1 Pet. 2:2; 1 John 2:27). Praying for the Ephesian saints, the Apostle introduces a vital reality when he makes request “that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints” (Eph. 1:17–18). Here the word *understanding* is a translation of καρδία (as in all the best MSS.), the thought being, evidently, that the heart, though usually supposed to be the seat of the emotions, is also the seat of thought and will (cf. Rom. 1:21). The reception of the great revelation for which the Apostle prays is, therefore, more extended than it would be if restricted to either the intellect or the emotions. Plato employs the phrase, “eye of the soul” (*Sophist*, 254), and Ovid, speaking of Pythagoras, says: “With his mind he approached the gods, though far removed in heaven, and what nature denied to human sight, he drew forth with the eyes of his heart” (*Metamorphoses*, xv., 62–64, citations made by M. R. Vincent, *Word Studies*, III, 371). All that the Apostle prays is to the end “that ye may know,” and know by the peculiar capacity of the heart, since the heart both feels and understands.

2. SENSIBILITY. This, another function of the immaterial part of man, is properly classed, also, as an important theme of psychology; yet there is much that is emotional in both God and man which is theological. In this respect man reflects or images that which is true of God. How vast is the love of God, and how real is the love and devotion of the human heart! Again, the human emotional nature, like the human intellect, may be wrought upon and enlarged experimentally by the power of the indwelling Spirit. “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us” (Rom. 5:5). The Scriptures declare that the divine compassion may find expression through the Christian and that it arises, not in the Christian’s capacity, but from the Spirit who indwells him. “The fruit of the Spirit is love” (Gal. 5:22; cf. 1 Cor. 13:1–13). The Christian, loving with divine love, will love those objects which God loves. The extent of such a possibility is limitless. This divine love being the actuating force, the emotions and life are lifted to the plane of that which is supernatural.

3. WILL. The human will is rightfully a major theme in theology. It appears not only in Anthropology, but also in Soteriology, and, in so far as man is created in the image of God and reflects the divine attributes, the will of man is

indirectly related to Theism. The *fact* of the will is a psychological truth, while the *freedom* of the will is theological. The latter aspect of the subject belongs specifically to Soteriology, and will be attended in due time. It may be recorded here, however, that the will usually acts as moved or influenced by the intellect and emotions, and its freedom is no more than the experience of acting without *conscious* necessity; yet no greater necessity could be imposed than that which arises when the intellect and emotions are themselves influenced by a superior power. Of the unregenerate it is said that Satan is working in them or energizing them (Eph. 2:2), while of the regenerate it is said that God is energizing them “both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:13). These two passages account for the whole of humanity and therefore determine the truth—important indeed—that no human will, in the absolute sense, is free. Addressing those who were under Satan’s influence, as all unregenerate are, Christ said, “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life” (John 5:40). He also declared, “No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him” (John 6:44; cf. 5:21). Such “drawing” is evidently a divine moving of the whole inner man and is experienced by the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will. Faith, or confidence in God, is a divinely wrought state of mind and to such the gracious invitation, “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37), is most attractive. There is such a thing as seeing the Son and believing on Him because of that vision (cf. John 6:40). Apart from this none is naturally inclined to believe. To those who are subject to the will of God, there is ever-increasing knowledge of the truth available. Of this gracious fact Christ said, “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself” (John 7:17).

Of the will in general the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states:

Will, in psychology, is sometimes used as synonymous with conation (*q.v.*), but more usually in the restricted sense of deliberate decision, as contrasted with mere impulse (*q.v.*) or desire. In an act of will there is a deliberate choice of one of several alternatives, and frequently a conscious reference to the interests of the subject’s self as a whole. People sometimes speak as though the will were a kind of independent entity or faculty which makes the decisions, etc. But that is only a loose way of talking. As Spinoza and Locke pointed out long ago, there is no will apart from particular acts or processes of willing; and it is not the will that wills but the whole self that does it. Similarly with the related hypostasis of “will-power” or “strength of will.” There is no strong “will,” but there are strong-willed characters, that is, people who can pursue distant ends (good or bad) with great perseverance; weak-willed people, on the other hand, are easily influenced and carried away by every instinct or impulse or desire that prompts them from time to time, and cannot subordinate them to the pursuit of remote ends.—14th Edition, XXIII, 605

Of the will theologically considered, Dr. Augustus H. Strong writes:

A. Will defined.—Will is the soul's power to choose between motives and to direct its subsequent activity according to the motive thus chosen,—in other words, the soul's power to choose both an end and the means to attain it. The choice of an ultimate end we call immanent preference; the choice of means we call executive volition.

B. Will and other faculties.—(a) We accept the threefold division of human faculties into intellect, sensibility, and will. (b) Intellect is the soul knowing; sensibility is the soul feeling (desires, affections); will is the soul choosing (end or means). (c) In every act of the soul, all the faculties act. Knowing involves feeling and willing; feeling involves knowing and willing; willing involves knowing and feeling. (d) Logically, each latter faculty involves the preceding action of the former: the soul must know before feeling; must know and feel before willing. (e) Yet since knowing and feeling are activities, neither of these is possible without willing.

C. Will and permanent states.—(a) Though every act of the soul involves the action of all the faculties, yet in any particular action one faculty may be more prominent than the others. So we speak of acts of intellect, of affection, of will. (b) This predominant action of any single faculty produces effects upon the other faculties associated with it. The action of will gives a direction to the intellect and to the affections, as well as a permanent bent to the will itself. (c) Each faculty, therefore, has its permanent states as well as its transient acts, and the will may originate these states. Hence we speak of voluntary affections, and may with equal propriety speak of voluntary opinions. These permanent voluntary states we denominate character.

D. Will and motives.—(a) The permanent states just mentioned, when they have been once determined, also influence the will. Internal views and dispositions, and not simply external presentations, constitute the strength of motives. (b) These motives often conflict, and though the soul never acts without motive, it does notwithstanding choose between motives, and so determines the end toward which it will direct its activities. (c) Motives are not *causes*, which compel the will, but *influences*, which persuade it. The power of these motives, however, is proportioned to the strength of will which has entered into them and has made them what they are.

E. Will and contrary choice.—(a) Though no act of pure will is possible, the soul may put forth single volitions in a direction opposed to its previous ruling purpose, and thus far man has the power of a contrary choice (Rom. 7:18—"to will is present with me"). (b) But in so far as will has entered into and revealed itself in permanent states of intellect and sensibility and in a settled bent of the will itself, man cannot by a single act reverse his moral state, and in this respect has not the power of a contrary choice. (c) In this latter case he can change his character only indirectly, by turning his attention to considerations fitted to awaken opposite dispositions, and by thus summoning up motives to an opposite course.

F. Will and responsibility.—(a) By repeated acts of will put forth in a given moral direction, the affections may become so confirmed in evil or in good as to make previously certain, though not necessary, the future good or evil action of the man. Thus, while the will is free, the man may be the "bondservant of sin" (John 8:31–36) or the "servant of righteousness" (Rom. 6:15–23; cf. Heb. 12:23—"spirits of just men made perfect"). (b) Man is responsible for all effects of will, as well as for will itself; for voluntary affections, as well as for voluntary acts; for the intellectual views into which will has entered, as well as for the acts of will by which these views have been formed in the past or are maintained in the present (2 Pet. 3:5—"wilfully forget").

G. Inferences from this view of the will.—(a) We can be responsible for the voluntary evil affections with which we are born, and for the will's inherited preference of selfishness, only upon the hypothesis that we originated these states of the affections and will, or had a part in originating them. Scripture furnishes this explanation, in its doctrine of Original Sin, or the doctrine of a common apostasy of the race in its first father, and our derivation of a corrupted nature by natural generation from him. (b) While there remains to man, even in his present condition, a natural power of will by which he may put forth transient volitions externally conformed to the divine law and so may to a limited extent modify his character, it still remains true that the sinful bent of his affections

is not directly under his control; and this bent constitutes a motive to evil so constant, inveterate, and powerful, that it actually influences every member of the race to reaffirm his evil choice, and renders necessary a special working of God's Spirit upon his heart to ensure his salvation. Hence the Scripture doctrine of Regeneration.—*Systematic Theology*, pp. 257–58

4. CONSCIENCE. The faculty of *conscience* is one of the major manifestations of the immaterial part of man, and doubtless no other faculty reflects more fully that which is in likeness to God. The estimation on the part of men of what the conscience really is varies to a large degree. Some maintain that it is not an integral part of man, but is rather the voice of God speaking directly to the one who is exercised by conscience. On the other hand, and far removed indeed, is the notion that conscience is no more than a bent of mind received by the discipline of childhood. Neither one of these extremes is sustained by Scripture. It is to be observed, however, that the voice of conscience, when normal to any degree, is ever true to the divine ideal, and this in spite of the fact that there is much in man—especially his flesh—which is contrary to God. Conscience is not subject to the will, but rather sits in judgment over the will and all other features of the life of man. The unity of man's being is none the less real regardless of the various elements in his immaterial nature—*soul, spirit, heart, flesh, and mind*—and regardless of the various modes of expression of that immaterial nature—*intellect, sensibility, will, memory, and conscience*. All these elements and manifestations perfectly articulate to form one experience which is called *life*. The mind may originate thoughts, the memory may retain thoughts, the spirit may discern the value of thoughts, and the soul respond to thoughts, but the conscience judges thoughts in respect to their moral worthiness. Naturally but little that is experienced by man is moral in character and therefore the conscience is not always exercised. At times and as occasion demands, conscience may become a torment, a lash, which is all but unbearable. In this, God seems to be more or less identified by every individual. He knows that God knows what he knows. Conscience is little concerned with the fact, as the case may be, that other people know that which constitutes its burden.

The Bible testimony concerning conscience is that it is either (a) *natural*—that which belongs to the unregenerate—or (b) *supernatural* that which belongs to the regenerate. The conscience of the unregenerate is *defiled* (Titus 1:15), *evil* (Heb. 10:22), *convicting* (John 8:9), *seared* (1 Tim. 4:2). On the other hand, the supernatural conscience, or that of the Christian, is far more complex. In fact a real question is raised properly whether the Christian lives by his conscience at all. It is contended that he is influenced by the indwelling Holy Spirit who is

either grieved or not grieved by the manner of the Christian's life. No more vivid description of the experience of one in whom the Spirit is grieved could be found than that written by David concerning himself in Psalm 32:3–4. He declares: "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer. Selah." The Apostle Paul significantly states that his conscience bore him witness in the Holy Ghost (Rom. 9:1). By this it would seem that the Spirit employs the conscience as His means of expression and impression, and perhaps that is the unveiling of the true relation between the Holy Spirit and the believer's conscience. With this in mind, certain revealed truths regarding the Christian's conscience may be considered. The conscience is *purged*. It is written: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins" (Heb. 10:1–2). There is no intimation here that the Christian will not be conscious of unconfessed sin in his life; it is rather that the whole record of past sins, having been forgiven as a part of salvation, the purged conscience will not be exercised over them. This specific Scripture presents a vital test which may prove whether one is saved and may be applied to any professed believer. Closely related to this is the *good* conscience which is mentioned six times in the New Testament (note 1 Pet. 3:16). This aspect of conscience relates to or reflects the state of the believer's heart. A good conscience is free from self-condemnation. Two passages serve to describe this reality. In 1 Corinthians 4:4, the Apostle asserts, "For I know nothing by [or, against] myself," and in 1 John 3:20–22 this good conscience is said to be an important factor in effectual prayer. The passage states: "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things. Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." Evidently the particular form of conscience noted here was experienced by those who were faithful to Jehovah under Judaism (cf. Acts 23:1; 2 Tim. 1:3). It is in this manner that conscience *witnesses* (Rom. 9:1) and may be void of offense (Acts 24:16). It is also worthy of note that the conscience of an immature Christian may be encouraged in the ways of sin by the example which other Christians present. It is written: "For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not

the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols?” (1 Cor. 8:10). The Apostle also identifies this as a *wounded* conscience: “But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ” (vs. 12).

Chapter XV

THE STATE OF INNOCENCE

I. The Environment of the First Man

THE DESCRIPTION of the environment of the first man is recorded in Genesis 2:8–9, 15, which reads: “And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.” It may be assumed that when Jehovah planted a garden in which was “every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food,” the prospect was as pleasing as could be secured by means of material things. The attractiveness of the garden was in harmony with all else that God had created and concerning which He had said it was “very good.” The evidence points unmistakably to the fact that a poor environment tends to encourage all manner of evil. The situation in which the first man was placed could not by any reasoning have been a contributing cause of his failure. What remains of this wonderful garden is only a poet’s dream. J. Vondel (1654), the greatest of Holland’s poets, in his greatest work, *Lucifer*, represents Apollyon reporting to Beelzebub of his visit to the Garden of Eden thus (translation by Leonard Charles van Noppen, pp. 269–70):

Apollion:

I have, Lord Belzebub,
The low terrene observed with keenest eye,
And now I offer thee the fruits grown there
So far below these heights, 'neath other skies
And other sun: now judge thou from the fruit
The land and garden which even God Himself
Hath blessed and planted for mankind's delight.

Belzebub:

I see the golden leaves, all laden with
Ethereal pearls, the sparkling silvery dew.
What sweet perfume exhale those radiant leaves
Of tint unfading! How alluring glows
That pleasant fruit with crimson and with gold!
'Twere pity to pollute it with the hands.
The eye doth tempt the mouth. Who would not lust
For earthly luxury? He loathes our day

And food celestial, who the fruit may pluck
Of Earth. One would for Adam's garden curse
Our Paradise. The bliss of Angels fades
In that of man.

Apollion:

Too true, Lord Belzebub,
Though high our Heaven may seem, 'tis far too low.
For what I saw with mine own eyes deceives
Me not. The world's delights, yea, Eden's fields
Alone, our Paradise excel.

. . .

Apollion:

Round is the garden, as the world itself.
Above the centre looms the mount from which
The fountain gushes that divides in four,
And waters all the land, refreshing trees
And fields; and flows in unreflective rills
Of crystal purity. The streams their rich
Alluvion bring and nourish all the ground.
Here Onyx gleams and Bdeellion doth shine;
And bright as Heaven glows with glittering stars;
So here Dame Nature sowed her constellations
Of stones that pale our stars. Here dazzle veins
Of gold; for Nature wished to gather all
Her treasures in one lap.

. . .

Apollion:

No angel us among, a breath exhales
So soft and sweet as the pure draught refreshing
That there meets man, that lightly cools his face
And with its gentle, vivifying touch
All things caresses in its blissful course:
There swells the bosom of the fertile field
With herb and hue and bud and branch and bloom
And odors manifold, which nightly dews
Refresh. The rising and the setting sun
Know and observe their proper, measured time
And so unto the need of every plant
Temper their mighty rays that flower and fruit
Are all within the selfsame season found.

II. The Responsibility of the First Man

With respect to his manner of life, the obligation resting on the first man—

aside from the task of dressing and keeping the garden—is the norm or pattern for all human life on the earth. During that undetermined period in which Adam lived before the fall, that ideal was realized to the fullest satisfaction of his Creator. That responsibility is easily stated in the words, *he did the will of God*. Evidence is not wanting to prove that in unbroken fellowship with God Adam received daily counsel and direction from God. But one prohibition was imposed upon him. This, indeed, formed an exceedingly small proportion of all the gracious instructions which fell from the lips of Jehovah. The present ideal for the redeemed is that they also may find and do the will of God for them. Too often the negative side of God's will is stressed out of all proportion. There are things which are evil and not convenient from which the Christian should abstain, but the will of God is *positive*. It is that which one may *do*, and in joyous fellowship with the Father and with His Son (1 John 1:3–4). That the Christian may walk and talk with God, that the guiding and teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed to him, and that the enabling power to realize God's perfect will and plan is freely bestowed, illustrates, to some measure, the high privilege and responsibility of the first man when no cloud intervened between his Creator and himself. “The husbandman's calling is an ancient and honourable calling; it was needful even in paradise. The garden of Eden, though it needed not to be weeded (for thorns and thistles were not yet a nuisance), yet must be dressed and kept. Nature, even in its primitive state, left room for the improvements of art and industry. It was a calling fit for a state of innocency, making provision for life, not for lust, and giving man an opportunity of admiring the Creator and acknowledging his providence: while his hands were about his trees, his heart might be with his God” (MATTHEW HENRY'S *Commentary*, Fleming H. Revell Co., new ed., revised, *in loc.*, Gen. 2:15).

III. The Moral Qualities of the First Man

Since holiness may be either *active* or *passive*—positive virtue, or the absence of evil—the moral qualities of the first man were passive. He was innocent of wrong. There had been no opportunity to develop a tested moral character; yet no record asserts that he had not understood the difference between right and wrong. What might have been required morally of the first man and the measure of his obligation, depended largely upon the degree of his development as created. If, as some have claimed, he was only an infant in his mental powers—being an infant with respect to days of his existence—then his moral

responsibility is lowered to the vanishing point and the transgression by which he fell called for no judgment whatsoever. In the matter of his transgression, God treated Adam as being wholly accountable and this fact alone certifies the moral development which he sustained. God created a *mature* man. It is true that he could recall no past history, nor could he marshal the value of accumulated experience; but these values were possessed to the degree required for maturity of action. Such was the character of the creative act of God. No higher attestation of full-grown human excellence could be found than is exhibited in the truth that man as created was well-pleasing to God and thus received into divine companionship. By so much the thought of immaturity or of irresponsibility is precluded; yet the holiness of the unfallen first man was passive in that it was innocence and untested character.

IV. The Tempter of the First Man

Of this being—identified as Satan—much has been written under Angelology about his person and the temptation he imposed, and more will be introduced at a later time under hamartiology.

It is to be recognized that the tempter is not identified in the Genesis account, which reads: “Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?” (Gen. 3:1). It is not until the writing of Revelation 12:9 that the title *serpent* is identified as referring to the devil and Satan. Earlier in the New Testament there are clear references to the fact that it was Satan who tempted the first parents (2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14). It is to be observed that, in the progress of doctrine, the clear revelation respecting the tempter is not given until after redemption is completed in the cross. The fact that the original account as given in Genesis does not identify the tempter, but deals only with the creature Satan employed as his means of communication, has encouraged various explanations of this momentous event, and has drawn out much criticism. The record states that the man and the woman, being created evidently outside the garden, are placed in it and appointed to dress it. Within the garden are two trees—“the tree of life” and “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” Of the latter the first parents are restrained from eating. The penalty for eating is death in all its forms, for God said to them, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” The serpent appears and denies the word God has spoken, and declares that in the act of eating their eyes would be

opened, they would be as *Elohim*, and know good and evil. The woman first partook of the fruit and then gave it to her husband who ate of it also. According to the Word of God, they became death-doomed and were expelled from the garden. In the light of subsequent Scriptures it is not difficult to identify the tempter as Satan, who is later revealed as ever going about seeking the ruin of God's human creatures. That he should have sought the downfall of Adam and Eve is in harmony with all his wiles, which are faithfully depicted in the later Scriptures.

Three opinions relative to this narrative may be listed, namely, (a) those who treat the record as a fiction, a *mythos*, and to these it is ever a difficulty to define the moral of the fable. Having departed so completely from the natural interpretation, they introduce freely as many ideas as the human mind may invent. (b) The second group of interpreters are those who attempt to blend reality with allegory and to varying degrees of reality and allegory. The absurdity of introducing allegorical features into that which purports to be real has been well pointed out by Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733–1806) thus:

No writer of true history would mix plain matter of fact with allegory in one continued narrative, without any intimation of a transition from one to the other. If, therefore, any part of this narrative be matter of fact, no part is allegorical. On the other hand, if any part be allegorical, no part is naked matter of fact: and the consequence of this will be, that every thing in every part of the whole narrative must be allegorical. If the formation of the woman out of the man be allegory, the woman must be an allegorical woman. The man therefore must be an allegorical man; for of such a man only the allegorical woman will be a meet companion. If the man is allegorical, his paradise will be an allegorical garden; the trees that grow in it, allegorical trees; the rivers that watered it, allegorical rivers; and thus we may ascend to the very beginning of the creation; and conclude at last, that the heavens are allegorical heavens, and the earth an allegorical earth. Thus the whole history of the creation will be an allegory, of which the real subject is not disclosed; and in this absurdity the scheme of allegorizing ends.—Cited by Watson, *Theological Institutes*, II, 30

(c) A third group believe the record to be literal. They contend that the Mosaic account, while doubtless conveying deeper truths than those which appear on the surface, is, nevertheless, a historical record regarding actual beings and conditions. That it is a literal account is proved, first, by the fact that it is a part of a *continuous* history. The narrative goes on without a break into all subsequent history. If this record be fable and not history, the historical character of the entire Pentateuch is to be called in question, for none could point out a convenient place where early fable becomes history. The argument based on a continuous history cannot be refuted. The story is as clearly literal at its beginning as it is at its end, or at any point in its progress. In the second place, the literal character of this record is evidenced by the fact that reference is made

to it in all candor in later Scriptures, and is there made the basis of instruction and appeal which would have no weight if drawn from a fable. The Bible, as a whole and without exception, treats the Genesis record as literal. This suggests an extensive theme which can be pursued here only to a limited degree.

Since the book of Job is earlier with respect to its writing than the Genesis account by Moses, it is significant that this book states: "Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon earth, that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment?" (20:4–5). In this text the word *man* could as well be translated *Adam*. Again Job declares: "If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom" (31:33). Thus, also, since God made man upright (Eccl. 7:29), the first sin of the woman is implied when Eliphaz says, "What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" (Job 15:14). "Eden the garden of God" is mentioned by the prophets, and "the tree of life" is four times referred to in Proverbs and three times in Revelation. Perhaps no word is more conclusive than the words of Christ as they appear in Matthew 19:4–5, "And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?" In this Scripture it is to be seen that Christ recognized that God made the first man and first woman and that the marriage relation rests on that basic fact to which Christ refers, namely, that the woman was taken from the man, and, because of that truth, Adam said, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. 2:23–24). In this instance, there could be no serious doubt concerning the truth that Christ was contemplating a historical event. The whole field of typology which obtains between Christ and Adam ceases to have any meaning or purpose if Adam, and all that concerns him, is unreal. "As by one man sin entered into the world"; "Adam to Moses"; "one that sinned"; "for if by one man's offence"; "one man's disobedience" (Rom. 5:12–21); "since by man came death"; "for as in Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:21–22); "the first man Adam was made a living soul"; "the first man is of the earth earthy" (1 Cor. 15:45, 47). "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3); "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the

transgression” (1 Tim. 2:13–14). Not one of the passages presents a rhetorical allusion. They are rather the basis of sound reasoning and the ground of far-reaching doctrine which is altogether sacrificed if the events recorded early in Genesis are no more than fable. The only motive that promotes argument against the historicity of these Mosaic records is that they seem absurd since, as is claimed, they are unlike present human experience; but such reasoning not only assumes that God is restricted to those modes of operation which are current today, but that man is free to sit in judgment upon the Word of God. The contention gathers around the two trees and the serpent. Of these objections Richard Watson has discoursed to some length as follows:

The fallacy of most of these objections is, however, easily pointed out. We are asked, first, whether it is reasonable to suppose, that the fruit of the tree of life could confer immortality? But what is there irrational in supposing that, though Adam was made exempt from death, yet that the fruit of a tree should be the appointed instrument of preserving his health, repairing the wastes of his animal nature, and of maintaining him in perpetual youth? Almighty God could have accomplished this end without means, or by other means; but since he so often employs instruments, it is not more strange that he should ordain to preserve Adam permanently from death by food of a special quality, than that now he should preserve men in health and life, for three-score years and ten, by specific foods; and that, to counteract disorders, he should have given specific medicinal qualities to herbs and minerals: or if, with some, we regard the eating of the tree of life as a sacramental act, an expression of faith in the promise of continued preservation, and a means through which the conserving influence of God was bestowed, a notion, however, not so well founded as the other, it is yet not inconsistent with the literal interpretation, and involves no really unreasonable consequence, and nothing directly contrary to the analogy of faith. It has been, also, foolishly enough asked whether the fruit of the prohibited tree, or of any tree, can be supposed to have communicated “knowledge of good and evil,” or have had any effect at all upon the intellectual powers? But this is not the idea conveyed by the history, however literally taken, and the objection is groundless. That tree might surely, without the least approach to allegory, be called “the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,” whether we understand by this, that by eating it man came to know, by sad experience, the value of the “good” he had forfeited, and the bitterness of “evil,” which he had before known only in name; or, as others have understood it, that it was appointed to be the test of Adam’s fidelity to his Creator, and, consequently, was a tree of the knowledge of good and evil, a tree for the purpose of knowing (or making known) whether he would cleave to the former, or make choice of the latter. The first of these interpretations is, I think, to be preferred, because it better harmonizes with the whole history; but either of them is consistent with a literal interpretation, and cannot be proved to involve any real absurdity.

To the account of the serpent, it has been objected that, taken literally, it makes the invisible tempter assume the body of an animal to carry on his designs; but we must be better acquainted with the nature and laws of disembodied spirits before we can prove this to be impossible, or even unlikely; and as for an animal being chosen as the means of approach to Eve, without exciting suspicion, it is manifest that, allowing a superior spirit to be the real tempter, it was good policy in him to address Eve through an animal which she must have noticed as one of the inhabitants of the garden, rather than in a human form, when she knew that herself and her husband were the only human beings as yet in existence. The presence of such a stranger would have been much more likely to put her on her guard. But then, we are told that the animal was a contemptible reptile.

Certainly not before he was degraded in form; but, on the contrary, one of the “beasts of the earth,” and not a “creeping thing;” and also more “subtle,” more discerning and sagacious “than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made”—consequently the head of all the inferior animals in intellect, and not unlikely to have been of a corresponding noble and beautiful form; for this, indeed, his bodily degradation imports. If there was policy, then, in Satan’s choosing an animal as the instrument by which he might make his approaches, there was as much good taste in his selection as the allegorists, who seem anxious on this point, can wish for him. The *speaking* of the serpent is another stumbling-block; but as the argument is not here with an infidel, but with those who profess to receive the Mosaic record as Divine, the speaking of the serpent is no more a reason for interpreting the relation allegorically, than the speaking of the ass of Balaam can be for allegorizing the whole of that transaction. That a good or an evil spirit has no power to produce articulate sounds from the organs of an animal, no philosophy can prove, and it is a fact which is, therefore, capable of being rationally substantiated by testimony. There is a clear reason, too, for this use of the power of Satan in the story itself. By his giving speech to the serpent, and representing *that*, as appears from the account, as a consequence of the serpent having himself eaten of the fruit, he took the most effectual means of impressing Eve with the dangerous and fatal notion, that the prohibition of the tree of knowledge was a restraint upon her happiness and intellectual improvement, and thus to suggest hard thoughts of her Maker. The objection that Eve manifested no *surprise* when she heard an animal speak, whom she must have known not to have had that faculty before, has also no weight, since that circumstance might have occurred without being mentioned in so brief a history. It is still more likely that Adam should have expressed some marks of surprise and anxiety too, when his wife presented the fruit to him, though nothing of the kind is mentioned. —*Ibid.*, II, 24–26

As to the equity of the judgment which fell upon the serpent, Watson continues thus:

An objection is taken to the *justice* of the sentence pronounced on the serpent, if the transaction be accounted real, and if that animal were but the unconscious instrument of the great seducer. To this the reply is obvious, that it could be no matter of just complaint to the serpent that its form should be changed, and its species lowered in the scale of being. It had no original right to its former superior rank, but held it at the pleasure of the Creator. If special pain and sufferings had been inflicted upon the serpent, there would have been a semblance of plausibility in the objection; but the serpent suffered, as to liability to pain and death, no more than other animals, and was not therefore any more than another irrational creature, accounted a responsible offender. Its degradation was evidently intended as a memento to man, and the real punishment, as we shall show, fell upon the real transgressor who used the serpent as his instrument; while the enmity of the whole race of serpents to the human race, their cunning, and their poisonous qualities, appear to have been wisely and graciously intended as standing warnings to us to beware of that great spiritual enemy, who ever lies in wait to wound and to destroy.—*Ibid.*, II, 27

That no direct sentence is pronounced upon Satan is in harmony with the evident divine intention to withhold the fuller revelation to a later place in the Divine Oracles. None can doubt but that unmitigated judgment does fall on Satan eventually for his original sin, for his share in the lapse of man, and for all his subsequent wickedness. The real issues between God and Satan belong to another sphere of existence which could not be incorporated into the records of

human history at this point without complicating the simplicity of the narrative of man's fall. Attention is called in passing to the veiled intimation, in the curse which fell on the serpent, of the judgment which descended upon the real tempter at the cross and those judgments, also, which will yet descend upon him in future times. No uncertainty exists about the judgment of Satan in the word of God to the serpent when He said: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. 3:15). Archbishop William King (1650–1729) has written: "As the literal sense does not exclude the mystical, the cursing of the serpent is a symbol to us, and a visible pledge of the malediction with which the devil is struck by God, and whereby he is become the most abominable and miserable of all creatures. But man, by the help of *the seed of the woman*, that is, by our Saviour, shall bruise his head, wound him in the place that is most mortal, and destroy him with eternal ruin. In the meantime, the enmity and abhorrence we have of the serpent is a continual warning to us of the danger we are in of the devil, and how heartily we ought to abhor him and all his works" (cited by Watson, *ibid.*, II, 39).

Five quotations from the Apocryphal writings serve to reveal the truth that the Jews of the early times believed in the literal character of the Genesis account: 2 Esdras 3:4–7, "O Lord, thou barest rule, thou spakest at the beginning, when thou didst plant the earth, and that thyself alone, and commandest the people; and gavest a body to Adam without soul, which was the workmanship of thy hands, and didst breathe into him the breath of life, and he was made living before thee; and thou leddest him into paradise, which thy right hand had planted, and unto him thou gavest commandment to love thy way, which he transgressed, and immediately thou appointedst death in him and in his generations, of whom came nations, tribes, people, and kindreds out of number." 2 Esdras 7:48, "O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we are all that came of thee." Wisdom 2:24, "Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world." Wisdom 10:1, "She (wisdom) preserved the first-formed father of the world, that was created alone, and brought him out of his fall." Ecclesiasticus 17:1, etc., "The Lord created man of the earth, and turned him into it again. He gave them a few days and a short time, and also power over all things therein—he filled them with the knowledge of understanding, and showed them good and evil."

V. The Temptation of the First Man

The chronicle of the temptation is in like manner presented in the simplest of terms. It is written: “Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons” (Gen. 3:1–7).

The plain question raised by Satan, as stated in verse 1, may have breathed the suggestion that there was injustice in the divine restriction touching the one tree. This question served to draw out the reaction of the woman who, in turn, was bold enough to add the words “neither shall ye touch it” to what God had said, and this altered to no small degree the divine command. Whether a resentment is present in these added words could not be proved. However, Satan is even bolder in his response when he asserts, “Ye shall not surely die,” which is a flat contradiction of Jehovah’s decree. It is possible that, as Satan was seeking the allegiance of Adam and Eve in his own great cause which involved his independence of God, he was promising that by power which he would exercise they would be saved from this divine judgment. Aside from this contradiction, Satan disclosed the truth that by independent action, such as disobedience really is, they would become as *Elohim*. As before stated, the word *Elohim* occurs twice in verse 5, and there is as much reason for translating the name *Elohim* ‘gods’ in the first instance as in the second, and no reason can be assigned in either case. The ambition to become “like the most High” (Isa. 14:14) was the original sin of this great angel, and no little meaning is attached to the fact that he brought his own identical sin of independence of God as a temptation to Adam and Eve and that they adopted this philosophy of life. It is even more significant that in the threefold temptation of Christ—the Last Adam—Satan sought in the sphere of Christ’s humanity to get Him to act outside the will of God. Thus it is evident that there resides in this disposition to independence of God the essential character of sin. This conclusion is confirmed

by the fact that the final act in Satan's tragic enterprise is to promote and exalt the man of sin whose identification is ever his avowed claim to be God. A more exhaustive treatment of this great theme, beyond what has already appeared under satanology, awaits the time of its logical consideration under hamartiology.

Since Adam and Eve had known enough of the difference between right and wrong to form a basis for right action concerning the will of God as involved in the one prohibition placed upon them, it is evident that the new knowledge of good and evil which came to them through their disobedience was deeper and of a different character. Though there was nothing attractive in the exploit of coming to know evil by the sorrow which the experience of it secures and the value of good by the loss of it, there is, nevertheless, a strange zest in free action. Of Moses it is written that he chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season" (Heb. 11:25). To the woman the forbidden fruit appeared as that which was "good for food," "pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise" (cf. 1 John 2:16). The inner cravings of her own being responded to the temptation from without and she yielded to evil, and thus repudiated God. That Adam followed in the same sin adds nothing to the account more than that, as declared in 1 Timothy 2:14, he was not deceived but sinned knowingly and willfully.

The range of possible testing for unfallen Adam was greatly restricted. He was not subject to the solicitation of avarice and covetousness since he was lord over earth's creation. He could not be drawn into immoral sexual relations since he was united in marriage to the only one in the world who might attract him. The one supreme sin of the repudiation of God was possible. The fallen man is susceptible to sinful desires; the unfallen man was susceptible to innocent desires. There was no inherent wrong in the eating of fruit. The first sin did not consist in a dietetic error. It was not a question of nourishing or injurious food. The tree and its fruit became the ground of testing with respect to the creature's obedience to his Creator—an issue as extensive and real as life itself. The end in view was whether the creature would abide in the sphere into which he had been placed by creation, or would revolt against his Creator. The importance of this tree as a means of testing unfallen man is stated by Dr. William G. T. Shedd in the following words: "The 'tree of knowledge' was an actual tree bearing fruit in the garden. It might have been a date-tree, or any other kind of tree, and still have been the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Because, when once God had selected a particular tree in the garden, and by a positive statute had

forbidden our first parents to eat of it, the instant they did eat of it they transgressed a Divine command, and then *knew* consciously and bitterly what evil is, and how it differs from good. The tree thus became ‘the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,’ not because it was a particular species of tree, but because it had been selected as the tree whereby to test the implicit obedience of Adam. The first sin was unique, in respect to the statute broken by it. The Eden commandment was confined to Eden. It was never given before or since. Hence the first Adamic transgression cannot be repeated. It remains a single solitary transgression; the ‘one’ sin spoken of in Rom. 5:12, 15–19” (*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 154).

The prohibition imposed upon Adam has been made the subject of many “a fool-born jest.” Likewise, its penalty has been deemed to be out of all proportion to the seeming wickedness of the sin. Enough has been said already to serve as an answer to such shallow suggestions. Bishop Joseph Butler (1692–1752) in his *Analogy* distinguishes between precepts which are *positive* and precepts which are *moral*. He states: “Moral precepts are those the reasons of which we see; positive precepts those, the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command: positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for such command received from him whose creatures and subjects we are” (cited by Watson, *op. cit.*, II, 35–36).

Very much has been written with reference to the action of the will of unfallen Adam. The problem is difficult and psychological in character. The influence of the tempter over Adam cannot be estimated. There was a kingdom of evil already in the universe when Adam was created. God had permitted the fall of the greatest of the angels, and he had led, by the same permissive will, an unnumbered host of angels into rebellion against God. The problem arises rather with Adam’s own desires. If he were lusting after forbidden knowledge and independence of God, he was fallen already. The situation is exceeded in complexity only by the fall of Satan; in which instance there was no tempter nor was there any inward urge which springs from a fallen nature. Yet Satan was lifted up with pride (1 Tim. 3:6) and became subject to unholy ambition desiring to reach beyond the sphere into which he was placed by creation—a sphere determined by infinite wisdom, in which he might know the benefit of infinite power, and be sustained and blessed by infinite love. The same sin is re-enacted by Adam. It is written: “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned”

(Rom. 5:12). The precise nature of sin was not changed by its entrance into the world. A cause may be assigned for sin, but it is never rational. Of this truth Augustine (354–430) wrote: “Let no one look for an efficient cause of the evil will; for it is not efficient, but deficient, since the evil will itself is not an effecting of something, but a defect. To seek for an efficient cause of sin [out of the will, and other than the will], is like attempting to see darkness, or hear silence.” Again he says, “God made man upright, and consequently with a good inclination. The good inclination, then, is the work of God. But the first evil inclination, which preceded all of man’s evil acts, was rather a kind of falling away from the good work of God to its own work, than any positive work; the will now not having God, but the will itself, for its end” (both passages cited by Shedd, *op. cit.*, p. 157).

The penalty threatened to fall upon Adam was death, and death in all its forms—spiritual, physical, and eternal. On the day they disobeyed God, the first parents died spiritually; they began to die physically having become mortal; and they were at once subject to eternal death unless redeemed from it. As created, Adam and Eve seemed to have had before them the possibility of death, but were not subject to death. They were rather subject to life with the prospect of ever closer conformity to the One in whose image and likeness they were made. The immortal body which these beings possessed before their sin was such only in a relative sense. It was subject to that which did actually eventuate. It has been held by some that, had Adam stood the test, he would have become immortal in the absolute sense. He would have put on, it is claimed, a spiritual body; but there is no clear assurance of such a prospect. It is certain, however, that, had the test been withstood, it would not have returned again. Its pressure was not to have remained as a constant experience until the first parents were broken down. The prohibition concerning the specific tree and its fruit seemed not to have disturbed them until it was accentuated and made the point of attack by the tempter. The stress of the moment was not the prohibition itself, but the tempter’s use of it. The mental process through which Eve passed is more fully disclosed than that through which Adam passed. She had observed the tree and was aware of the divinely imposed restriction placed upon it, but quite suddenly she saw that it was beautiful to the eye, that it was good for food, and that it offered an avenue into greater wisdom. These new impressions were but for the moment. Had they been resisted, the test would have passed forever. The experience of these two parents is not a norm or pattern of temptations which beset fallen humanity, whose experience is that of a ceaseless stress and trial

with the depressing consciousness of many failures and defeats.

There yet remains the urgency to consider the great *protevangelium* declaration which fell as a word of hope from the lips of Jehovah at the conclusion of the judgment pronounced upon the serpent, and beyond the serpent to the incarnate tempter himself. A literal bruising of a serpent's head and a corresponding injury to the heel of a man will not fulfill this prophetic expectation. The serpent, in this instance, is Satan himself and the "seed of the woman" is none other than the incarnate Christ of God. This abrupt extension of the divine judgment into universal and eternal realms lends encouragement to the belief that all that this narrative records is applicable far beyond the natural limitations which the simple story chronicles.

Chapter XVI

THE FALL

THE FALL, or lapse, of the first man must be contemplated in the light of that which preceded it—innocence, tempter, temptation—and that which followed it—spiritual death and depravity of those who sinned, spiritual death and depravity of the race, and physical death. These factors which preceded the fall have been attended in recent pages; the things which followed, though yet to be examined more fully under hamartiology, should be pursued briefly at least at this present juncture.

The extended doctrine concerning death is at once in evidence. God had warned the two parents that in the day they ate of the forbidden fruit “dying they should die.” The penalty thus proposed was executed and death in its three forms was imposed upon them. (1) Spiritual death, which is separation of soul and spirit from God, fell upon them the moment they sinned; (2) physical death began at once its unavoidable process of disintegration and eventual separation of soul and spirit from the body; and (3) they became subject to the second death which is the lake of fire—the eternal separation of soul and spirit from God. Of the lake of fire, it is written that it is prepared for the devil and his angels. It was not prepared for human beings and they enter it only on the ground that they repudiate God and cast in their lot with Satan and his angels. Dr. Lindsay Alexander in his *System of Biblical Theology*, Volume I, has written a general account of the fall of man which is here incorporated:

Let us now turn to glance for a little at the immediate effect of the temptation. And here it is interesting also to observe the process by which evil consummated its triumph over Eve. The narrative of Moses, brief as it is, may be viewed as an articulate illustration of the analysis of the Apostle John in his theory of evil as consisting of the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye and the pride of life. The woman, we are told, when she looked saw that the tree was good for food: there was the lust of the flesh, the craving of irregular appetite and lawless desire; and that it was pleasant to the eyes: there was the lust of the eyes, the inordinate love and desire of what is merely beautiful and attractive with the craving after the possession of what merely enriches and magnifies; and that it was a tree to be desired to make one wise: there was the pride of life, the unholy love of pre-eminence, the restless curiosity that would pry into what God has concealed, the ambition to grasp power above our due, and the impious assumption, if not of equality with God, yet of a right over ourselves independent of God. These three affections are the main sources and occasions of the evil which now predominate in the world; and we see they had all a share in bringing about the first sin that was committed on its surface. They saw the origin of evil in our race; and as they sat at its cradle, they have ever since nourished and fed it; nor shall it utterly perish until they have been entirely subdued, and man’s whole nature has been restored to its pristine purity. There is another

statement of the New Testament which receives an interesting illustration from the process by which Eve advanced along the path into which the tempter had drawn her. “Lust,” says the Apostle James, “when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin.” This is the genealogy of transgression; first there is the evil desire, and then by natural consequence from that the evil act. So was it with our first mother; she began with lust and ended with sin. She allowed a forbidden desire to be nourished in her heart, and this quickly developed itself into a forbidden deed. A deceived heart led her aside; a mind betrayed by Satan betrayed her in turn. And as lust leads to sin, so sin naturally tends to propagate itself. Hence no sooner had Eve herself sinned than she sought to draw her husband into the same snare. Adam, however, was not deceived as she had been. He followed her example, but it was with his eyes open. Whether it was mere thoughtless indifference, or a too yielding affection for his wife, or a sort of chivalrous feeling that he would share with her in the risks she had incurred, that moved him, we cannot tell; but certain it is that what he did he did fully aware of the evil of it and the consequence of it. In any case his sin was great. He preferred a brief indulgence to the claims of duty and of gratitude. Forgetful of God and His authority and His law, he looked only at the beautiful and smiling image, and listened only to the horrid words of the fair but fallen partner of his life. Thus was he drawn to follow her example and to partake of her sin. Then was man’s first disobedience complete. Then was the ruin of our race accomplished. Then was the covenant broken and the curse incurred. Then was the image of God in man blotted and defaced. Then was discord produced between earth and heaven. Then did the bowers of Paradise, a moment before the abodes of stainless innocence, become the sorrowful scenes of guilt and passion and shame.—Pp. 195–96

In Book ix of *Paradise Lost*, Milton (cited by Alexander, *ibid.*) describes the reaction of nature to the sin of man—not unlike the reaction of nature when God’s remedy for sin was wrought out at the cross—

Earth trembled from her entrails, as again
In pangs, and nature gave a second groan;
Sky lour’d, and, muttering thunder, some sad drops
Wept at completing of the mortal sin.

The great issues which eventuated with the first sin of the first man demand separate and attentive consideration

I. Spiritual Death and Depravity

A later investigation will demonstrate that both spiritual death and physical death, though so different in character and in the manner in which they reach Adam’s posterity, originate alike in the first sin of the first man. Spiritually dead persons may be physically alive. The Apostle asserts that the Ephesian believers were, before their salvation, “dead in trespasses and sins,” and that at that time of spiritual death they were walking “according to the course of this [*cosmos*] world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in [energizeth] the children of disobedience” (Eph. 2:1–2). Likewise, he also states, “She that liveth in pleasure [*σπαταλῶσα*, ‘self-gratification’] is dead

while she liveth [ζῶσα]” (1 Tim. 5:6).

When Adam sinned his first sin he experienced a conversion downwards. He became degenerate and depraved. He developed within himself a fallen nature which is contrary to God and is ever prone to evil. His constitution was altered fundamentally and he thus became a wholly different being from the one God had created. A similar fall into degeneracy had been experienced before by the highest of all angels and by the angels who joined his rebellion against God. No other human being than Adam has ever become a sinner by sinning. All others were born sinners. Distinction is made at this point between sin as an evil act and sin as an evil nature. By a sinful act Adam acquired a sinful nature, whereas all members of his family are born with that nature.

By his sin Adam came under the domination of Satan. He literally surrendered to the evil one. The extent of this authority is not revealed and probably could not be, since it involves spheres and relationships which are beyond the range of human observation. Attention is called again to four New Testament passages: 2 Corinthians 4:3–4, in which it is said that those that are lost are under Satan’s power to the extent that their minds are blinded concerning the gospel of their salvation; Ephesians 2:1–2, where it is asserted that the unsaved are energized by Satan; Colossians 1:13, where it is declared that, when saved, the believer is translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of His love; and 1 John 5:19, where it is revealed that the whole *cosmos* world “lieth in” the wicked one, and this relationship is vital and organic and is comparable only to the truth that the Christian is *in Christ* as a new creation. These passages set forth the present relationship between unregenerate humanity and Satan; but they as certainly disclose the fact that it was into such a relationship that Adam was drawn at the moment he sinned. It could not be shown that the human family came into this relation to Satan at any subsequent time in human history.

Little, indeed, is recorded of Adam’s history following his sin. The implication is that he lived the normal life of a fallen man of his time. Memory, however, served him faithfully and no doubt exercised a great influence in his life and his testimony to his posterity was equally effective.

The immediate change in Adam and Eve which their sin wrought is revealed in the record that they were ashamed, having discovered that they were unclothed. This incident in the narrative, like the *protevangelium* of Genesis 3:15, reaches into deeper realities which were foreshadowed in this initial experience of mankind. In its Scripture use, clothing is the symbol of

righteousness. The shame which these two experienced was not between themselves but rather between themselves and God. They did not hide from each other, but they did hide from God. They had experienced a change in their very constitution which separated them from God. If they were at once to be expelled from the garden, it was because of the truth that they had first voluntarily broken their relation with God by hiding from His presence. Whatever may have been their own consciousness at that time, the faithful record of God's Word offers the undisputable evidence that they deemed themselves no longer worthy to meet God face to face. Much truth, likewise, lies hidden in the facts that they attempted to clothe themselves, which clothing was of no value; and that God clothed them with skins, which meant the shedding of blood. Thus another great doctrine of the Bible is enacted in type at least: "Without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22), and "being justified ['declared righteous'] freely ['without a cause'] by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24).

The Bible further teaches with complete unanimity that the race is depraved—apart from the saving grace of God—and it is equally evident that no time can be indicated when this came to pass other than the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. The claim that the unregenerate are totally depraved is resented by many and for want of a right understanding of its meaning. If, as viewed by men, it is asserted that there is nothing good in man, the statement is untrue; for, as man is quick to declare, there is no human being so degraded that there is not some good in him. If, on the other hand, as viewed by God, it is claimed that man is without merit in His sight, the case is far different. Depravity as a doctrine does not stand or fall on the ground of man's estimation of himself; it rather reflects God's estimation of man. What the Bible avers on the fallen and depraved estate of man would not be written by man. He would have no sufficient perspective by which to form a worthy conclusion, nor would he thus abase himself.

Dr. Shedd's concluding remarks on depravity are to the point:

The depravity or corruption of nature is total. Man is "wholly inclined to evil, and that continually." Westminster L. C., 25. Gen. 6:5, "God saw that every imagination of the thoughts of man was only evil continually." There can be but a single dominant inclination in the will at one and the same time; though with it there may be *remnants* of a previously dominant inclination. Adam began a new sinful inclination. This expelled the prior holy inclination. He was therefore totally depraved, because there were no *remainders* of original righteousness left after apostasy, as there are remainders of original sin left after regeneration. This is proved by the fact that there is no struggle between sin and holiness, in the natural man, like that in the spiritual man. In the regenerate, "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," Gal. 5:17. Holiness and sin are in a conflict that causes the regenerate to "groan within themselves," Rom. 8:23. But

there is no such conflict and groaning in the natural man. Apostasy was the fall of the human will, with no remnants of original righteousness. Regeneration is the recovery of the human will, with some remnants of original sin. Total depravity means the entire absence of holiness, not the highest intensity of sin. A totally depraved man is not as bad as he can be, but he has no holiness, that is, no supreme love of God. He worships and loves the creature rather than the creator, Rom. 1:25.
—*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 257

Following the record of the fall of man, the text of the Bible is not pursued far until the evidence of universal death is discovered (cf. Gen. 5:5–31), and the solemn declaration: “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen. 6:5). How in contrast this statement stands over against the original estimation of Jehovah, “And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good” (Gen. 1:31)! Writing by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, holy men have declared: “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one” (Job. 14:4); “What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?” (Job 15:14); “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me” (Ps. 51:5); “For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.... Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions” (Eccl. 7:20, 29); “Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward. Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment” (Isa. 1:4–6); “There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. ... And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man” (Mark 7:15, 20–23); “What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues

they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes” (Rom. 3:9–18); “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19–21); “Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death” (James 1:13–15).

From such a testimony, which might be greatly enlarged, the doctrine of *depravity* is drawn; nor can these Scriptures be explained otherwise. To this conception every line of the Bible is harmonious. It was this that called forth the saving grace of God in Christ Jesus. No more misleading or injurious word can be given the unsaved than to impress upon them that they are lost only on the ground of their personal sins. If this be true, they are lost only to the degree to which they have thus sinned. Men are lost by *nature*—“by nature the children of wrath” (Eph. 2:3) —and there is deep significance, reaching far beyond the realms of personal wrongdoing, in the words of Christ, “Ye are of your father the devil” (John 8:44). Only the grace of God, proffered to the meritless, through the cross of Christ can avail, and that salvation contemplates not only the forgiveness of sins committed but the impartation of a new divine nature.

The experience of man is a confirming testimony to his sinful nature. Men expect little good from themselves or their fellow men; they avoid every relationship to God and even blaspheme His holy name; a child goes naturally in the ways of evil, but must be disciplined in the direction of good.

Writing of the depravity of human nature, Dr. Timothy Dwight states: “In truth, no doctrine of the Scriptures is expressed in more numerous or more various forms, or in terms more direct or less capable of misapprehension” (*Theology*, Sermon 29). So also Dr. Thomas Chalmers, “If it be through the blood of Christ, the blood of expiation, that all who get to heaven are saved, then does it follow universally of them who get to heaven as of them who are kept out of heaven,—inclusive of the whole human race,—that one and all of them have sinned” (*Institutes of Theology*, i, p. 385). Likewise, Dr. Pye Smith: “The

Scriptures represent holiness of character in any of mankind as the *exception*, and as owing to *grace* which makes men ‘new creatures’ and ‘all things new;’ whereas the wickedness of extremely depraved men is put as affording fair specimens of human nature, because it is the spontaneous unchecked growth of our nature” (*First Lines of Theology*, p. 383). Observe, also, Dr. Lindsay Alexander’s brief word: “The gospel is a call to the race as such to repent and return unto God. ‘God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent’ (Acts 17:30). But what need of universal repentance, except on the supposition of universal sinfulness? The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick; the Lord came to call sinners, not righteous persons, to repentance; and when, consequently, we hear Him addressing this call to ‘all men everywhere,’ we cannot doubt that in the view of heaven all men are sinners, and further, that unless this be admitted and realized, there is no just apprehension of the true nature and design of Christianity obtained” (*Op. cit.*, p. 205). The word of Aristotle is equally as impressive: “There appears another something besides the reason natural to us which fights and struggles against the reason; and just as the limbs of the body when under paralysis are when they would move to the right are carried away to the left, so is it in the soul” (*Eth. Nicom.*, i. 11). So also Plutarch declaims: “Some portion of evil is mingled in all who are born; for the seeds of our being are mortal, and hence they share in causing this, whence depravity of soul, diseases, and cares creep upon us” (*De Consol. ad Apoll.*). The assertion of Kant is equally clear and forceful: “That the world lieth in wickedness is a lament as old as history, nay, as old as the oldest poetry. The world began, it is allowed, with good, with a golden age, with a life in Paradise, or with one still happier in communion with heavenly being. But this felicity, it is admitted, has vanished like a dream; and now man’s course is even with accelerated speed from bad (morally bad, with which the physically bad ever advances *pari passu*) to worse. ... A few moderns have advanced the opposite opinion, which, however, has found favour only with philosophers, and in our day chiefly among pedagogues, that the world is progressively tending from bad to better, or, at least, that the basis of this lies in human nature. But this opinion assuredly is not derived from experience, if it is of moral goodness and badness, not civilisation, they speak; for the history of all times speaks decisively against it” (*Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, p. 1). G. L. Hahn says: “Profound observers of the human nature in great numbers since Kant have acknowledged the truth of the Biblical doctrine, that the root of man’s nature is corrupt, so that each feels himself by nature morally sick and unfree, and no one

is able of his own strength to fulfil the divine law, though he acknowledges it to be good and inviolable” (*Lehrbuch*, p. 364; the above citations are from Alexander, *ibid.*, pp. 204–5, 212–13).

II. Physical Death

The separation of soul and spirit from the body, which experience is termed *physical death*, is in no way comparable to *spiritual death*, though they both originate in the first sin of the first man. Not a few have been confused with regard to these widely different aspects of truth; but the fuller treatment of this theme must be deferred here and resumed under hamartiology. Suffice it to indicate that, though they originate at the same point or place, their experience is, obviously, altogether diverse. Those that in this life are spiritually dead are alive physically, while those that have died physically are alive spiritually, in the sense that they cannot cease to exist. In the end, spiritual death of this life, if not healed by redeeming grace, merges into unending second death, while physical death will yet be rebuked for all—saved and unsaved. “There shall be no more death” (Rev. 21:4), and “the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:26).

Conclusion

In tracing the vast field which the Anthropology of the Bible presents, consideration has been given to the origin by creation, the constitution and capacities of man, his temptation and his fall as well as the results of that fall upon himself and the race. This, with the doctrine of sin—next to be attended—becomes the background for the all-engaging theme of Soteriology.

Chapter XVII

INTRODUCTION TO HAMARTIOLOGY

THERE IS A justification for the fact that the two great doctrines—*sin* and *redemption*—go hand in hand. It is sin that has drawn out redemption from the heart of God, and redemption is the only cure for sin. These two realities, in turn, become measurements of each other. Where sin is minimized, redemption is automatically impoverished since its necessity is by so much decreased. The worthy approach to the doctrine of *sin* is to discover all that is revealed about the sinfulness of sin and then to recognize that God's provided Savior is equal to every demand which sin imposes. It is one of Satan's most effective methods of attack upon the saving work of Christ to soften the voice which is set to proclaim the evil character and effect of sin. Apparently not all who are known as teachers of God's truth are awake to this satanic strategy. It is too often assumed that it is wiser to leave this loathsome monster called *sin* to lurk in the dark, and to dwell on the more attractive virtues of human life. Sin is what God says it is, and here human opinion and philosophy must bend to the testimony of the Word of God in which He declares the true nature of sin. Opinions of self-flattering men are of little value in a matter which can be determined only by revelation.

Sin is likewise to be seen as opposed to holiness. The essential facts related to all distinctions between holiness and sin are supermundane in their character. There is nothing which in itself is more restricted to, or more grounded in, the very nature of God than holiness, and its opposite —evil—derives all its properties from the one and only fact that it is *unholy*. There is a legitimate field of research which contemplates sin in the light of its experimental, philosophical, and sociological effects; but the fundamental traits of evil, like its counterpart—holiness—are discovered only as they are given form and substance by virtue of their relation to the Person of God. What God *is* and what God *says* are the material out of which all moral and spiritual values are derived. Since God is revealed adequately only in the Scriptures of Truth, there can be little apprehension of the true character of either good or evil apart from that which it has pleased God to disclose in the Bible. Every approach to this vast theme which is extra-Biblical must be speculative and therefore of little abiding value.

At the opening of his treatise on *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Dr. Julius Müller writes the following on the dark character of sin in this human sphere and

the importance of knowing the revelation God has made:

It requires no special profundity of reflection but only a moderate degree of moral earnestness to prompt us thoughtfully to pause before ONE GREAT PHENOMENON of human life, and ever and anon to turn towards it a scrutinizing look. I refer to the phenomenon of EVIL; the presence of an element of disturbance and discord in a sphere where the demand for harmony and unity is felt with peculiar emphasis. It meets us at every turn as the history of the human race in the course of its development passes before us; it betrays its presence in manifold forms when we fix our eyes upon the closest relationships of society; and we cannot hide from ourselves its reality when we look into our own hearts. It is a dark and dismal nightshade, casting a gloom over every department of human life, and continually pervading its fairest and brightest forms. They, indeed, make very light of their philosophical perceptions who fancy they can dismiss the greatest riddle of the world, the existence of evil, simply by forbidding it serious thought. They speak of the disagreeableness of reflections so studiously directed towards the dark side of life; they find that it is only “according to nature,” that the more steadily you fix your eyes upon the darkness, the more immeasurable does it appear; and they advise us for our own sakes to turn away from the question of evil, because our troubling ourselves about it will be of no avail save to plunge us into gloomy melancholy. How gladly should we follow this advice if only Novalis were right in his bold promise,—which expresses the mind of Carpocrates the Gnostic, and that perhaps of Fichte also,—that, “if a man suddenly and thoroughly persuaded himself that he was moral, he would really be so.” Were it true, that if a man with firm resolve shook off “that old and grievous delusion of sin,” as a wild and empty dream, he would be free from sin, who would not in so easy a manner be released? But as the well-known device of the ostrich does not save it from the weapon of the hunter, so the mere shutting of our eyes to the reality of evil does not make it vanish, but delivers us only the more surely into its power. In order to be conquered, the enemy must first of all be known; and the very complaints of the disagreeableness of such reflections strongly witness how dangerous it is to shrink from them.—I, 28–29

In the investigation of the subject of sin, two general modes of procedure have been employed, namely, the *exegetical* and the *speculative*. The exegetical method is an attempt, by an induction from the Biblical testimony, to formulate the complete doctrine as set forth in the Scriptures. The speculative method is characterized by its attention to human philosophy and experience. The exegetical method is without question justified, and yet, even when attempting to formulate the doctrine from the Scriptures, it is essential to recognize the practical working of each Bible truth as it appears in human lives.

How vast is the sum total of the spiritual shadows of this universe— those in heaven and those on earth! The extent and character of the shadows will be computed only when He whose standards and valuations are infinite shall have completed all that He has decreed. These issues are immeasurable—immeasurable with respect to the quantity indeed, but even more immeasurable with respect to their hideous character— for sin is credited with having caused infinite tragedy both in heaven and on earth. But, beyond all this, sin must be identified as that which occasioned the greatest divine sacrifice and necessitated the payment of a ransom on no less terms than the lifeblood of the Son of God.

Any human attempts to contemplate a theme so boundless will be restricted, on the one hand, to the only source of authoritative information—the Word of God—and expanded, on the other hand, by so much as it may please God to enlighten the mind. At best, man will but feebly react to the divine estimation of sin, and yet more hopeless must he be in his appreciation of the problem when he considers its presence in the universe, which universe is designed, created, executed, and consummated according to the free and sovereign will of the One who acts ever and only in the sphere of that which is infinitely holy.

The problem which sin creates is more than a mere conflict between good and evil in human conduct; it involves the measureless and timeless issues in the conflict between that holiness which is the substance of God's character and all that is opposed to it. It contemplates more than the loss and injury sustained by the one who sins. It intrudes into the sphere of the divine rights which, by the Creator's ownership, are vested in the creature of His hand. The ultimate triumph of righteousness over unrighteousness is assured and secured in the very nature and being of God, for an unqualified promise is made of an on-coming new heaven and new earth in which righteousness shall *dwell*. That long-anticipated hour will bring in the final banishment of all evil and demonstrate the rectitude of God both in His permission of sin in the universe and in every aspect of His dealing with it from its inception to its consummation.

There are fundamental features of the doctrine of sin which, in their outreach, extend beyond the range of the usual treatment of this theme. The evangelist rightly assumes that all men are ruined in the tragedy of sin and, without recognition of more extended issues, proceeds to proclaim the gospel of the saving grace of God. Of the theologian it is required that he shall penetrate into the deeper problems of the origin and essential character of sin and deal with this doctrine not alone in its relation to man, but with its beginning and ending, in its relation to angels, and specifically in its relation to God. Though but briefly stated by way of introduction and yet to be considered more exhaustively, some of the deeper aspects of this doctrine are:

I. The Essential Nature of Sin

The holy character of God is the final and only standard by which moral values may be accurately judged. To the one who disregards God, there are no moral standards other than social custom, or the dictates of an uncertain and perverted conscience. And even these, it will be observed, though indirect,

failing, and feeble, are, nevertheless, reflections of the standards of God. Sin is sinful because it is unlike God. The *Larger Catechism* (Westminster) declares: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of any law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature." However, inasmuch as the law of God may not incorporate all that God's character is and inasmuch as anything will be sinful which contradicts God's character, whether expressed in His law or not, this definition is strengthened when the word *character* is substituted for the word *law*. It is true that disobedience of God's law is sin, but it does not follow that sin is restricted to disobedience of law. Similarly, selfishness is sin, but sin is not always selfishness; and the love of money is a root of all evil, but all evil is not represented in the love of money. So, also, unbelief is sin, but sin is more than unbelief. Whether sin be viewed as the individual's share in Adam's sin, the sin-nature, the estate "under sin," or personal sin with all its varied features, it still draws its essential character of sinfulness from the fact that it is unlike God.

Divine record is given of three major demonstrations of the exceeding sinfulness of sin: (1) The first demonstration is the first sin in heaven, which caused the highest of all the angels to fall from his estate and with him a vast number of lesser angels to follow in his rebellion against God. This highest of angels became Satan the resister, the god of this world, and the prince of the power of the air. The lesser angels became the demons over whom Satan continues his determining influence, and these—Satan and his hosts—are doomed without remedy to the lake of fire forever. Against what inconceivable light these beings sinned is not revealed, but there is provided no redemption for them; and, while Satan and the demons cease not to sin, their tragic fall in heaven and all that has followed both in heaven and on earth is due to the *first* sin committed in heaven. (2) The first sin of man is the second demonstration of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. This sin caused the natural head to fall and the race which he represented to fall in him. Directly or indirectly, this one sin has caused the immeasurable suffering, sorrow, and death of the race, and will be consummated in the eternal woes of all who are lost. (3) In His death on the cross, Christ bore the sin of the world, and the character of sin was there finally measured and its sinfulness revealed to angels and men. In the light of the forensic character of Christ's death, it is evident that had there been but one sinner in the world who had committed but one sin, the same divine requirements would have been imposed upon the One who took the sinner's place. Had God chosen to terminate sin in the world immediately after Adam's first sin and there to have provided a righteous ground for divine forgiveness and

justification for that one sinner, the same awful burden would necessarily have been laid upon the only Substitute who could take Adam's place as was laid upon Him when He bore the sin of the world. This solemn fact is typically set forth in the shedding of blood that Adam might be clothed.

That God is Himself transparent holiness and in Him is no darkness at all is a fact which at once guarantees that, though in His inscrutable purpose He has permitted sin in the universe, He is in no way involved in its guilt. God is righteous in the absolute sense, the judge of all that is evil, and the executor of the penalty which His righteous judgments must impose. It may thus be restated that God is Himself the standard of holiness and His character is that which determines the sinfulness of sin.

II. The Derivation of Sin

The terms *evil* and *sin* represent somewhat different ideas. *Evil* may refer to that which, though latent or not expressed, is ever conceivable as the opposite of that which is good, while *sin* is that which is concrete and actively opposed to the character of God. It is difficult for the human mind to depict a time when there was not an opposite to good even though, for want of beings who were capable of sinning, it could have had no opportunity of expression. But since God cannot err, sin could not come into existence until another form of being was created; and, apparently, following upon God's creative act, the highest of angels sinned, as did also the first man.

Since the conception of *evil* as a creatable thing is so difficult for the mind to grasp, the problem of its derivation is not easily solved. Indeed, little is revealed concerning the derivation of evil; however, the origin of *sin*, if reference be made to the first actual disobedience to the divine ideal, is recorded in the Scriptures and its guilt is there distinctly attributed to the one who sinned. Though both good and evil acquire their distinctive character from the essential and immutable perfection of God, He, being infinitely holy, could not create evil, though He might, for worthy reasons, permit its manifestations.

III. The Divine Permission of Sin

The presence of sin in the universe is due to the fact that God permits it. It must serve some justifiable purpose attainable in no other way else God would not have permitted it, or, having permitted it, He would now terminate it without delay. The divine purpose relative to sin has not been revealed, and, doubtless,

the human mind could not comprehend all that is involved. Devout souls will continue to believe that, though no manifestation of sin is possible outside the permissive will of God, He is Himself ever free from the slightest complicity with the evil which He permits. When contending with Jehovah about Job, Satan recognized the sovereign permission of God with respect to evil when he said to Jehovah, "Put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face." In response to this challenge, Jehovah said to Satan, "All that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand." Thus under sovereign restrictions Job passed from the hand of God to the hand of Satan. But when the calamity fell on Job, by the declaration, "Thou movedst me against him, to destroy him without cause," Jehovah disclaimed any responsibility for the evil.

God has not been overtaken with unexpected disaster in respect to His holy purposes, nor is He now seeking to salvage something out of an unforeseen wreckage. There is immeasurable evil in the world, but, without the slightest mitigation or sanctification of it, it is the part of faith to believe that somehow and somewhere it fulfills a necessary part of the ultimate purpose of Him who will with absolute certainty achieve those ends which are infinitely perfect. If the imagination of man could penetrate the past and picture God as confronted with ten thousand possible blueprints of which the plan for the present universe with all its lights and shadows, its triumphs and tragedies, its satisfactions and sufferings, its gains and losses, was but one, the voice of faith would say that the present universe as planned and as it is being executed and will be executed to the end, is the best plan and purpose that could be devised by infinite wisdom, executed by infinite power, and will be the fullest possible satisfaction to infinite love. God could not devise anything more worthy of Himself than that which is now in process. For want of perspective and understanding, the finite mind, in the midst of and observing the surrounding spiritual darkness, would eliminate every shadow from the picture; but the issues are greater than the sphere of human observation and the ultimate triumph which is yet to be will glorify God with a glory otherwise unattainable, and in this glory others will share. On the other hand, God permitted sin in spite of His holy hatred of it, and in spite of His own anticipation of the fact that it would not only bring untold suffering and eternal ruin to His creatures whom He would love, and in spite of the fact that it would cost Him the sacrifice of His own Son. Beyond the present tragedy of sin is the final triumph of good.

The devout mind cannot but contemplate the problem of the divine

permission of sin, though the sum total of all its reasonings is inadequate to form a final answer to the question. The problem, it should be remembered, extends to the angelic spheres and makes inquiry as much about why the defection among heavenly beings should have been permitted as it does about why the fall should have come to the earthly creation. There is, however, a redemptive purpose with its unsurpassed glories developed through the sin of man; yet the Scriptures reveal no redemption for the fallen angels. They are said to be consigned without hope to the lake of fire (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10); and, as the Word of God is silent on the problem of the reason for permission of sin in angelic spheres, that aspect of the subject offers no field for discussion. In all contemplation of the question of the divine permission of sin in the earth, there are two facts which abide, and to these the mind must cling without wavering: (1) sin is everywhere and always exceedingly sinful, and God's condemnation of it is never diminished for He cannot be lenient toward sin; and (2) God is Himself holy and perfect in all His ways. "In him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James 1:13).

The following are some of the reasons which have been advanced for the divine permission of sin:

1. THE DIVINE RECOGNITION OF THE CREATURE'S FREE CHOICE. It is evidently the purpose of God to secure a company of beings for His eternal glory who are possessed of that virtue which is the result of a free-choice victory over evil. Indeed, He will have wrought in them by His own power both to will and to do of His good pleasure; but as certainly as the choice of evil on man's part becomes the ground of guilt and judgment which God does not share, so certainly the choice of good on the part of those who are saved is ever the ground of God's commendation and reward, and they will stand before Him eternally identified as those who by their own choice elected to walk with Him. But it should be observed, man cannot make choice between good and evil unless evil exists.

2. THE SPECIFIC VALUE OF REDEEMED BEINGS. According to the Scriptures, God is not revealed as One who seeks to avoid the issues which arise because of the presence of sin in the universe. He could have created innocent, unfallen beings possessing no capacity to err; but if He desires redeemed souls purified by sacrificial blood and purchased at infinite cost, the expression of such love and the exercise of such sacrifice are possible only when sin is present in the world.

3. THE ACQUISITION OF DIVINE KNOWLEDGE. The creatures of God's hand must, by a process of learning, attain to that knowledge which God has possessed eternally. They can learn only by experience and revelation. Even Christ, on the human side, was made perfect through suffering, and though He were a son, yet learned He obedience through the things which He endured. There is no intimation in any of these Scriptures that there was the slightest taint of evil in Him, or that He needed to learn the deep reality of sin. On the other hand, man must learn concerning both good and evil. He must realize the sinfulness of sin if he is to attain in any degree to the knowledge God possesses; but he cannot attain to such knowledge unless sin exists as a living reality which is ever demonstrating its sinful character.

At this point it is reasonable to inquire, How far in the experience of sin and its consequences must humanity go in order that the knowledge of sin may be attained? The answer to this question is not easily formed. It is evident that man learns the reality of sin both from the suffering which it inflicts and from the revelation concerning the judgments God imposes upon those who sin. If man is to learn his lesson well, the suffering cannot be diminished or the judgments of God be reduced. We conclude, therefore, that if man is to attain to the knowledge of good and evil, there must be evil in the world with all its tragic effects as well as the prospect of divine judgment for sin.

4. THE INSTRUCTION OF ANGELS. From certain Scriptures (cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Pet. 1:12) it is possible to conclude that angels are observing men on the earth and learning important facts through the present experience of human beings. It would be as necessary for angels to learn the truth regarding that which is evil as it is for them to learn the truth regarding that which is good, but the acquiring of the knowledge of evil through human experience must be denied the angels unless evil is permitted as an active principle in the universe.

5. THE DEMONSTRATION OF THE DIVINE HATRED OF EVIL. It is evidently of measureless importance for God to demonstrate His hatred of evil. The Apostle declares that God was "willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known" (Rom. 9:22); but no judgment, wrath, or power in relation to sin could be disclosed apart from the permitted presence of active sin in the world.

6. THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENTS OF ALL EVIL. Far beyond the mere details of the expression of sin is the essential fact of the *principle* of evil which, if it is to be judged by God, must, evidently, be brought out into an open demonstration of

its actual character. Such a demonstration could not be secured with sin existing as a hypothetical issue. It had to become concrete and prove its unlikeness to God. As has been observed under satanology, the creature's proposal must always be put to an experimental test; and Satan's purpose to construct a *cosmos*, such as now exists, is being tested to the end that it may be judged in all its veritable wickedness. What the judgment and complete disposition of every form of evil will mean to the absolute tranquillity of yet future eternal ages, is but partially declared in the Word of God. That reality which was anticipated in the divine mind in eternal ages past and that has wrought such ruin in its experimental demonstration in time, by righteous judgments will have been outlawed from God's presence and from His creation forever.

7. THE MANIFESTATION AND EXERCISE OF DIVINE GRACE. Finally, and of the greatest import, there was that in God which no created being had ever seen. The angelic hosts had seen His wisdom, His power, and His glory, but they had never seen His *grace*. They had no conception of the goodness of God to the undeserving. They may have seen something of His love, but love and grace are not the same. God might love sinners upon whom, for want of redeeming, reconciling, and propitiatory sacrifice, He was in no way righteously free to bestow His benefits. By one marvelous act of mercy in the gift of His Son as a sacrifice for sinners, He opened the way for the exercise of His *grace* toward those who, because of their sin, deserved only His *wrath*. But there could be no exercise of divine grace toward the sinful and undeserving until there were sinful and undeserving beings in the world. Thus it is declared that the revelation of divine grace in the ages to come with all its marvelous import (Eph. 2:7) demanded that there should be objects of grace, and this, in turn, demanded the permission of sin in the world. This same truth is presented again in a slightly different form and from the human side by Christ. He, when speaking to Simeon concerning the woman who had bathed His feet with her tears, said, "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little" (Luke 7:47).

Thus, though it is impossible for a creature to understand how a holy God could permit sin, either in heaven or on earth, it is evident that the realization of His greatest purposes necessitates its permission. The entire problem is illustrated to a limited extent in the experience of a Christian who has sinned. He first admits that God, who could have hindered the sin, did nevertheless permit it. He likewise recognizes that he has profited in the ways of understanding and

experience by the sin; and, finally, he admits that God, though permitting the sin, is in no way complicated with its guilt and wickedness.

Preparatory Remarks

In approaching an investigation of the doctrine of sin as now contemplated, certain unusual features of this treatment should be mentioned:

(a) The usual treatment of the doctrine of sin, as set forth in theological treatises generally, is to restrict the discussion to the one aspect—personal sin—though some have given attention to the fact of a sin nature. This thesis will undertake a sevenfold investigation, covering what is believed to be the complete Biblical revelation.

(b) It will be observed that while the origin of sin is usually traced no further than the first sin of man, in the Garden of Eden, this work traces it back to the initial sin in angelic spheres.

(c) A clear distinction is drawn in this treatment of the doctrine between the *transmitted sin nature*, which is spiritual death, and *imputed sin*, which is the cause of physical death.

(d) The entire division entitled *Man's Estate under Sin* (Chapter XXI) represents a line of truth which is quite foreign to theological discussions. The importance of this aspect of the truth regarding sin will be seen only in the light of a right understanding of the dispensational feature of the doctrine of grace.

(e) It is admittedly unusual to introduce into the discussion of the doctrine of sin the cure which God has provided. Discourse on the cure of sin belongs to the field of Soteriology and under that head these salvation truths must yet have a fuller treatment.

(f) The order in which these main divisions of the doctrine of sin are taken up is with due consideration of certain reasons why they should appear under a different arrangement. It is obvious that, since the two realities—the *sin nature* and *imputed sin*—are each derived from the one original sin of Adam, they should be examined in succession; but the order between the treatment of the sin nature and personal sin is debatable, inasmuch as in the experience of humanity (excepting One) since the fall, all have sinned personally as a natural fruit of their inborn sin nature. Over against this, is the more primitive truth that the sin nature is itself the result of one personal sin. This primary fact determines the order which is to be followed in this thesis.

(g) If in published systems of theology any worthy attempt has been made

heretofore to distinguish the crucial distinctions which arise between the divine method of dealing with the Christian's sins and the divine dealing with the sins of the unregenerate, such writings have not been discovered. Had due attention been assigned to these distinctions, many of the misconceived and misleading Arminian notions would have faded into oblivion. By the exigencies of the case, certain truths which are germane to hamartiology will reappear under a different treatment when Soteriology determines the order of discussion.

The general sevenfold division and arrangement of the doctrine of sin to be pursued is:

- (a) Personal sin and its remedy,
- (b) The transmitted sin nature and its remedy,
- (c) Imputed sin and its remedy,
- (d) Man's estate "under sin" and his relation to Satan,
- (e) The Christian's sin and its remedy,
- (f) Punishment,
- (g) The final triumph over all sin.

Chapter XVIII

PERSONAL SIN

BY THE TERM *personal sin* is indicated that form of sin which originates with, or is committed by, a person. The designation includes the sins of angels as well as human beings. Under this division of the whole doctrine, that aspect of sin is contemplated which, because of human consciousness and experience, seems to men to be the one and only ground of divine condemnation of humanity. It is too often assumed that if personal sin is forgiven there is nothing more to be desired, whereas it is both reasonable and Scriptural to conclude that to deal with the root or tree is more important than to deal with the fruit; for so long as the root and tree are undealt with, the undesirable fruit must appear, and, in the case of a sin nature, assuredly does appear. Nevertheless, the doctrine of personal sin is of great importance, occupying, as it does, by far a larger portion of the Scriptures than all other phases of the sin question combined. This is the theme which contemplates all immediate human experience, and stains the pages of history with tears and blood. Again, the importance of this aspect of sin is seen when it is recognized that the first sin from which all other forms of sin are derived was itself a personal sin. From their personal sins, men must be saved, and according to their evil works men will be judged and condemned forever.

This division of hamartiology permits an eightfold analysis: (a) the origin of sin, (b) the sinful nature of sin, (c) general definitions, (d) general terms and classifications, (e) the divine remedy for personal sin, (f) original sin, (g) guilt, (h) the universality of personal sin.

I. The Origin of Sin

The familiar classification among theologians of the theories respecting the origin of sin includes the following: (a) that of *necessity*, (b) that of the Manichaeian philosophy of duality, (c) that God is the Author of sin, and (d) that sin arises from the abuse of moral freedom. The theory of *necessity* proposes that sin is something over which God has no authority, and is without foundation. The Manichaeian doctrine—advanced by Mani who was born about 215 A.D.—is that there are two deities, one good and one evil, and that, owing to the influence of these, two opposing principles have always been present in the universe, which accounts for light and darkness, soul and body, good and evil. This

theory, likewise, fails for want of foundation. The conception that God is the author of sin is an unguarded stressing of the doctrine of the divine decree. Over against this is the truth that, throughout the Bible, men are held responsible for their evil conduct whatever may have been the divine anticipation respecting all that is in the universe. It is therefore clear that in angelic realms, as in that of humanity, sin arises from the abuse of moral freedom.

Beyond this fourfold classification is the more extended and complex aspect of hamartiology which recognizes three origins or distinct beginnings of sin. These are: (a) its eternal anticipation in the foreknowledge of God, (b) its first concrete enactment in heaven by an unfallen angel, and (c) its first concrete enactment on earth by an unfallen human being.

1. THE ETERNAL ANTICIPATION OF SIN IN THE FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD. While the truth that God foreknew the oncoming reality of sin does not constitute a beginning, in the sense that it presents no enactment of sin, His foreknowledge does enter largely into this phase of the doctrine of sin. That form of Dualism which contends that two opposing principles—good and evil—have existed from all eternity, and that they are both primary and essential—the one as fully as the other—cannot be received. A digression at this point into either the ancient or the more modern dualistic philosophies is uncalled for. Suffice it to say that, while in the permissive will of God there has arisen a kingdom of darkness into which are gathered fallen angels and fallen human beings and which sets itself against God, that kingdom has not existed forever and its end is clearly predicted when it shall have wrought that which was in view when it was divinely permitted to run its course. In other words, the Bible assigns to evil a transitory character—recording its beginning, its course, and its end. Sin in *anticipation* and sin in *action* are two widely different ideas, and no more can be asserted regarding the eternal aspect of evil than that God foreknew and permitted it. On a plane too vast for human understanding—involving angelic spheres as much or more than human spheres—what may be termed the *principle* of evil was granted its experimental demonstration, that it might be judged with that finality which will silence every voice among created beings and bring those hosts who have not existed forever and who as yet know not the worthiness of divine holiness into complete rapport with their Creator, unless, indeed, they, because of their repudiation of Him, shall be banished from His presence forever.

Revelation concerning the holy character of God precludes the thought that any form of sin could have been an active reality before finite beings were

created and when the Godhead alone existed. The creation of angels, and later, of human beings, at once generated a possibility for evil to become an existing fact; and such it became through the fall of angels and through the fall of humanity. In such an eventuality, God is neither surprised nor defeated. His determination to give existence to them for an eternity to come included, as well, the purpose to test and judge vast moral issues the consummation of which will demonstrate His infinite holiness as well as His glory and grace. He who in every exemplification is proved to be holy, just, and good, may be trusted implicitly in realms which lie beyond human comprehension.

Not only does reason aver that God both foreknew and designed the program which creation is now executing, but it as clearly contends that God foresaw every form of evil from all eternity. In that sense, and in that alone, evil existed before creation was consummated. That evil existed in the foreknowledge of God is proved by those Scriptures which indicate that redemption was eternally in the mind and purpose of God, and none more forcibly than Revelation 13:8 wherein it is published that Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the *cosmos*. Whenever the *cosmos* had its inception—even in the form of a divine anticipation—a redeeming Lamb was a major feature of the divine intention. May it not be better said that, apart from the achievements of the redeeming Lamb, no *cosmos* would have been permitted? Is it not true that this universe, so vast indeed, is *redempto-centric*? No redemption is in view which merely rescues for their own sake unfortunate beings fallen in sin. If that were all, the reason for their fall would be difficult to conceive. Their redemption is for His sake. God has an eternal purpose, and to His glory it may be said that His purpose provides eternal felicity to all who welcome His grace. Such benefit, however vast, does not exhaust all that is in the eternal purpose of God.

Under this general division of this theme, which contemplates the divine foreknowledge of evil, it is logical that consideration be given to the comparative realities of good and evil. No more exhaustive or clarifying treatment of this theme has been found than that by Dr. Julius Müller in *The Christian Doctrine of Sin* (I, 412–17). Though this quotation is extended, it is too valuable not to be introduced here:

We must call special attention to the supposed independence of the evil principle in relation to the good, by which Dualism stands or falls. Good ... is quite independent of evil; it is the nature of good to reveal itself in contrast with evil, since evil has made its appearance in the world. But good has no need of evil for its self-realization; love would be eternally the same, and ever conscious of its own nature, though there were no hatred. Evil, on the other hand, is so far dependent upon good that it comes into existence only as a contrast thereto. As opposition implies something which is

opposed, evil presupposes good, and is conceivable only as a departure or fall therefrom. If evil be regarded as wholly primary and original, it cannot in any true sense be called evil or “that which ought not to be.” This dependence of evil upon good is still more apparent when we recollect that evil as an antithesis is nothing more than a perverted abstraction and separation of one essential element in our conception of moral good,—the elevation of self-love into a principle of action. Not only, therefore, is moral good perfectly intelligible of itself and by means of itself, but evil, on the other hand, can be understood only by means of good; *bonum index sui et mali*, an expression analogous to Spinoza’s fine saying, “*verum, index sui et falsi*.”

No one can fairly taunt us here with tacitly admitting that metaphysical conception of good which our former investigation led us to reject:—That good, the positive negation and denial of which makes evil evil, is by no means bare “reality,” but is the inmost essence of moral good, love. We cannot recognize evil as in the depths of our moral consciousness we feel it to be—not only something unreasonable, vain, and worthless, but as fearful and loathsome, a continual spring of innumerable ills—while we look upon the eternal being from whom man in evil turns away merely as “absolute substance,” “real existence,” and so forth. It is the very centre of the doctrine of Christianity concerning God, that He who is absolute existence and who contains in Himself the source of all reality, is at the same time PERSONALITY and LOVE. Recognizing thus that in evil man opposes the holiest love by the alienation and enmity of his will, the peculiar clearness of our moral consciousness regarding evil, our deep horror in the contemplation of it (which is wanting only where conscience is seared) is adequately explained: now at last the feeling of shame, repentance, and remorse of conscience, find their adequate solution. If God were not Love, there might indeed be badness and worthlessness, but there could be no EVIL.

Evil, therefore, as the antithesis of good, is directly dependent upon good; and from this general view of the true conception of it, we see how originality can in no true sense be attributed to it. Its dependence upon good, however, has another, a positive aspect. In order to realize itself in our earthly life, and attain the arbitrarily chosen goal of its endeavours, evil must in some way or other link itself to good, and recognize and fulfil some of its demands in all their authority. Evil has in itself no uniting or concentrating power; it can only produce an inwardly hollow semblance of unity, an ever vanishing appearance of fellowship. Not only does it separate and isolate its servants, but it brings them into collision with each other by the continual clashing of selfish interests, so that if evil had ever the sole dominion over human life that “state of nature,” as Hobbes calls it. “*bellum omnium contra omnes*” would ensue. The powers enlisted in the service of evil would lay aside their inner strifes and would unite only against the good, and when it was vanquished would return again to their internal conflicts; and it is nothing more than this combination that Christ refers to when He speaks of the βασιλεία τοῦ σατανᾶ, Matt. 12:25, 26. But evil would always be in its own way in such circumstances, its inward pain would break through every veil of earthly satisfaction, the innumerable woes and oppressions by which the wicked, as the unconscious instruments of God’s righteous punishment, torment one another, would wholly occupy their existence, and thus the present life would become a hell to sinners. Man’s sensuous wants compel him to seek the fellowship of his fellow-men, though reason and God’s law have lost their influence upon him; and in order to gain possession of and enjoy that for which he strives in sin he must subordinate his will to certain regulations of society. These regulations themselves, however, are the carrying out of the principles of justice in human relations, and have their deepest objective ground in love.

We thus discover this remarkable fact, that evil in our earthly life is obliged to submit to some extent to the law of good, if it is not to destroy its own subjects and instruments. As the essence of evil is selfishness, which implies separation and isolation, all organized society forms a strong bulwark against its overwhelming power, and the very worst abandonment to evil has to contribute something to maintain this bulwark. Thus every band of robbers who have given up all honest intercourse with the rest of the world, and have declared open war against the laws of the state, has to some extent re-established these laws within itself, so as to put some restraint upon the

destructive power of evil among its members. Thus, too, in our own day, we have seen how demoniacal rebellion against all heavenly and earthly majesty, when once it has attained dominion, will prosecute its own laws of utterly limitless arbitrariness against individuals, even with fire and sword. Driven by its own inner discord, evil is ever bearing witness to the conserving power of good in society; and must, equally with good, become serviceable to that power for the punishment of disorder and crime. Even when the wicked unite together in avowed hostility to good, they must at the very outset submit to certain things which are included in any adequate conception of good, if only the most abstract and formal, such as order, and obedience to a common law. Evil, I say, has in itself no productive or formative power; it cannot give itself any complete or historical reality in forms and arrangements of human life peculiar to itself; it cannot attain supremacy in any sphere of society, save by resorting to principles which have their origin in good. In connection with this there is a phenomenon already referred to which is very striking and strange, namely, that evil never manifests itself openly and above board in human life, it always tries in one way or another to conceal itself, John 3:20. *Evil does not venture to be itself*; it incessantly shuns itself, and hides hypocritically beneath some outward appearance of good. This is the usual occasion of so-called “white lies,” in which the dependence we have been speaking of evil upon good is strikingly illustrated. The lie which thus in a cowardly way disowns itself, really acknowledges the good as alone true and right, and itself as that which ought not to be, which has only an assumed existence. The moral foundations upon which all society rests thus restrain the most confirmed villain who has quenched the last spark of shame within him, and who no longer heeds the inner voice of conscience. Even the mightiest and proudest tyrant finds himself compelled, from prudential considerations,—provided the principle of his capricious despotism has not become utterly senseless and absurd,—to assume the mask of not seeking his own interests, but the general good, the glory, peradventure, or the well-being of the people.

If, therefore, we must recognize the power of holiness in the control which the Divine government exercises over even what resists it, and by which it completes itself in its main outlines amid the discord of selfish interests and passions, how can we maintain the dualistic notion of an independent principle of evil? In virtue of the conditions to which the divine purpose submits in the history of our race, evil may indeed hinder and retard the realization of that design, but it cannot wholly thwart it. We have seen in the preceding chapter how thoroughly the disturbing power of evil has penetrated the earthly development of the human race; but however severe the conflict in which we are engaged, there is ever present and visible to the eye of God the final triumph of the good.

If we examine the inner variance of evil still more closely, and follow it a step further, we shall find it not only in the higher sphere of society generally, but in the inner life of the individual. Passion strives with passion, one affection counteracts another; man, while slavishly dependent on the various objects of desire, never finds that rest and satisfaction which he seeks in the service of sin. He cannot attain these even by a total surrender to any one passion; for—apart from the impossibility of fully satisfying it—it can never attain sufficient strength perfectly to free him from the calls of other impulses striving after unbridled freedom. The two fundamental tendencies of sin which we have already referred to—pride and the supremacy of fleshly lust—are precisely those which stand in the most striking contrast and mutual hostility to each other. Whoever gets between these two currents is restlessly driven hither and thither by them; when he frees himself from the one, the other seizes him. In a condition of greater cultivation this alternation in the service of sin becomes a secret play of arbitrary will. Man learns the miserable art of turning now to the one side and now to the other, now to pride and now to sensuousness. The virtuous soarings into which he rises from the degradation of sensuousness serve only to excite and strengthen his humbled self-consciousness, and he relinquishes the pleasures of lust in order to recreate himself with the efforts of his pride. Rightly recognizing the fact of this inner variance of evil, modern education, by alienating itself from that Christian principle upon which alone true self-love and noble self-reliance

rest, frequently adopts the plan of conquering sins of self-degradation and abandonment in youth, by the passionate stimulus of pride and ambition; and thus, alas! it has done nothing more than drive out the devil by Beelzebub the prince of the devils.

Goodness, on the contrary, is ever in harmony with itself; its several parts, its manifold endeavours, and the acts in which it realizes itself, mutually strengthen and confirm each other: whatever violates the ideal of good, cannot, according to the unholy principle of the end sanctifying the means, be confirmed and advanced by that ideal. Evil is at variance not only with good but with itself; good has but one enemy, evil; but evil has two enemies, *good and evil*. This contradiction of evil with itself has, in addition to its moral and psychological import, a peculiar metaphysical aspect. Evil has, indeed, no existence independently of God the absolute good, but it strives after it; and as we have seen, it is nothing more or less than this departing from the living God, this panting after independence apart from Him. When the creature surrenders himself to evil he practically denies his creation by God, he does not want to have his existence in God, but he will live, behave, and gratify self, as if he had life in himself and were his own lord. How would it be were God to permit evil in the creature to attain its end? were He to separate Himself from man, as man does from Him? The moment such an emancipation of the sinful creature from God were realized he would sink into nonentity, for he could not exist a moment save in the hands of God, and as His *mancipium*, be his will otherwise good or evil. Evil does not possess in itself any substantial being, but as the *Formula Concordiae*, following Augustine and opposing Flacius, explains, it exists only so far as it cleaves to some being in the form of a depraved nature or tendency; and therefore, by its efforts after separation from God (which is the true conception of it) it clearly involves itself in a self-destructive contradiction. If it succeeded, it would not only destroy its basis of good, but it would annihilate itself. The parasitic plant endeavours to extract all the juices from the organic body of the tree, appropriating them to its own depraved and poisonous development; but in attaining the end of its efforts it works its own destruction.

Over against this conclusive statement by Dr. Müller, is another truth which must not be overlooked, which is, that when sin takes the form of actual occurrence or performance, it is a positive force in itself. The sense in which sin is negative must be restricted to its relation to God and to His original creation. This essential aspect of truth is well stated by Francis J. McConnell in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*:

Very often sin is defined as the mere absence of goodness. The man who sins is one who does not keep the Law. This, however, is hardly the full Biblical conception. Of course, the man who does not keep the Law is regarded as a *sinner*, but the idea of transgression is very often that of a positive refusal to keep the commandment and a breaking of the commandment. Two courses are set before men, one good, the other evil. The evil course is, in a sense, something positive in itself. The evil man does not stand still; he moves as truly as the good man moves; he becomes a positive force for evil. In all our discussions we must keep clearly in mind the truth that evil is not something existing in and by itself. The Scriptures deal with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense of the word sin does run a course of positive destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer who describes the conditions which, in his belief, made necessary the Flood, we have a positive state of evil contaminating almost the whole world (Gen. 6:11). It would be absurd to characterize the world in the midst of which Noah lived as merely a negative world. The world was positively set toward evil. And so, in later writings, Paul's thought of Roman society is of a world of sinful men moving with increasing velocity toward the destruction of themselves and of all around them through doing evil. It is impossible to believe that

Romans 1 conceives of sin merely in negative terms. We repeat, we do not do full justice to the Biblical conception when we speak of sin merely in negative terms. If we may be permitted to use a present-day illustration, we may say that in the Biblical thought sinful men are like the destructive forces in the world of Nature which must be removed before there can be peace and health for human life.—IV, 2800

It may therefore be concluded that evil had no actual existence before sin was committed by the creatures whom God had called into being, and who by His design had the capacity to sin through a resisting of His will. Such capacity is of necessity restricted to the creature; for if sin be defined as independence of God and that which is contrary to God, it follows that God could Himself sin only as He became independent of Himself and as He contradicted Himself. Such ideas are not only absurdities, but are wholly foreign to One in whom only infinite holiness dwells. The facts with which Systematic Theology must deal are that some angels have fallen in sin with no revealed promise that there is redemption for them, while other angels abode in their first estate and are ever going on in the progress which the divine purpose assigned to them. An additional fact is that humanity in its entirety (excepting One) has fallen in sin and for them a perfect redemption is provided which, it is clearly revealed, will be received by some and rejected by others. Thus *evil*, and its manifestation, *sin*, became a reality only as they were made such by the creature's perversion of the will of God. Evil has no original substance in itself. It is spiritual insanity and must, in due time—as divinely determined—come to its end. That it will exist forever as a memory as it existed forever in anticipation could hardly be questioned.

2. THE FIRST CONCRETE ENACTMENT OF SIN IN HEAVEN BY AN UNFALLEN ANGEL. As has been intimated, it is noticeable that the great majority of the works on Systematic Theology have been satisfied to trace the origin of sin no further than to the fall of man in Eden. It is true that human sin began in Eden, but, though Adam merely re-enacted that sin which before had been committed in heaven, the essential character of sin is to be determined, to a large measure, by the sin of the first angel rather than by its reproduction by the first man.

A convincing proof that the Bible is a supernatural book is found in the fact that without hesitation or uncertainty it discloses conditions which antedate human history and as freely penetrates into and unveils the ages to come. Its message is not restricted to the field comprehended by human observations, but treats of other parts of the universe as familiarly as it treats of the earth. Among its disclosures concerning other spheres and the dateless past, a revelation is given of what appears to be the first sin that was committed in the universe. That

sin, we are told, was committed in heaven and by the highest of the angels, and, after having wrought its tragic results in those realms, was, upon the creation of man in the Garden of Eden, suggested to and re-enacted by unfallen Adam. It is stated in Romans 5:12 that “by one man sin entered into the world,” thus revealing the truth that man was not the first to sin, but was rather the medium through whom that form of sin which was already wrought in heaven secured entrance into earth. A reasonable approach to an understanding of the truth regarding the first sin to be committed in heaven is to consider (a) the person who first sinned, and (b) the nature of the first sin.

a. The Person Who First Sinned. The exceedingly sinful character of the first sin in the universe is largely determined by the exalted character and position of the first sinner. In the contemplation of this being and the circumstances under which he sinned, the natural discernment of man will help not at all. It is altogether a matter of revelation. This revelation distinguishes important differences between the estate of man and the estate of the angels. Among these differences we note that the divine method of securing a race of beings on the earth was to create a man and a woman to whom God gave instructions that they multiply and replenish the earth, but the divine method of securing the uncounted hosts of angels was by a fiat of omnipotent, creative power. Of these heavenly beings thus created, Christ intimated that they never increase by propagation nor are they decreased by death. Though angels were evidently created before material things, since they appear to have beheld the creative work of God, there is no clear indication of where in the order of events the first sin occurred; however, the exalted person and position of the angel who first sinned as well as the precise nature of his sin are revealed. This disclosure is found in the following Scripture: “Moreover the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee” (Ezek. 28:11–15).

The person here addressed as “the king of Tyrus” is evidently of the angelic,

or superhuman, order. This fact is abundantly disclosed in the text. It is possible that in a secondary sense this address applied to a human king in Tyrus, but as almost everything ascribed to this being is supernatural, none but one of the angelic creation could be first in view; and of the angels this peculiar description could apply to none but one—to him who by his sin became Satan. This the highest of angelic beings appears in the Bible under about forty different titles, all of which are, like all titles in the Scriptures, revealing with respect to the person and character of the one designated.

Since Satan's crowning effort in the sphere of his relation to humanity in its present situation in the earth is the setting forth of the man of sin, it is significant that this passage is, in its context, preceded by ten verses which convey a divine message to "the prince of Tyrus," whose twofold blasphemous assumption is that he claims to be God, and that he sits in the seat of God. There is a clear identification here which relates this prince of Tyrus to Satan's superman, the man of sin, who is yet to appear, and of whom the Apostle prophesied saying: "And that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:3–4; cf. Matt. 24:15; Rev. 13:5–8). That this "wicked one" has not yet appeared is evident from the fact that his brief career, when experienced, will be terminated, we are told, by the "brightness" of Christ's coming, and by "the spirit of his mouth" (2 Thess. 2:8). As a prince is related to a king, so this blasphemous person described in the first instance (Ezek. 28:1–10) is related to the one who is set forth in the text under consideration (Ezek. 28:11–15).

It is of greatest importance to note that it is Jehovah who addresses this mighty being as "the king of Tyrus," and who describes this one in all his supernatural characteristics. It is Jehovah also who is here pictured as lamenting over this great angel. The thought expressed by the word *lamentation* is that of extreme anguish accompanied by the beating of the breast. Such, indeed, is the attitude of Jehovah toward this fallen angel. There is infinite pathos in every word which describes the measureless exaltation and honor conferred on this angel in view of his subsequent repudiation of Jehovah. A feeble illustration of this lamentation on the part of Jehovah over this angel is to be seen in David's lamentation over Absalom: "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" (2 Sam. 18:33).

Similarly, Jehovah declares this great angel to be the "sum," being "full of wisdom and perfect in beauty," and that he has "been in Eden the garden of

God,” and that every precious stone was his covering. Though Satan did appear in the Eden described in Genesis (and this no king of Tyrus ever did) it is probable, considering the details set forth in this passage, that reference here is to the primal Edenic glory of the earth before it became “without form and void.” Continuing this description, Jehovah states that this being was created with marvelous capacities, and, by the use of specific imagery, implies that he was a diadem of praise to his Creator. He is also said to belong to the order of the cherubim, which company of the angels seem charged with the protection of the holy presence of God (cf. Gen. 3:24; Ex. 25:18–22; 2 Sam. 6:2); but of this being it is revealed that he was, as protector, or cherub, placed upon the “holy mountain of God,” which, according to Old Testament symbolism, refers to the seat or throne of God’s government in the earth (cf. Isa. 2:1–4). The climax of this important Scripture is reached when the declaration is made that this being was perfect in all his ways from the day he was created until iniquity was uncovered in him. This passage thus discloses the exalted character of a heavenly being and indicates the fact of his sin. The context goes on to add some light concerning the sin itself and the judgment of God that must eventually follow.

The identification of this being may be thus restated: He was the sum, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. He had been in Eden the Garden of God. His covering was that of precious stones. Tabrets and pipes were in him from his creation. He was of the Cherubim and appointed of God as guardian over His holy mountain. He had walked up and down midst the stones of fire. He was perfect in his ways from the day of his creation. Thus the most exalted and heavenly among created beings is described, and of him it is also revealed that iniquity was found, or uncovered, in him. The proof that this has reference to Satan, the highest of angelic beings, is disclosed in the fact that, so far as revelation goes, this description could apply to no other.

b. The Nature of the First Sin. The Prophet Isaiah sets forth by the Spirit of God the precise nature and detailed features of Satan’s sin. We read: “How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High” (Isa. 14:12–14).

Again the identification is not difficult. The address is to one who is here designated as Lucifer, son of the morning, which title relates him to the highest

of the angels and the greatness of his power is disclosed in the context. There he is said to be the one “which didst weaken the nations, that made the world a wilderness, that destroyed the cities thereof,” and “that opened not the house of his prisoners” (cf. Isa. 61:1). That Isaiah is viewing these stupendous achievements of this being from the end of that career and that he is seeing the full and final outworking of all divinely permitted evil, is indicated by the fact that Lucifer is, in this passage, declared to be “fallen from heaven” and “cut down to the ground,” which judgment is yet future in the experience of Satan (Ezek. 28:16; Job 1:6; Luke 10:18; Eph. 6:11–12, R.V.; Rev. 12:7–9). It is equally clear that to this hour Satan’s permitted program of evil in the world is not yet fully accomplished.

The sin which Lucifer committed includes five particulars and these are expressed under five assertions of his proposed independence of God. He used the impious phrase *I will* in each declaration. The peculiar evil character of the words *I will* under these circumstances is disclosed in the fact that these words belong primarily to sovereignty. This is demonstrated in the great unconditional covenants God has made with men. The phrase *I will* is, more than any other which language can exhibit, the sole prerogative and solemn right of Deity. When uttered by God the phrase *I will* is in no way abnormal. However, there is a secondary use of this phrase which may be sanctioned—even on the lips of a creature. Having yielded to the will of God, it is becoming of him to say, *I will* do the will of God. Such a use of these words only emphasizes the truth that God’s will is supreme; but as these words of sovereign intent fell from the lips of the first sinning angel, there was no element of submission expressed or intended. They represented an assumed independence wholly unbecoming to a creature. Though it be a small creature with a small purpose—as is true in the case of each and all of those who comprise the mass of humanity—if he be opposed to or independent of God, the very basis of all sin is manifest. These words, coming from Lucifer, were more ominous since, by the greatness of his position, he purposed no less than the production of what has come to be the *cosmos* world system. These five uses of the phrase *I will*, which appear in Isaiah 14:12–14, must be carefully considered.

An extended exposition of these verses has been presented earlier in the work under Angelology. The present treatment of these vital statements will, therefore, be brief.

“I will ascend into heaven.” This bold purpose expressed in these words will be understood only in the light of the truth that there are three heavens. The

angels have their rightful abode in the second heaven. Lucifer's responsibility as guard to the throne of God required him to do service in that higher realm where God dwells. The ambition of Lucifer is thus seen to be a most impious and willful attempt to a residence above the sphere allotted to him.

"I will exalt my throne above the stars of God," which phrase expresses the purpose on Lucifer's part to secure a dominion in angelic spheres. Little may be known of the issue involved or of the extent of this purpose. The intention has been realized under divine permission since Satan is now at the head of a kingdom of evil spirits (Matt. 12:26).

"I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north." This assertion is somewhat obscure. However, the understanding of three words used seems to lend some light. The *mount* is the throne of God, the *congregation* is Israel, and the *sides of the north* may be a reference to the crucifixion which occurred on the north of Jerusalem and to the earthly authority over Israel which belongs to Christ as Redeemer and King. In such an interpretation it may be seen that there was a purpose in Lucifer to secure an earthly throne. That such a throne now exists is declared in Revelation 2:13 (note that here the word *seat* should be *throne*).

"I will ascend above the heights of the clouds." In this declaration there is an attempt in view to secure some of the divine glory which is symbolized so constantly through the Bible by the clouds.

"I will be like the most High" is the consummation of all that has gone before. This is Lucifer's supreme purpose concerning which the other *I will's* are but particulars. In this assertion the whole essence of sin lies concealed. It is independent action outside of, and opposed to, the purpose of God. Of Satan Christ said that he "abode not in the truth" (John 8:44), and by so much implied that to depart from the will of God is to enact a lie. Over against this, the truth consisted in that divine purpose and appointment for this being, immeasurable in its privilege, eternal value, and glory. Lucifer chose his own course of independent action evidently determined to move into the third heaven, to gain authority on earth, to usurp the divine glory, and to be like the most High. Later Scripture revelation discloses this satanic ambition to be—so far as earth is concerned—the present *cosmos* world system, over which Satan is now prince (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11), and, in this age, its god (2 Cor. 4:4). God has evidently permitted the purpose of Satan to be put to an experimental test to the end that it may be judged more perfectly. What Lucifer was, and could have been, in the will of God constituted the *truth* in which he abode not. What he has

wrought is *the lie*, and Satan is the author of it. That lie was hid in his heart from the beginning. The future judgments that will fall on the *cosmos* world are clearly predicted in the Word of God, as also the tragic end of Satan, and all associated with him, in the lake of fire. With all these revelations in view, it is as puerile to talk of a converted *cosmos* world as it would be to talk of a converted devil. Each reaches its determined end with all the certainty of infinity.

Too much importance cannot be attached to the truth that Lucifer's first sin—a willful ambition against God which proposed the *cosmos* world system—is the norm or pattern of all sin. All human beings acting independently who are not concerned to fulfill the divine purpose for them are re-enacting this same sin, and their destiny is that of the devil and his angels (Rev. 20:10–15), unless they come under the saving grace of God.

3. THE FIRST CONCRETE ENACTMENT OF SIN BY A HUMAN BEING ON EARTH.

Should an error be adopted as the major premise in a sequence of closely related themes, there is little hope that the entire succession of thought would not be characterized by deviation from, if not contradiction of, the truth. There is scarcely another phase of divine revelation which is more germane to the right understanding of all doctrine than that of *sin*. Practically all heretical systems of thought base themselves upon misconceptions of sin, and these must, therefore, of necessity be saturated with error. An attempt to enumerate in full these misconceptions would be inconsistent with the purpose of this thesis. However, in this connection it may be observed that to underestimate the true character of sin is (1) to disregard the explicit terms employed in the Bible to set forth the exceeding sinfulness of sin, thus causing God to seem to be untruthful; (2) to contradict, to a greater or less degree, the holy character of God; (3) to vitiate even the right conception of human guilt; (4) to disregard the sanctity and authority of the Word of God; (5) to cause the unavoidable divine reprobation of sin to seem to be an extreme and unwarrantable judgment; (6) to render the great facts of redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation to appear to be uncalled for; and (7) to dismiss from consideration the only sufficient reason for the death of Christ.

It is true, as before stated, that sin is sinful because of the fact that it is unlike God, and that a thing which is evil will be demonstrated to be such when compared with the holy character of God. It is equally true that sin calls for judgment because it is an outrage against the Person and law of God; and, since God is infinite and His goodness unbounded, sin is infinite and its evil character

is beyond all human computation. Sin inflicts not only an immeasurable injury upon the one who sins, but is more specifically characterized by the injury it inflicts upon God, the Creator's rights being disregarded, His holy law broken, and His property being damaged through sin.

The far-reaching effect of the first human sin is to be discovered in its movement along two widely different channels—the *sin nature*, and *imputed sin*, which subjects are to be attended in their proper place and order. Discussion now centers upon the first human sin itself. The record of the first human sin is found in Genesis 3:1–19. Having specifically prohibited the eating of the fruit of one tree and having given warning that the penalty for disobedience would be death, God thus placed Adam and Eve on probation. The issue was fully comprehended by them and apparently they, when left to themselves, did abstain from eating of the fruit which was prohibited. It was when the tempter appeared that they were induced to disregard God. The details of this sin and the influences leading up to it have been recited in a previous section of Anthropology. The essential fact, which cannot be restated too often, is that, in his temptation, Satan proposed to the first parents that they adopt the precise course he had himself espoused and pursued, which was to assume independence of God by departing from His will and purpose. Short-sighted ambition doubly blinded by unholy pride was willing to exchange the perfection of estate and destiny which the infinite love, wisdom, and power of the Creator has designed, for the wretched warfare of a self-centered life with its eternal agonizing experience in death. Evidently the whole truth was not displayed before these human beings. They were told that they would be like *Elohim* (Gen. 3:5), but only in one respect—their eyes would be open and they would know good and evil. They were as created, experiencing the good; as fallen they would experience the evil. They had nothing to gain but rather everything to lose. The creature, whether angel or human, is by creation not only the property of the Creator by rights more vital than any other, but, as created, the creature is wholly dependent on the Creator. This relationship was blessed indeed before the fall and engendered no offense. By repudiating God through disobedience, Adam and Eve embarked upon a tempest-tossed, shoreless sea without compass, rudder, or helm. Such a course could only lead to ignominious failure and to the final judgments of the One whom they had rejected and abjured. The truth that sin is insanity is thus fully demonstrated.

In the last analysis, there are but two philosophies of life. One is to be conformed to the will of God which is the original divine arrangement, the other is to forsake the Creator and renounce His authority and purpose. In respect to

the latter philosophy, it may be said that there is probably no pride so despicable as that which resents the authority of the Creator and which presumes to devise a program of life and achievement which is a substitute for the original plan and purpose of God. One philosophy is satanic, and this hideous fact is not changed even though the whole human race has embraced the satanic ideal. Appearing in the Garden, Satan brought no great volume elucidating his philosophy. Having led up to his ignoble proposition with such strategy as only Satan can command—he appealed to natural desires, he belittled sin, he attacked the character of God by intimating that God is untrustworthy and unloving—he proposed a likeness to *Elohim*. The translation “Be as gods” is most misleading. The original text says, “Be as *Elohim*.” The satanic philosophy is expressed perfectly in these brief words and it leads on, regardless of a moment of satisfaction of self and pride, to the lake of fire, and the same end is announced for all, angels or human beings, who adopt and pursue this course to its bitter end.

Satan’s purpose did not consist merely in rejecting God; he was designing a vast *cosmos* world system in which he proposed to utilize and misappropriate the elements which belong to God’s creation, which, in themselves, are *good*. Satan creates nothing. No step in the satanic *cosmos* project was more essential than that he should secure the allegiance of humanity. The issues at stake in the Garden of Eden were, in respect to Satan’s career, such as would determine his realization of his whole undertaking. He must gain supremacy over man or fail completely. Little did Adam and Eve realize that, so far from attaining independence, they were becoming bondslaves to sin and Satan. From that time forth Satan was to energize them and their children to do his will (Eph. 2:1–2; Col. 1:13; 1 John 5:19). From such an estate only the regenerating power of God, made possible through the Redeemer, could rescue. As long as Satan is permitted to rule as the prince of the *cosmos*, it is probable that humanity will experience some sense of cohesion and security—something vague indeed—but when Satan is banished and his authority at an end the isolation and segregation of unregenerate human beings will result in terror and anguish for all eternity to come.

No extended investigation of the Scriptures is required to prove that sin originated in heavenly spheres and that man became the avenue or way by which sin gained entrance into the world (Rom. 5:12). It is also to be concluded that, though human sin may manifest its character in various ways, it is from one root and consists in a departure from the living God. It is this departure which precipitated the fall of man, and the same spirit of independence lives on to curse

the race.

II. The Sinful Nature of Sin

In its fundamental character, sin is a restless unwillingness on the part of the creature to abide in the sphere and limitation in which the Creator, guided by infinite wisdom, had placed him. This unwillingness may be expressed in many ways, and these are sometimes thought to be the real nature of sin. In the general field of manifestation of sin, the fact is that it is a want of conformity to the character of God. The first sin of man was a personal sin, and, as before stated, resulted in a sin nature. In this the order in human experience is reversed, since, in the case of each of Adam's posterity, there is first a fallen nature and this engenders personal sin. Thus, as already pointed out, the sin nature and personal sin may each in turn be seen to be cause or effect.

The widest possible difference exists—amounting to no less than a contrast between things infinite and things finite—when God's estimate of sin is compared with man's estimate of sin; yet to an extent which is all but universal, sin is judged by men quite apart from revelation and on the basis of the natural human evaluation.

Since sin is negative to the extent that it has no standards of its own, but must derive its measurements from that which is positive or good, and since the holy character of God is the standard of that which is good, it follows that sin is as evil as it appears to be when viewed from the vantage point of the holiness of God. No fallen human being can ever attain to an understanding of the holiness of God, and, to the same degree, no fallen human being can attain to the right conception of the sinful nature of sin. When it is discovered that divine judgments for sin reach to eternity, as indeed they do, it ill becomes finite, fallen man to call these judgments into question.

III. Three Major Proofs of the Exceeding Sinfulness of Personal Sin

1. THE ANGELIC PROOF. One of the angelic hosts committed one sin, which sin in their own sphere men deem most commendable, namely, *unholy ambition*, and, as a result of that sin, that angel fell and became the eternal enemy of God and drew after him a vast company of the heavenly hosts, some of whom are bound in chains of darkness, and for whom there is no ray of hope through all eternity.

2. THE HUMAN PROOF. One individual, the first of the human creation, committed one sin and that sin being apparently so innocuous men are prone to ridicule the thought that God would notice it at all; yet that one sin is, according to divine estimation, sufficiently evil to cause the degeneracy and depravity of the unfallen person who committed the sin, and to cause uncounted millions of his posterity to suffer in the flesh and die, and the vast majority of them to spend eternity in the realms of woe.

3. THE DIVINE PROOF. The Son of God suffered to an infinite degree and died on the cross because of sin. There was no other way whereby redemption could be secured. However, had there never been but one sin committed in this world, the same depths of suffering and death by the Son of God would have been required as a righteous ground for divine forgiveness of that one sin and the justification of that sinner.

The study of the personal sins of those whose failure is recorded in the Scriptures will add much to the understanding of the doctrine of personal sins. Such a study should include the sins of Adam, Cain, Noah, Nadab, Abihu, Korah, Dathan, Abiram, Aaron, Moses, Achan, Eli, Saul, David, Solomon, Peter, Pilate, Judas, Ananias, Sapphira, and Saul of Tarsus.

Having constructed an intricate machine composed of many parts, a man expects each part to remain in its place and fulfill the specific responsibility assigned to it. The separate independent action of one part would disarrange the whole. The creation is composed of many parts and under the present exercise of opposing wills is a confusion which God alone can correct. This He will do in His own time and way.

As there is no rational accounting for the universe—a system and order which embraces all regulations from the movement of the stars down to the laws which overrule all forms of life that exist—apart from the truth that God is the Designer, Creator, and Sustainer of all, in like manner all that enters into moral character derives its values from God. It should be no more a problem to recognize God as the ground source of things moral than of things physical or intellectual. Were there actually such a thing as a wandering star severed from all other forces and attractions, it would well serve to illustrate a created intelligence, fitted for a great purpose and sustaining far-flung relationships, as sundered from the Source of all its being and wantonly defying the elements of holy character upon which all moral values depend and from which all obligations arise. Indeed, Jude likens certain “ungodly men” to “wandering stars,

to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever” (Jude 1:4, 13). As the necessity is laid on physical elements to abide under that mandate wherein they were placed by the Creator if they are to serve the end for which they were created, thus, and to a far more important degree, the necessity is laid upon moral beings to abide under the mandate wherein they were placed if they are to know the eternal fullness of life and experience which infinite love and wisdom proposed. Outside such a reasonable continuing, there can be only “blackness of darkness”; for apart from God no light exists, and man apart from God, having no power to generate light, is “full of darkness.”

Sin usually combines an immoral feature with the element of disobedience and what that means to God could not be fully revealed.

Again, the sinful character of sin is reflected in the penalties which are righteously imposed. The doom of Satan, the doom of unregenerate men, and all the suffering of this life bear their testimony, and it may be believed that any sin committed by any creature is as sinful in the divine estimation as those sins which, because of the position occupied by the sinner, brought ruin to uncounted multitudes of beings.

The utter independence of God on the part of the creature, whether it be angel or man, is the basic principle of evil. It manifests itself in manifold ways. The prophet declares: “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way” (Isa. 53:6). The wise man said: “In the multitude of words there wanteth not sin” (Prov. 10:19); “He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth” (Prov. 14:21); “The thought of foolishness is sin” (Prov. 24:9). And in the New Testament we read: “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23); “To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” (James 4:17); “Sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4); and “The love of money is the root of all evil” (1 Tim. 6:10). Thus the Scriptures indicate the extensive and complex character of sin’s expression, but in every case, whether it be doctrine or human experience, the one original evil is found to be in the sphere of the creature’s relation to the Creator.

IV. General Definitions

In entering the extensive field of the definition of sin, a distinction arises at the outset between the state of heart which impels one to sin and the overt act of the sin itself. In the case of Adam who sinned without the promptings of a sin nature, it is evident that his act of disobedience was preceded and prepared by a

consent of his will, and that, when he had thus determined his course, or was willing to disobey God, he had already sinned potentially. That attitude could be defined as a *state* of sin. It is to be noted that, had he been hindered against his will from the overt act of disobedience, he would, nevertheless, have been condemnable on the ground of his intention and willingness. In the case of Adam's posterity all of whom inherit the sin nature which unceasingly excites to sin, a constant state of sin exists which can be relieved only by the preventing power of the indwelling Spirit. Sin is therefore sometimes defined as a state of heart or mind. Much has been written on the subject of sin from a psychological approach, but such considerations are too often speculative and do not tend to develop the evil character of sin as it is set forth in the Bible. It may be admitted along with the speculative ideals that sin is an action of the will—either an overt omission or commission—but back of the will is the evil heart. Christ emphasized this when He said, "That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man" (Mark 7:20–23). The nature of fallen man is sinful whether it expresses its true character in overt acts or not.

Under the title *Modern Theories of Sin*, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (following Orchard) presents four theories which are here quoted, and, as they are clear, no comment on them need be added:

"(1) Theories which trace sin to the will of man (represented by Kant, Coleridge, and Müller).

"(2) Theories which regard sin as a necessity (represented by Schelling, Weisse, and Hegel).

"(3) Theories which seek to explain sin by confining it within the bounds of religion (represented by Schleiermacher and Ritschl).

"(4) Theories which seek to explain sin from empirical observation (represented by Pfleiderer and Tennant)" (*The Principles of Theology*, p. 170).

The general field of definition concerning *personal sin* may be comprehended in two aspects: (a) sin against God, and (b) sin against law. A patent distinction obtains between sin against God's Person—which sin may be indicated by such terms as *godlessness*, *defilement*, *selfhood*—and sin against God's moral government which is as properly expressed by such terms as *transgression*, *rebellion*, *lawlessness*. This twofold division seems to comprehend the whole field of definition, and the whole trend of man's obligation may be traced along

these two lines of relationship. These two forms of duty, being interdependent, are inseparable. No relationship to God can be conceived that does not acknowledge His holy will or law, nor can any authority be discovered in His holy will or law that does not ground itself in His holy Person. Man's relation to the Person of God is largely one of *state*, while his relation to the will of God is one of *action*. The general term for sin is ἁμαρτία, meaning that a prescribed mark or ideal has been missed. This mark or ideal is the essential character of God which is made known to man by God's revealed will or law. Attention may now be given to these two aspects of sin and in the order indicated above:

1. SIN AGAINST GOD'S HOLY PERSON. Philosophers have long debated the question whether man is capable of originating a conscious distinction between right and wrong, whether the laws he makes for himself—though made through the medium of his limited understanding—are a reflection of his own ideals or whether they are derived from God. Theoretically, it is a question whether the voice of conscience—man's intuition about what is right and true—is directly or indirectly the voice of God, or whether conscience is to be recognized as a natural factor in man's being. Attention has been given to this subject in a previous section of this work and there it was asserted that conscience seems to stand over, or above, the other faculties of man's being as a monitor or judge—a voice outside the action of the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will; yet a voice which may be stultified if not silenced, or, on the other hand, may be stimulated to keen discernment. Has God created a delicate instrument which, within its own resources, is able to contend for that which is right, or is conscience the immediate voice of God speaking in the inner consciousness of man? One thing is assured, which is, that God is the original good and all that is good in the universe is derived from Him. The untenable idea that right is an eternal principle to which God subscribes, or the notion that right is what it is because God has arbitrarily assigned that character to it—that He could have as easily made evil good had He chosen to do so—need not be refuted here. Since God Himself is the eternal One, immutable in His infinite holiness, He subscribes to no principle as one who is subject to it. He is the Principle. What is good and true is not a law which governs God; He is the source of these virtues. He is in no sense the source of evil and untruth. Evil and untruth have no original source. There was a time when evil could have been contemplated only as a possibility; but good, like all the divine attributes, in its most exalted reality has the same eternal existence which belongs to God. There was a time—if time it be—when

evil was only an anticipation; there will yet be a time—if time it be—when it will be only a memory. Good is immutable from everlasting to everlasting.

The effect of sin upon God and of His attitude toward sin is displayed in the plan by which He saves the lost. Too little, indeed, is it realized by many who attempt to preach the gospel, that the grace of God which saves the lost is not mere big-heartedness or generosity on God's part. He could have saved souls without the sacrifice of His Son had that been the case. The death of His Son as a sacrifice is required only because God cannot compromise His holy character by making light of sin. It is the very structure of the gospel that God is infinitely righteous in His attitude toward sinners, which means perfect and eternal condemnation unless the demands of infinite holiness are righteously met. In other words, whatever is done to save the lost, must be done in such a way as to preserve untarnished the character of God. To some it has seemed a worthy conception of God when presented as liberal and magnanimous enough to waive His holy requirements, little realizing that to turn thus from His holy judgments would be to forfeit every vestige of that foundation of righteousness on which His throne rests, which undergirds His government, and sustains His immutable character. Should God save one soul from the condemnation which rests on that soul because of sin by softening the condemnation or by so loving the sinner that He surrenders or relinquishes one fraction of His holy demands against sin, that the soul might be saved, God, in turn, would be lost, His essential Being ruined by a compromise with sin, and Himself needing to be saved from dissolution. Such a truth has never been stated strongly enough, nor can it be, since language is incapable of expressing the hideous dishonor to God which lurks in gospel appeals that offer salvation based upon divine charity and not on the efficacious blood of Christ. If men had never preached any other message than that sin is so exceedingly sinful that it can be forgiven only on the ground of the shedding of the blood of one of the Godhead Three, and that this illimitable sacrifice is as much required for the cure of one sin of one individual as for the sins of many, a better realization of the divine attitude toward sin would no doubt obtain. God Himself must be, and is, *just* when He justifies the ungodly who do no more than to *believe* in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). Preaching anything less than this merits the unrevoked anathema assured in Galatians 1:8–9.

What to this point has been defended, is to the end that a most essential truth may be emphasized, i.e., that sin is against God. It affects God immediately and directly; and it affects the one who sins largely through the reaction which arises because of its primary influence upon God. In his blindness and wickedness the

creature may assume that what he may do is no concern of God's, but such reasoning is only the hallucination which waits upon the insanity of sin. The supposition that the creature is free from responsibility and accountability to his Creator is the worst of delusions—second only to that irrational notion that God is not cognizant of the creature's sin, or that sin can be hid from God. Concerning the divine observation of the creature's sin, it is written: "For his eyes are upon the ways of man, and he seeth all his goings" (Job 34:21); "Shall not God search this out? for he knoweth the secrets of the heart" (Ps. 44:21); "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance" (Ps. 90:8); "For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God" (Jer. 2:22). And two testimonies recorded in the Bible declare the truth that sin is directly against God. David wrote: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest" (Ps. 51:4); "And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son" (Luke 15:21). In addition to the condemnation which is imposed because of the sin nature, every personal sin must be, and therefore will be, weighed and judged on the basis of divine holiness. Quite dissimilar, however, is the relationship of the sinning Christian to God. He is subject to chastisement, but not to condemnation.

Beyond the offense which sin is to God's government, and beyond the injury it is to that which is the indisputable property of God, it, because of its immoral nature, outrages and insults the holy Person of God. He is infinitely pure and righteous. The prophet of old has said, "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity: wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?" (Hab. 1:13), and the Apostle John has written: "This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). So, also, the Apostle James declares: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James 1:13). When the truth is considered apart from all relationships, there is no argument respecting the holiness of God; yet this is the very truth which measures the sinfulness of sin. It is the fact that God is transparently holy which lends meaning to such terms as *ungodliness*, *defilement*, and *impiety*.

If any unprejudiced attention be given to the subject at all, it will not be

deemed unreasonable that the One who gives man his existence, who designs all that is best for man in time and eternity, who creates and arranges all that enters into man's environment and comfort, who exercises an unceasing providing and protecting providence, who at infinite cost prepares a remedy for man's sin and failure, who loves man with an infinite love, and desires man—even though fallen in sin—to be blessed with His richest blessings, should, being Himself pellucidly holy, be injured and offended by man's rejection of His Person, insult to His character, and rebellion against His holy will. Nor should any be amazed that, because of His immutable righteousness, He cannot condone sin but must demand that the price of redemption, reconciliation, and propitiation—which He alone could pay—should be included by man in his reckoning respecting what must enter into his salvation. It should not be counted strange that salvation is restricted to confidence in God to save through the Saviorhood of Christ, or that the rejection of Christ as Savior should be deemed the last and most iniquitous insult to God.

a. The Theory that Sin is Selfishness. Closely related to that aspect of sin which is against God, is the widely accepted contention that sin is selfishness, or selfhood in one form or another. This theory has claimed advocates in the early days of the church; it was argued by Dr. Julius Müller, whose work, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, has long been hailed by devout scholarship as the most complete and worthy treatment of this great theme; and it has been defended by later theologians—notably Dr. Augustus H. Strong. The real issue may be approached by the inquiry whether all sin is selfishness, or whether all selfishness is sin. The difference in these propositions is obvious and the issue should not be passed over without attention.

Extended argument has already been advanced in this work to prove that the very essence of sin, as it was first committed by the highest angel and later by the first man, was an act both self-willed and self-seeking—a departure from that which, having been divinely purposed, was and ever must be God's truth. For this truth the lie was substituted, which included not only the repudiation of God but also the adoption of an antigod enterprise which is none other than the present *cosmos* world system. The beginning of sin, or the first sin, is naturally the mold or pattern of all sin; that is, what Lucifer did is, with respect to its vital nature, a model of all subsequent sin. In this connection, it has been noted also that the last sinner of the satanic program—the man of sin—will pursue the same unholy purpose. Of him it is written that he both “opposeth [God] and exalteth himself above all that is called God” (2 Thess. 2:4). While there is always a very

wide field open for the multiplied manifestations of sin, sin is, in its essential nature, twofold: repudiation of God and promotion of self. Opposition to God and exaltation of self doubtless spring from the same self motive. It is true, as is often claimed, that self in all its forms constitutes an opposite to sacrificial love (it is identical with self-love). On this ground, it has been reasoned, and by none more effectively than Dr. Müller and Dr. Strong, that, since love is the first obligation in fulfilling the law—as it is said in Matthew 22:37–40, “Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets”; and in Romans 13:10, “Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law” (cf. Gal. 5:14; James 2:8)—failure to love must be the first all-inclusive sin. Perplexity must arise if no recognition be accorded to the difference which exists between sin as a state, or nature, and sin in its outworking, or manifestation. In general, objective love is a manifestation; but, even if it be considered as a state of heart, the unregenerate person needs more than a revolution in his emotions. He must be regenerated. He has no ability to reverse his emotions. In place of fulfilling the law by the exercise of love, he fulfills “the desires of the flesh and of the mind” (Eph. 2:3). However, were he able, even by divine enablement—admittedly an impossible hypothesis—to exercise love, yet he would be lacking those great transformations which constitute salvation. In other words, if salvation from sin may be secured by espousing a life characterized by love—even divinely enabled—it is by *works*; it arises in man; and to man be all the glory. If, as is usual, the problem be restricted to personal sins, even these are in some instances void of the element of self. No self-interest need be present in *malice, enmity toward God*, or in *unbelief*.

It may be concluded that the part of anything is never the whole of it. Love for God and man is not all there is of holy character, as love for self is not all there is of sin. Unselfishness in Christ did not exhaust His virtues, nor does selfishness in Satan exhaust all his iniquity. To the Christian it may be said that, though Christ emphasized love to a marked degree (cf. John 13:34–35; 15:12), He did not imply that love is all that is required. When He said, “Keep my commandments,” He could hardly be thought to be referring to only one of them. Sin is any want of conformity to the character of God. It is true that “God is love,” but He is vastly more; He is *truth*, He is *faithfulness*, He is *righteousness*. When the Bible declares that lawlessness is sin, that lack of faith

is sin, that failure to do what is known to be good is sin, there is no implication that the exercise of love will correct these evils.

2. SIN AGAINST THE LAW. The term *law* must, in the present consideration, be given a very broad meaning including every form of the revealed will of God whether it be (a) early communications preserved by tradition, (b) human conscience, (c) direct spiritual guidance, or (d) the written Word of God with its various age-applications. These forms of the law are best considered separately and in the order indicated:

a. Early Communications Preserved by Tradition. This aspect of law fills a large place in human history. It was apparently the sole governing rule over human life from Adam to Moses. It was that which determined the distinction between good and evil as recorded concerning the first parents; it was that which separated Cain from Abel; it was that upon the basis of which the antediluvians were judged and condemned; it was that which made subsequent Gentile peoples to be abhorrent to God; and it was that to which faithful Enoch, Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph conformed their lives. Jehovah declared to Isaac concerning his father Abraham who lived a full half a millennium before the giving of a written law, “Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” (Gen. 26:5). A similar expression that Abraham pursued “the way of Jehovah” (Gen 18:19, R.V.) evidently recognizes the truth that a well-defined edict or mandate was abroad in all those centuries of early history. To what extent humanity has preserved these early requirements or impressions would be difficult to determine. Such recognition of right conduct and equity as the heathen exhibit must be, to a large degree, the manifestations of this original unwritten, yet divinely revealed, law of God.

b. Human Conscience. A return is made at this point to the contemplation of that mysterious faculty of the natural man, or within the natural man, which conforms not merely to that which *is*, but rather to that which *ought to be*—a faculty which so far transcends, in things moral, the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will, that it sits in judgment over them. The conscience, though acting as judge, does not essay to execute its decrees. Having declared what ought to be in that clearness which is commensurable with its competence, conscience must depend upon the spirit of man acting through his will to execute its decrees. In its broadest phase, this vital faculty of man’s being which governs and yet does not execute its judgments, is the *moral law*. The law in its written form presents only a general statement of that which in principle is applicable to those to

whom it is addressed. It cannot trace the specific obligations which arise in relation to the individual's peculiar and ever-changing circumstances. The conscience alone can guide in these details of life. Obviously, what is thus said applies to the unregenerate; for a different relationship and responsibility rests on the regenerate, who, being indwelt by the Holy Spirit, are privileged to be led of the Spirit. Over against this, or to be added to this, God has spoken with particular directness to Jews and with another particular directness to Christians with due consideration of their different spheres of relationship to Him; but all are, like the inner voice of conscience, only proclamations of the one moral law—that which proceedeth from God and is the affirmation of His holy nature. This conception of law does not necessarily presuppose evil in the individual to be corrected; it is primarily a positive directing, a pointing of the way, to those who otherwise would not know. Even human laws are to a large degree based on divine revelation and are usually accepted or rejected according to the conscience, or convictions due to conscience, of those to whom such authority is given. It has been true that human authorities have sometimes confused their authority to act with their power to act, supposing that mere power determined that which is right; but the very resistance of such perversion argues strongly for the existence in men of the *moral law* as an innate sense of that which is right as in contrast to that which is wrong. Thus conscience, as a feature of moral law, coincides with all other forms of law and, normally, proclaims that which God requires. A violation of conscience, in so far as conscience asserts its authority, is sin.

c. Direct Spiritual Guidance. In this aspect of the divine will as revealed, the Christian alone is concerned. It is possible for the child of God to refuse the guidance which the Spirit proffers. A carnal life is a life lived in the flesh and in opposition to the mind of the Spirit, yet the word *carnal* applies to Christians (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1). This extensive theme must be reserved for its proper time and place.

d. The Written Word of God with Its Various Age-Applications. At this point in this thesis, the most common definition for sin is in evidence, namely, that sin is ἀνομία—a violation of law, or *lawlessness*. Using this word, the Apostle John declares that “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4). The question whether this is a complete or a restricted definition of sin has received some attention earlier when seeking to draft a proper definition of sin. There it was observed that any want of conformity to revealed law is not a broad enough conception; for much may be in the character of God that has not specific expression in any revealed law, just as, indeed, a lack of faith is sin, yet all sin is not a lack of faith; and to

know good and not do it is sin, but not all sin is failure to do what is known to be good; and, again, to love money is a root of evil; but all evil is not included in the love of money. In the same manner, lawlessness is sin, but not all sin is a violation of some written code. Since the written law so nearly represents the whole of the divine requirement, great stress should be put on the searching truth that to transgress a law, which is addressed to one, is the most specific disobedience and compares with that disobedience by which angels and men have fallen. Question 24 of *The Larger Catechism* (Westminster) aims at the solemn truth regarding sin and the law. It reads, “*What is sin?*” and the answer is clear as far as it goes: “Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of any law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature.”

No discussion of sin as against law will be true to the Bible that does not incorporate some exposition of 1 John 3:4–10. The deeper meaning of this passage will be understood only when a distinction between the sins of regenerate men and unregenerate men is kept in mind. Possibly no other passage of Scripture contributes more to the present theme than this. It is certain that few portions of Scripture have been subject to more varied interpretations. The passage sets up a distinction between sin with its source in Satan, and righteousness (in conduct—not conduct which generates righteousness as a ground of standing before God, but conduct which is prompted to deeds of rectitude because of the perfect standing in the divine righteousness imputed to all who believe) with its source in God. Though allusion has been made before in this general discussion to this passage, a more extended consideration of it is essential at this point.

Probably the key phrase in this context is, “Sin is the transgression of the law” (vs. 4), where the force of *is* amounts to *is equivalent to*. In the foregoing chapters of this volume, evidence has been adduced to demonstrate that sin began with Satan in heaven, he thus becoming the father or originator of it; and that sin is, in its essential character, a lawless departure from the purpose and will of God. The passage under present consideration is in accord with the most distinctive characteristic of sin, namely, *lawlessness*. The Apostle includes here *all* sin, not *some* sin. It is lawlessness against God and all that His holy character demands. If the interpretation were permitted that *some* sins only were in view, there would be provided an explanation, which some have *supposed* to be true, of the strong statements which follow in the context. Roman Catholic theology distinguishes here between *mortal* and *venial* sins. Augustine, Luther, and Bede, in harmony with the tenor of the Epistle, sought to restrict this form of sin to sin

against brotherly love. Others have restricted it to *deadly* sin. However, the passage is clear in its declaration. It most evidently refers to *all* sin and not merely to *bad* sins as in contradistinction to *good* sins, and the passage as certainly asserts that the essential character of sin (as the Greek ἀμαρτία implies) is lawlessness—lawlessness, indeed, which is foreign to the Christian’s redemption, new birth by the Spirit, and present position *in Christ*. In verse 5, “And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin,” the Apostle refers parenthetically to the ground of all saving grace. The unqualified declaration of verse 6, “Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him,” need not be softened by any modifications whatever. When abiding in Him, lawless sinning is excluded. Over against this, the lawless sinner neither seeth Christ nor knoweth Christ. Some have introduced here the explanation of the statement—that the one who sins neither sees nor knows Christ—by pointing out that the Christian’s vision and understanding are dulled by the practice of sin, which truth could not be denied by any believer who knows from personal experience the effect of sin upon his own heart. To be observed, however, is the fact that the contrast in this passage is not between spiritual and unspiritual Christians, but is between the children of God and the children of Satan. The statement of verse 7, addressed to the “little children” of God, is exceedingly forceful and vital. It is there written: “Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.” The verse declares that the only one who practices righteousness is by his new birth a partaker of the imputed righteousness of God. He not only *does* righteousness, but *is* righteous according to his eternal standing in Christ. Similarly (vs. 8), he that practiseth lawlessness is of the devil.

At this point it may clarify that which follows in this context if citation first be made of the culminative statement in verse 10: “In this [the freedom to practice sin lawlessly] the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil.” Verse 9 reads as follows: “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” Whatever specific qualities are in view under the phrase “doth not commit sin” (lit., ‘doeth no sin’), are predicated of *all* who are “born of God.” No portion of this context has been more distorted by torturing exposition than verse 9, yet the truth here disclosed is only the logical conclusion of that which has gone before concerning lawless sinning. There is no basis in this passage for the doctrine of sinless perfection on the part of some Christians which is not true of all Christians. It will be remembered that the Apostle has warned here against all

such conclusions (1:8–10). Nor does the Bible teach here, or elsewhere, that Christians do not sin. It does teach, however, that the Christian retains his Adamic, carnal nature until the day of his death, and, apart from the enabling power of the Spirit, there will be sin in the Christian's life. There is a very important difference to be observed between the two phrases *not able to sin* and *able not to sin*. The latter alone is within the divine provisions. The Bible also teaches that the Christian, being indwelt by the Holy Spirit, is possessed with a new standard of what is good or bad. His conduct either grieves, or does not grieve, the Holy Spirit. There is limitless suffering of heart in the path of the child of God who sins lawlessly. The Scriptures abound with illustrations of this suffering in the lives of saints whose history it records. David likened this heart suffering at the time of his lawless sinning to the waxing old of his bones through his roaring all day long, asserting that the heavy hand of God was upon him and that his moisture was turned into the drought of summer (Ps. 32:3–4). Paul, because of his failure to reach his spiritual ideals, testified that he was a “wretched man.” It is to be concluded, then, that the true child of God cannot sin *lawlessly* without great suffering and that suffering is due to the presence of the divine seed or nature in him. This reaction of the divine nature against sin in the Christian, which could never be experienced by unregenerate men who have not the Spirit (Jude 1:19), constitutes a ground for distinction between those who are the children of God and those who are not. There are manifold other disclosures found in the Word of God which serve to emphasize the specific character of the Christian's sin. Some of these will yet appear in that which follows.

To a certain degree there is an element of indefiniteness about God's law as expressed through conscience and through the leading of the Spirit, but that element is not lacking in the law of God as it is embodied in the Scriptures of Truth. The written law appears in three major forms or divisions according to its application in three distinct dispensations. The first is known as the Mosaic system, or the Mosaic Law which was addressed to Israel only, and was in effect from Mt. Sinai to the death of Christ. The second is the heaven-high instruction to Christians who, being perfected in Christ Jesus, are called to walk worthy of their heavenly calling. The third system will govern in the yet future kingdom age and doubtless be extended as a rule of life for Gentiles who will share Israel's earthly blessings. The difference between these governing rules of conduct, the time of their application, and the penalties related to each will yet be treated with a degree of completeness under Ecclesiology. When thus attempting a panoramic view of God's times and ways of dealing with men,

attention should be given, as before intimated, to the period between Adam and Moses—a period which is identified as before the law (Rom. 5:13; cf. Gen. 26:5). To the same end, the truth should be observed that God addressed almost no instructions directly to Gentiles. Of them it is said that they “have not the law” (Rom. 2:14), and their estate is fully described also in Ephesians 2:12, “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.” Yet, again, no rule of life is addressed to the unsaved of the present age—Jew or Gentile. To such God addresses warnings, as He does to the nations (Ps. 2:10–12), but His primary message to the unsaved is the invitation embodied in the gospel of divine grace.

A clear recognition of the important truth that the law of God presents various systems which belong to specific peoples of different ages is stated by Dr. Julius Müller:

It is evident from the hints here given regarding the relation of the moral law to the consciousness of man, that its elevation to an ever-increasing clearness of subjective conviction depends upon the progressive development of the human spirit generally; and it also follows that it must be exposed to disturbance and darkening in individuals and nations, through the force of propensities and tendencies of the will that strive against it. Hence it comes to pass that a positive revelation of the moral law—a giving of the law—appropriately finds its place in the series of God’s historical revelations to man. The Law of Moses is clearly in its moral precepts nothing more than a republication of the moral law in its intrinsic truth, suited to the wants of the Israelites; and, in order to preserve the knowledge of it in the midst of the darkening and perverting influence of human wilfulness and sin, it was necessary to have it committed to writing as an actual standard of appeal. But as the moral law was in this case embodied in a code, clothed with outward political authority and interwoven with ritualistic and civil laws, it had to accommodate itself both to the character and historical relations of the Israelites, and to the requirements of the stage of moral culture which the age had then reached. The exposition of it as a whole had therefore to be limited, and its moral principles are exhibited only in the broadest outlines. An unprejudiced consideration of the Mosaic law obliges us to allow that while it announces the eternal principles of true morality, and is ever calculated to beget the knowledge of sin and repentance, there is in the Christian Church, through the power of the pattern of holiness in Christ and of the divine Spirit, a far more developed and deeper knowledge of the law than could possibly have been given to the Israelites through Moses. —*Op. cit.*, I, 38–39

The written law does not serve to originate sin. It is stated in Romans 5:13 that “sin was in the world” before the Mosaic Law was given, though at that time, or until the law, sin was not imputed. In the light of all Scripture bearing on the period from Adam to Moses, the statement that sin was not then imputed must be interpreted as meaning that the specific things which the law introduced and were thus definitely commanded became new ideals, the breaking of which became an overt act of disobedience. These new ideals, however, were not

prescribed before the giving of the law and thus, in that earlier time, men were not charged with disobedience to commandments not yet given; but sin was in the world before the specific commands were given. The law which is “holy, and just, and good” (Rom. 7:12) does stir the reaction of the sin nature and by so much creates discord in the life. It is written, “But sin [sin nature], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead” (Rom. 7:8). The Apostle also states, “Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression” (Rom. 4:15); “Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound” (Rom. 5:20).

To say that sin is lawlessness assigns a very wide field of application to it if all forms of law are considered, yet it is more extensive and complete to assert that sin is any want of conformity to the character of God.

V. General Terms and Classifications

Concerning the precise meaning of terms which belong to the doctrine of sin, the student of theology would do well to be informed. The term *sin* is peculiar and restricted in its application. On this point Dr. A. M. Fairbairn remarks: “‘Sin’ is a religious term, intelligible only in the realm of religious experience and thought. ‘Evil’ is a philosophical term, and denotes every condition, circumstance, or act that in any manner or degree interferes with complete perfection or happiness of being, whether physical, metaphysical, or moral. ‘Vice’ is an ethical term; it is moral evil interpreted as an offence against the ideal or law given in the nature of man: it is the blot or stain left by the departure from nature. ‘Crime’ is a legal term, denotes the open or public violation of the law which a society or state has framed for its own preservation and the protection of its members. But sin differs from these in this respect:—they may be in a system which knows no God, but without God there can be no sin” (*Christ in Modern Theology*, 10th edition, p. 452).

Personal sins may be classified somewhat accurately by the familiar Biblical terms employed in the Authorized Version of both Old and New Testament to designate them.

- (1) *Transgression*, which is the stepping to one side, or the overstepping of those boundaries which God has marked off.
- (2) *Iniquity*, referring to that which is altogether wrong.
- (3) *Error*, that which disregards the right or goes astray.
- (4) *Sin*, which is coming short, or missing the mark.

(5) *Wickedness*, the outworking and expression of an evil nature, depravity.

(6) *Evil*, with reference to that which is actually wrong, opposing God.

(7) *Ungodliness*, lacking any worthy fear of God.

(8) *Disobedience*, an unwillingness to be led or guided in ways of truth.

(9) *Unbelief*, failure to trust in God. “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” Unbelief appears as the one and only “besetting sin,” which sin is universal. Men do not have individual and varied besetting sins. Each person is characterized by his failure to believe God (note Heb. 12:1–2, where the one reference to “the sin which doth so easily beset us” is set over against that faith of which Jesus is the Author and Finisher).

(10) *Lawlessness*, which consists in the persistent contempt of divine law and a breaking through all restraint to the end that self may be gratified regardless of divine admonition. The most illuminating passage—1 John 3:4–10—is rendered somewhat obscure by the translation of ἀνομία by ‘transgression.’ The discussion of this context develops the one aspect of sin which is lawlessness, as in contrast to that righteousness which impels the saved one whose new nature received from God cannot go in the ways of lawless sin. The unregenerate prove their lost estate by their ability to sin lawlessly without pain of heart—that suffering to which David referred when he said, “When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer” (Ps. 32:3–4). The child of God when sinning experiences the grieving of the Spirit of God (Eph. 4:30), which experience will keep him from that carelessness of soul termed ἀνομία—*lawlessness*. Therefore, according to 1 John 3:9, anyone born of God does not sin lawlessly. The presence of the divine nature precludes this. However, there is no reference in this passage to sinless perfection. Such perfection could not be in view at this point since what is here declared is said to be true in the case of *all* who are born of God, and not one of these is sinless before God. Similarly, the following verse (3:10) declares that this ability to sin lawlessly is a marking off of children of the devil from the children of God.

Again, personal sins may be classified according to their general aspects.

(1) As related to the divine requirements, they are either *omissions* or *commissions*.

(2) As related to the object, they are against *God*, *neighbor*, or *self*.

(3) As related to compass, they are either *inward*—of the soul—or *outward*—of the body.

(4) As related to chargeableness, they are to *self* alone, or to *others* as being

partakers in them (1 Tim. 5:22). There is probably no practice of sin which is harder to terminate than that which has drawn people into a partnership. The reason for this is clear. One cannot forsake the enterprise, as he might were he alone, without seeming to incriminate the other, or others, and to seem to be superior to the other, or others.

(5) As related to intention, they are *voluntary*, or *involuntary*, which latter may be due to ignorance, uncontrollable passion, or infirmity.

(6) As related to sinfulness, they may be *greater*, or *less*.

(7) As related to the subject, they may be that of the *unsaved*, or *saved*.

(8) As related to the divine penalty, some sins are at least *partially judged in this world*, while others are *judged in the world to come*.

(9) As related to divine forgiveness, they are *unforgiven*, or *forgiven*. A form of unforgiven sin is seen in the case of the unpardonable sin, which was committed only when Christ was here on earth, and which sin is not now possible, both because of the fact that Christ is not here as He was then nor is He in the same relation to the Holy Spirit, and because such a penalty as is imposed on those who committed the unpardonable sin sets up a direct contradiction of divine grace in salvation. There cannot be an unpardonable sin and a whosoever-will gospel at the same time.

(10) As related to their cause, they may be sins of *ignorance*, *imprudence*, *heedlessness*, *concupiscence*, *malice*, or *presumption*.

(11) As related to God as the Governor of the universe, sins are such as to call forth His *vengeance*, or such as to call forth His *longsuffering*.

VI. The Divine Remedy for Personal Sin

In a previous discussion the specific character of personal sin has been presented, and it was there pointed out that personal sin of whatever form is only the legitimate fruitage of the sin nature. However, the divine cure for personal sin, it should be observed, is of a wholly different character than the divine cure for the sin nature. Being by birth a partaker of the sin nature, there is no personal guilt charged against the individual because of that nature, though there is condemnation on the ground of the inherent unlikeness of that nature to God. On the other hand, both guilt and condemnation are attributed to the individual because of personal sin. The divine cure for personal sin is twofold, namely, (1) forgiveness and (2) justification. It is recognized that the two themes—*forgiveness* and *justification*—belong primarily to Soteriology, and under that

main division they are to be treated again. With some disregard for precise divisional boundaries it has seemed good to incorporate into this work some reference to the divine remedy for each major aspect of sin.

1. FORGIVENESS. In approaching the doctrine of the forgiveness of personal sin, three erroneous impressions, quite common indeed, may well be pointed out—one of which has to do directly with this subject. (a) In their treatment of the whole doctrine of sin, theological writers have too often restricted their discussion to the one theme of personal sin, which misleading practice has imposed incalculable limitations on the doctrine as a whole. (b) It is by many assumed that the forgiveness of personal sin is the equivalent of personal salvation. To such persons, a Christian is no more than a forgiven sinner, whereas, of upwards of thirty-three divine accomplishments which together comprise salvation, forgiveness is but one of them. (c) The distinction between divine forgiveness of the unsaved and that of the Christian must be clearly recognized, and will be so recognized in this treatment by reserving the discussion of that phase of the doctrine which concerns the Christian until a later division of this general theme is reached.

As an act of God, forgiveness is common to both Testaments, the English word *forgive*, in its various forms, being a translation of five Hebrew words and four Greek words. One of the Greek words is translated nine times by the English word *remission*. The underlying thought which the word *forgive* universally conveys when expressing the act of God is that of putting away, releasing, or pardoning. It is the taking away of sin and its condemnation from the offender, or offenders, by imputing the sin to, and imposing its righteous judgments upon, Another. Covering all generations of human life on the earth, no statement could be more conclusive than that found in Hebrews 9:22, “And without shedding of blood is no remission.” In the period covered by the Old Testament records, we find the word *forgive* used only of God in His dealing nationally or individually with Israel and her proselytes. Gentile standing before God preceding the death of Christ is described in Ephesians 2:12 wherein it is declared that they were without Christ, without commonwealth privileges, without covenant promises, without hope, and without God in the world. There is but little Scripture bearing upon the forgiveness of the sin of Gentiles in the days before Christ. Some Gentiles, we are told, did offer sacrifices, and their forgiveness is thus implied. To Israel, whether as a nation or as individuals, divine forgiveness was an act of God which was based on and followed the

offering of sacrifices (national—Num. 15:24–25, and individual—Lev. 4:31), though, being a people related to God by covenant based upon sacrifices, they were at times both nationally (Num. 14:11–20) and individually (Ps. 32:1–5) forgiven on the ground of confession of sin. When forgiveness was extended on the ground of confession, it was, as in the New Testament (cf. 1 John 1:9), made righteously possible only as based on sacrificial blood. Herein is seen the major distinction which exists between divine forgiveness and human forgiveness. At best, human forgiveness can do no more than to pass over, waive, or abandon any and all penalty that exists. In such forgiveness the injured party relinquishes all claim to any form of satisfaction which otherwise might be demanded or imposed upon the offender. Such forgiveness, so far as it ever exists, is only a voluntary gratuity in which the offended party surrenders all claim to compensation. On the other hand, divine forgiveness is never extended to the offender as an act of leniency, nor is the penalty waived, since God, being infinitely holy and upholding His government which is founded on undeviating righteousness, cannot make light of sin. Divine forgiveness is therefore extended only when the last demand or penalty against the offender has been satisfied. Since no human being could ever render divine satisfaction for his sins, God, in measureless mercy, has provided all the satisfaction, even divine propitiation, which the sinner could ever need. This is good news. The following from Dr. Henry C. Mabie is well stated: “God Himself, as Carnegie Simpson in his book, ‘The Fact of Christ,’ has so strongly shown, ‘*is the moral law, is the ethical order,*’ in a sense that no man, no earthly father is. While among men, and particularly men as forgiven sinners, ‘forgiveness to others is the first and simplest of duties, with God it is the *profoundest of problems.*’ If He as the world’s moral Governor, even with the profoundest fatherly love, forgives, He must do it in a way that will *not legitimize sin* on the one hand, and as will *win the heart* to penitence and faith on the other” (*The Divine Reason of the Cross*, p. 130).

Under the Old Testament order, the value of the divinely provided and efficacious sacrifice of Christ was accepted in anticipation and symbolized by the shedding of blood. In due time God justified that expectation, and all His acts of forgiveness which had been based upon those offerings were proved to have been righteous by the bearing by Christ of those sins which were previously forgiven (Rom. 3:25). As a verification of the fact that, in the old order, sacrifices preceded divine forgiveness of the offender, we read the following statement four times in Leviticus, chapter four: “And the priest shall make an

atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him” (vss. 20, 26, 31, 35). Correspondingly in the New Testament, divine forgiveness is invariably based on the one sacrifice for sin which Christ has made. But one passage need be cited: “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph. 1:7). If question be raised here concerning the fact that before His death Christ forgave sin, it should be remembered that such forgiveness preceded and was therefore in anticipation of His death. Being Himself the sacrificial Lamb that was to be slain who would elect to bear all sin, He said of Himself, “The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins” (Mark 2:10). However, it should be observed that divine forgiveness, being based as it is upon the perfect satisfaction which the death of Christ supplies, can be, and is, as perfect and complete in character as is the work of the Substitute on which it is based. Thus, according to Colossians 2:13, divine forgiveness is seen to reach to “all trespasses”—past, present, and future—for the one who is saved. The perfection of this transaction and the extent of it are said to be such that the believer is now on a peace footing with God—“We have peace with God” (Rom. 5:1)—and “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1). Such unqualified forgiveness belongs only to the Christian’s perfect *standing*, being “in Christ Jesus.” As a counterpart of this, there yet remains to be considered, as it will be in Chapter XXII, “The Christian’s Sin and Its Remedy,” the important divine method of dealing with those sins which the child of God commits after he is saved and the fact that he is wholly forgiven through the blood of Christ, being perfectly accepted in the Beloved.

Though, on the divine side, the freedom to forgive sin is always secured, directly or indirectly, through the blood of Christ, the requirements on the human side vary to some extent with the different ages of time. During the period between Abel and Christ, forgiveness was made, on the human side, to depend on the presentation of a specified sacrifice. During the present age, it is made to depend, for the unsaved, on faith in Christ; but for the saved, who are already under the value of Christ’s blood, forgiveness is made to depend upon confession and is impelled by the fact that God has already forgiven (Eph. 4:32). But during the coming age divine forgiveness is, on the human side, made to depend upon a willingness of the offender to forgive those who have sinned against him (Matt. 6:14–15). The two principles—forgiving to be forgiven, or forgiving because forgiven—cannot be harmonized; nor is such an effort required since they belong to different ages and represent two widely diverse

divine administrations.

It may be concluded, then, that divine forgiveness of sin in whatever age or under whatever conditions, though varying in the requirements on the human side, is always based upon the sacrifice of Christ and consists in a removal of sin in the sense that it is no longer charged against the sinner, but is charged against his Substitute. No better word can be found to express this removal of sin by forgiveness than that employed in Romans 11:27 concerning the yet future divine dealing with the sins of the nation Israel: "For this is my covenant with them, when I shall take away their sins."

2. JUSTIFICATION. The words *just* and *justify* often occur in the Bible and are usually related directly or indirectly to *justice* as an element of human character. According to Scripture usage, to be just or justified may mean no more than to be free from guilt or innocent of any charge. With respect to their characters, the Old Testament saints are described upwards of thirty times as "just" persons, and it is under that designation, it would seem, they are to appear in the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb. 12:22–24). Speaking to those who were still under the old order and by the parable of the lost sheep, Christ refers to one hundred individuals of whom ninety and nine were "just persons," needing no repentance (Luke 15:3–7). In like manner, by his good works man may be justified in the eyes of his fellow men. This is the distinctive teaching of James 2:14–26. However, of far greater import is that justification of man by God, which justification is based on the imputed righteousness of God. Of the Old Testament saints, Abraham is said to have attained unto imputed righteousness (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1–4), and David declares the man to be "blessed" unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works (Rom. 4:6; cf. Ps. 32:1–2). The Scriptures thus record the fact that Abraham attained by faith unto imputed righteousness and implies that he was justified by faith since he was not justified by works. David wrote, "For in thy sight shall no man living be justified" (Ps. 143:2), and Bildad, who expressed the beliefs of the ancients, said: "How ... can man be justified with God?" (Job 25:4). Though anticipated in the Old Testament, divine justification of men, as more fully revealed in the New Testament, is the highest consummating work, but one, of God for the believer, being surpassed only by that eternal glory which is to follow: "And whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8:30). Though the precise features of this great doctrine are set forth in the Word of God, directly or indirectly, Romish perversions and Arminian unbelief have gone far in robbing multitudes of Christians of any adequate understanding of

the benefits that justification affords them.

Imputed righteousness is secured by a vital union with Christ, while divine justification is a judicial decree of God which is based on, and is an acknowledgment of, imputed righteousness. There is a logical order —though not chronological, since each and every step is wrought simultaneously at the moment saving faith is effective—which leads to that consummating justification which is by divine decree. These steps are: (1) Upon believing, the individual enters actually and completely into the values secured for him by the death of Christ. This includes the remission of sins; but far more, indeed, since that death became the ground of divine justification. The precise rendering of Romans 4:25 is of surpassing importance as relating divine justification to the death rather than to the resurrection of Christ. We read: “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” In all, three causes for divine justification are to be distinguished: (a) a *primary*— the sovereign love of God, (b) a *meritorious*—the substitutionary death of Christ, and (c) an *instrumental*—faith. The text in question is concerned only with the meritorious cause and is one of the few texts in the New Testament bearing on this phase of the truth (cf. Rom. 5:9, where justification is declared to be by the blood of Christ; and 2 Cor. 5:21, where imputed righteousness, the ground of justification, is said to be possible because of the fact that Christ, by His death, was made to be sin for us). “It is finished,” which phrase was on the lips of Christ when about to die, would be emptied of much of its meaning if it did not witness to the fact that the basis of divine justification is established forever. By a certain group of expositors, this passage (Rom. 4:25) is taken to mean that Christ’s death is the ground of our forgiveness, while His resurrection is the ground of our justification. It is thus assumed that as sin caused Christ’s death, so justification necessitated His resurrection. On the contrary, as passages cited above imply, divine justification is based only on the death of Christ, who having secured the foundation for justification by His death, rose from the dead; for “it was not possible that he should be holden of it” (Acts 2:24). Bishop Moule stated it thus: “We sinned, therefore He suffered: we were justified, therefore He rose” (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges—Romans*, p. 98). This interpretation preserves the grammatical form, both phrases being of the same construction. It is obvious that none are actually justified until they believe, but *provisionally* the righteous ground upon which they could be justified when they do believe was secured once for all by Christ in His death. Therefore, that work being wrought, He rose from the dead.

Continuing the enumeration of the steps in their logical order which lead to divine justification, we note: (2) that the believer is, by a twofold ministry of the Spirit—namely, regeneration, by which a divine nature is imparted to the believer, which is the indwelling Christ; and the Spirit’s baptism, by which the believer is placed in Christ—so vitally and eternally related to Christ as Substitute that all that Christ is and all that He has done are imputed to the child of God. What Christ is, when reckoned to the believer, becomes the basis of his divine justification; what Christ has done becomes the basis of his divine forgiveness.

The doctrine of divine justification has ever suffered from, and at times has been all but lost by, the unwarranted supposition that it is synonymous with divine forgiveness. Though closely related as measureless benefits to the Christian, these benefits, since they point in opposite directions, are far removed the one from the other. Even the *Shorter Catechism* (Westminster)—usually dependable for accuracy of doctrine—confuses these two divine undertakings. It declares that “justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone.” Similarly, the theology of Rome states: “Not the mere remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inner man.” The Arminians go even further by stating: “Justification is a remission of sins and a sentence of pardon.” John Wesley asserted: “Justification is pardon—the forgiveness of sins.” This is but a slight improvement over the Unitarian contention that justification is only a moral change. It is true that none are justified who are not forgiven; and, with respect to that forgiveness which accompanies salvation, none are forgiven who are not justified. But divine forgiveness, often repeated in the Christian’s experience, is the *subtraction* of that which has been sinful, while once-for-all divine justification is made possible by the *addition* of that which is righteous. The act of accepting Christ as Savior is *one* act, yet it results in many specific benefits and among these are pardon and justification.

It is likewise essential to a clear understanding of the doctrine of justification that a distinction be observed between imputed righteousness and divine justification. That these two aspects of the believer’s standing are closely related is evidenced by the fact that in the original Greek they are two forms of one and the same word. Imputed righteousness, which is that righteousness from God now reckoned to the believer because of the fact that he is *in Christ*—Christ being *made* unto him the very righteousness of God (cf. Rom. 3:22; 10:3–4; 1

Cor. 1:30; 2 Cor. 5:21; Eph. 1:6; 2:13)—represents the unchangeable value which Christ becomes to all who are in Him. It is secured wholly by the believer's place in Christ and exists only by virtue of that relationship.

The letter to the Romans distinguishes four kinds of righteousness, namely, (a) God's own character (3:25; 9:14); (b) human character (10:3); (c) inwrought, or Spirit-empowered, righteousness (8:4); and (d) imputed righteousness (1:17, etc.). The last-named is that which Christ *is* and which becomes the believer's by divine imputation or reckoning, being, as it is, the legitimate benefit accruing automatically to the one who is in Christ. That righteousness of God which Christ is never ceased to be *de facto* Christ's own, nor does it ever become *de facto* any part of the believer's own character. As the wedding garment is not the person who wears it, so imputed righteousness is the believer's standing or covering, and is not antecedently the believer's own righteousness. It is true, however, that the undiminished value of imputed righteousness endures as long as the merit of Christ endures, upon which it is made to stand.

On the other hand, divine justification is the decree, or public acknowledgment, on the part of God that the believer whom He sees perfected with respect to standing, being in Christ, is justified in His sight. Thus (3) the last step in the logical order of divine undertakings leading to justification is seen to be, not the creation and bestowment of righteousness which is secured only through the believer's relation to Christ, but rather the official divine *recognition* of that righteousness. The child of God is justified by virtue of the fact that God has *declared* him to be righteous. God does not, nor could He, legalize a mere fiction, much less a falsehood. The righteousness which is the basis of His justifying decree is no less than the *absolute* righteousness of God made available through Christ and is imputed to all who believe.

Concerning the legal, equitable character of imputed righteousness and the decree of divine justification, it should be observed that, of the five typical offerings of Leviticus, chapters 1 to 5—the burnt offering, typifying Christ offering Himself without spot to God to do the Father's will; the meal offering, typifying the evenness, balance, and perfection of Christ's character; the peace offering, typifying Christ as our peace; the sin offering, typifying Christ as the Sin-bearer; and the trespass offering, typifying Christ in relation to the injury which sin has wrought against God and His rightful possessions as Creator (cf. Ps. 51:4)—the first three of these are classified as "sweet savour offerings" and the remaining two are classified as "non-sweet savour offerings." By so much it is indicated that there was that in Christ's death which was a delight to His

Father. It was a sweet incense to His Father. And, likewise, there was that in the death of Christ which was abhorrent to His Father, and this was typified by the last two offerings which were non-sweet savor.

Considering these two groups of typical offerings more at length and in their reverse order, we observe: (a) that, because of the holy character of God and the moral impossibility of His looking upon sin with the least degree of allowance, His face was turned away from the Sin-bearer. It was then that the Savior cried, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” It may well be inquired *why* the adorable Second Person of the Godhead was nailed to a cross and forsaken of the First Person. Indeed, men have advanced many answers to this question. The Word of God advances only one answer, namely, the Second Person, as the Lamb of God, is substituting as an offering in the room and stead of a lost world. As a part of the value to God of this sacrifice, the Father is able to forgive the personal sins of all those who come unto Him by Christ Jesus. When thus based upon the death of Christ, the transaction becomes legal, for when pardoning even the chief of sinners God is in no way complicated with sin nor is He condoning unrighteousness. Every penalty which His righteous government must impose upon the sinner, having fallen upon a Substitute, is perfectly answered. (b) We likewise observe that when Christ offered His own perfections to the Father, as typified by the sweet savor offerings, a legal provision was secured whereby the merit of the Son of God might be imputed to the one whom He saves. Referring to the Father’s delight in this aspect of the death of His Son, we read in Hebrews 10:6–7—words spoken by the Son to His Father when the Son came into the world (vs. 5)—“In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come ... to do thy will O God.” The contrast which is here presented should not be passed over inattentively. The word of the Son that He received a sacrificial body (vs. 5), implies that His sacrifice will be well-pleasing to His Father as former burnt offerings and sacrifices (note that He here relates His death to the sweet savor offerings) had not been. In that aspect of Christ’s death, typified by the sweet savor offerings, the Father’s face is not turned away, but in this He finds delight; for the Second Person then “offered himself without spot to God” (Heb. 9:14). If the question be asked why the Second Person of the blessed Trinity is on a cross offering His perfections to the First Person, it may be answered: Certainly He is not making that offering as a revelation to the Father, for every perfection of the Son has been known by the Father throughout all eternity. It is rather that, since fallen man possesses no merit before God of his own, the Son, as Substitute, is offering His own perfect

merit to the Father for him. Thus a legal ground is secured whereon God is free, not only to forgive according to the non-sweet savor offering type, but is likewise free to impute all the perfections of His Son according to the sweet savor offering type to the one whom He saves.

We thus conclude that divine justification is not a mere removal of personal sins by forgiveness, but it is rather a divine decree which declares the believer to be eternally clothed with the righteousness of God; it has no relation to the resurrection of Christ, but is based only upon His death. Justification is a divine act which is equitable to an infinite degree, and, though in no conflict with human reason, is knowledge-surpassing in its magnitude and glory. Divine justification is a bit of heaven's perfection brought down to earth. It is so harmonious to divine jurisprudence that God is said to be *just* when He justifies a sinner who does no more than to *believe* in Jesus (Rom. 3:26). Divine justification, being legally equitable, will be defended by God to the end of eternity. In fact, the same righteousness which once condemned the sinner will, when that sinner is justified, defend his perfect standing in Christ forever. The chief end of man, we are told, is to glorify God. This every created being will do, for God has created no being who will not contribute to His eternal glory. Each and every one will either demonstrate His grace in all its perfections (Eph. 2:7), or display His wrath (Rom. 9:22) in all the ages to come. Divine justification is a feature of the divine cure for personal sin. It extends, also, to every other aspect of man's unlikeness to God, and answers every challenge that could be brought against the one who is saved through faith in Christ.

VII. Original Sin

The term *original sin* carries with it at least two implications, namely, (1) the first sin of the race and (2) the state of man in all subsequent generations, which state is due to that original sin. The latter meaning of this term is assigned an entire section of the present main division of this discussion. The former meaning of the term is the one reason for the introduction of this topic under *personal sin*; for the first sin of Adam, which wrought his ruin and that of the race, was a *personal* sin. Much has been written about the specific nature of that original sin which does not call for restatement other than to point out that every human sin is of the same nature as the original sin, and, were the one who sins placed as Adam was placed as the federal, unfallen head of a race, the commonest sin in human life would have in it the power to cause the fall of the

one who sinned as well as the entire race which he represented. The obvious effect of the first sin serves as one of the best measurements of the evil character of all sin.

VIII. Guilt

The *New Standard Dictionary* (1913 ed.) defines *guilt* as “the state of one who has consciously disobeyed God and is therefore under the divine condemnation.” From the theological point of view, this definition is defective. Sin is not a matter of *consciousness* of evil. Being, as it is, against God, and drawing its evil character from the fact that it is unlike God, sin is evil whether the sinner realizes it to be such or not. A distinction thus arises between *blameworthiness*, which must be tempered by extenuating circumstances, and *guilt*, which in its primary meaning refers to the historical fact that a certain sin was committed by a certain individual. No better illustration will be found of the mitigation which may determine blameworthiness than the experience of the Apostle Paul as a persecutor of the Church. He writes: “Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief” (1 Tim. 1:13). On the other hand, guilt, and sometimes blameworthiness, belong to the individual where his own estimation concerning himself would not coincide. Christ taught that a glance of the eye was equivalent to adultery (Matt. 5:27–28).

In its historical aspect, the guilt of sin committed will never be changed; it could not be transferred to any other person. God in grace may forget it and mention it no more forever, having removed all penalty and condemnation. The historical record remains unchanged. There is, however, an aspect of guilt, as related to theology, which considers it as an obligation to law. This may be discharged by punishment endured or transferred to another who as substitute suffers the penalty for the guilty person. Christ bore our guilt, not historically, which would mean that He became the actual doer of the crimes of men, but in the sense that the sin of man is an obligation to divine justice. As Substitute, He died “the just for the unjust.” In this undertaking He never *became* the unjust, but as the just He bore the burden which was ever the rightful portion of the unjust.

The problem of guilt because of the sin nature is one which has divided the two major schools of theology, the Calvinistic and the Arminian. This phase of this discussion appears in the following section.

It remains to observe that concerning guilt, even as an obligation to God, no

sinner could ever discharge his own responsibility. Human effort or suffering will not avail in time or eternity. The obligation is too vast. This truth must be stressed constantly. It therefore follows that, apart from the perfect relief which is provided in Christ's forensic, substitutionary sufferings, the sinner must remain guilty before God in every sense of the word and for all eternity. On the basis of this truth, it is justly argued that, in respect to duration, the penalty continues forever, or as long as the unchangeable guilt endures. As long as the cause for penalty exists, there is reason for it to continue—the same reason which determined its infliction at all. The human mind dreams of a time when penalty will have been paid and relief earned by the sinner, but this is to assert that the sinner can pay the price of sin, which is never true. The *fact* of guilt and the *consciousness* of it are immeasurable realities. Carlyle, writing in his *French Revolution* (III.1:4), states regarding the reality of guilt:

From the purpose of crime to the act of crime there is an abyss; wonderful to think of. The finger lies on the pistol; but the man is not yet a murderer; nay, his whole nature staggering at such a consummation, is there not a confused pause rather—one last instant of possibility for him? Not yet a murderer; it is at the mercy of light trifles whether the most fixed idea may not yet become unfixed. One slight twitch of a muscle, the death-flash bursts; and he is *it*, and will for Eternity be it; and Earth has become a penal Tartarus for him; his horizon girdled now not with golden hope, but with red flames of remorse; voices from the depths of Nature sounding, Woe, woe on him! Of such stuff are we all made; on such powder-mines of bottomless guilt and criminality—"if God restrained not," as is well said—does the purest of us walk? There are depths in man that go to the length of lowest Hell, as there are heights that reach highest Heaven—for are not both Heaven and Hell made out of him, made by him, everlasting miracle and mystery as he is?—Cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 723

In the midst of the awful truth regarding the eternity of guilt and its consequences, no small comfort is accorded those who embrace that inexhaustible, immutable, and perfect salvation which the substitutionary work of Christ affords. Not only is there "peace with God" through our Lord Jesus Christ and a perfect relationship secured which is no less than a justification which God accomplishes to His own satisfaction, but He will remember against the saved one no more those sins with their guilt which He has taken on His own breast in the Person of His Son. Thus by forgiveness and justification even the historical aspect of guilt is relieved beyond comprehension for those who believe.

IX. Universality

That the entire race, except One, have been, and are, sinners by practice is the

teaching of the Bible and is confirmed by every candid observation. Richard Watson cites five striking proofs of the universality of human sin. These are as headings in the extended discussion which he offers in his *Institutes* (II, 61–66).

1. That in all ages great, and even general wickedness has prevailed among those large masses of men which are called *nations*.

2. The second fact to be accounted for is, the strength of that tendency to the wickedness which we have seen to be general.

3. The third fact is, that the seeds of the vices which exist in society may be discovered in children in their earliest years; selfishness, envy, pride, resentment, deceit, lying, and often cruelty; and so much is this the case, so explicitly is this acknowledged by all, that it is the principal object of the moral branch of education to restrain and correct those evils, both by coercion, and by diligently impressing upon children, as their faculties open, the evil and mischief of all such affections and tendencies.

4. The fourth fact is, that every man is conscious of a natural tendency to many evils.

5. The fifth fact is, that, even after a serious wish and intention has been formed in men to renounce these views, and “to live righteously, soberly, and godly,” as becomes creatures made to glorify God, and on their trial for eternity, strong and constant resistance is made by the passions, appetites, and inclinations of the heart at every step of the attempt.

The Scriptures bear an uncomplicated testimony to the sinfulness of man; even the sins of those who wrote the Bible are exposed. The Old Testament declares: “For there is no man that sinneth not” (1 Kings 8:46); “For in thy sight shall no man living be justified” (Ps. 143:2); “Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?” (Prov. 20:9); “For there is not a just man on the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not” (Eccl. 7:20). With the same end in view, the New Testament is even more emphatic. The universal practice of sin is presupposed by Christ (cf. Matt. 4:17; Mark 1:15; 6:12; Luke 24:47; John 3:3–5). The preaching of the gospel is itself an implication that salvation is needed by all. Apart from redemption, man is wrong in the sight of God. Those who fail to receive the saving grace of God are in every instance condemned. The very universality of Christ’s death indicates the truth that God sees a lost world of men for whom He gave His Son (2 Cor. 5:14–15). Many direct statements appear in the New Testament. A few only need be quoted: “What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin” (Rom. 3:9); “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin” (Rom. 3:19–20); “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:23); “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe”

(Gal. 3:22); “If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us” (1 John 1:10).

The experience of personal sin is so closely related to the fact of the sin nature that any discussion of the one involves the other. Men have sought to modify the teachings of the Bible on the sinfulness of sin, and they have denied the doctrine of the sin nature; but none from the earliest of heathen philosophers to the leaders of modern thought have denied the universality of sin.

The truth relative to personal sin, though extended, is but a portion of the whole doctrine of sin; therefore this discussion advances to the transmitted sin nature.

Chapter XIX

THE TRANSMITTED SIN NATURE

AS EVERY EFFECT must have its cause, there is a cause or reason for the fact that personal sin is universal. That cause is the sin nature—sometimes styled the *Adamic nature*, *inborn sin*, *original sin*, or the *old man*. By whatever term it is indicated, the reference is to a reality which originated with Adam and has been transmitted from Adam to all his race. The effect of the first sin upon unfallen Adam was a degeneration—a conversion downwards. As an immediate result of that first sin, Adam became a different kind of being from that which God had created, and the law of generation obtained, which sees to it that reproduction by any living thing will be “after its kind.” Of the Adamic nature which Adam gained by disobedience, John Calvin writes in his *Institutes*, II. 2:12: “Since God is the author of nature, how comes it that no blame attaches to God if we are lost by nature? I answer, there is a twofold nature: The one produced by God, and the other is corruption of it. We are not born such as Adam was at first created” (cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 196). Adam’s experience was unique beyond all other members of his race—save One. Adam became a sinner by sinning. Every other member of the race—save One—sins because he is a sinner by birth. In Adam’s case a personal sin caused the sin nature; in the case of all other human beings—save One—the sin nature causes personal sins. The fact that sinners sin should create no surprise; and while this truth does not mitigate the sinfulness of personal sin, it is clear that God fully anticipates that where the root is evil the fruit will be evil also. Where the fountain is bitter the water will be bitter also. The divine reasonableness proposes to deal with the root that is evil and the fountain that is bitter. At once, when this aspect of truth is approached, deep and far-reaching problems—more or less metaphysical—are encountered. Nothing could be more useless than are those systems which propose to deal with sin’s manifestations and not at all with the cause. It is the folly of treating symptoms without any effort to identify and correct the cause. In the *Expositor* (I–IX, 21), Dr. George Matheson says, “There is the same difference between the Christian and Pagan idea of prayer as there is between the Christian and Pagan idea of sin. Paganism knows nothing of sin, it knows only sins; it has no conception of the principle of evil, it comprehends only a succession of sinful acts” (cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas in *The Principles of Theology*, p. 161). Another folly may be identified in the rationalistic notion that

the Adamic nature may be eradicated through some so-called *second work of grace*. As is always the case, normal experience runs true to sound Biblical doctrine. Not only does the Bible lend no sanction to this eradication idea, but human experience contradicts it without exception. As Dr. Müller well says concerning a similar error, “This theory does not explain the real facts of our moral life and consciousness; it gives them the lie, and the facts avenge themselves by taking no notice of the theory” (*The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, I, 30). This phase of this general theme pertains wholly to the Christian life and experience and will be resumed under a subsequent division of this study. In fact, nothing belongs to this division—as it concerns the unregenerate—other than the general proofs which establish the truth regarding the sin nature as a vital part of every unregenerate person.

Since the sin of Adam merited the penalty of death, attention is again directed to that penalty in its three forms. Apart from revelation, men gain vague notions about the experience termed *death*. Revelation alone explains its origin, present universal sway, and its future termination. Death is an intruder into God’s creation. As created, man was as immortal as the angels. The history is plainly written. God said to Adam concerning the forbidden fruit, “In the day that thou eatest thereof, ‘dying thou shalt die.’” The death thus promised and afterwards executed in judgment, embraced spiritual death, which is the separation of soul and spirit from God; second death, which is the permanent form of spiritual death or eternal separation of soul and spirit from God; and physical death, which is the separation of soul and spirit from the body. Upon his repudiation of God by disobedience, Adam came at once into the experience of spiritual death. He was doomed to the second death, except he should be redeemed, and then he began the process of physical death, which process in due time came to its full completion.

As physical death is related to imputed sin (yet to be examined), spiritual death is related to the transmitted sin nature. This nature manifests itself along two lines—inclination to evil, by which it is usually identified; and depravity, which is the inability to do good in the manner which is pleasing to God. Spiritual death is evidenced in both of these features, though, since death is so universally associated with cessation, it is perhaps easier to relate spiritual death with the incapacity to do good than to associate it with the inclination to evil. The truth to be stressed by which much confusion may be clarified is that spiritual death is not the cessation of any form of life. It is rather life to its full measure as separate from God. The state of spiritual death is well described with

its activities in Ephesians 2:1–3: “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others” and Ephesians 4:18–19: “Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.”

Spiritual death and the sin nature are alike, then, in these respects that each manifests life in separation from the knowledge of God, from the life of God, from the power of God, and from the benefits of His grace. Spiritual death is a state. The sin nature is fallen man attempting to live in that state.

It remains to be seen that both spiritual death and the sin nature are transmitted *mediately* from parent to child in all generations. There is no apparent diminishing of the force and character of this perverted life. The last child born into the race is as affected with spiritual death and as saturated with the sin nature as was Cain who received his evil tendency immediately from his father, Adam.

I. The Fact of the Sin Nature

In seeking to analyze more specifically what the sin nature is, it should be remembered that it is a perversion of God’s original creation and in that sense is an abnormal thing. Every faculty of man is injured by the fall, and the disability to do good and the strange predisposition to evil arise from that inner confusion.

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd has written at length on the injury to the original man by sin and the peculiar characteristics of the sin nature. He asserts:

Viewed as natural corruption, original sin may be considered with respect to the *understanding*. (a) It is blindness. Is. 42:7, “A light to open blind eyes.” Luke 4:18, “Recovering of sight to the blind.” Rev. 3:17, “Knowest not that thou art blind.” 2 Cor. 4:4, “The god of this world hath blinded their minds.” All texts that speak of regeneration as “enlightening.” 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 5:14; 1 Thess. 5:5; Ps. 97:11, etc. All texts that call sin “darkness.” Prov. 4:19; Is. 60:2; Eph. 5:11; Col. 1:13; 1 John 2:11; 1 Thess. 5:4; Eph. 4:18, “Having the understanding darkened;” Rom. 1:28, “Reprobate mind.” Sin blinds and darkens the understanding, by destroying the *consciousness* of divine things. For example, the soul destitute of love to God is no longer conscious of love; of reverence, is no longer conscious of reverence, etc. Its knowledge of such affections, therefore, is from hearsay, like that which a blind man has of colors, or a deaf man of sound. God, the object of these affections, is of course unknown for the same reason. The spiritual discernment, spoken of in 1 Cor. 2:6, is the

immediate consciousness of a renewed man. It is experimental knowledge. Sin is described in Scripture as voluntary ignorance. "This they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old," 2 Pet. 3:5. Christ says to the Jews: "If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin:" the sin, namely, of "not knowing him that sent me," John 15:21, 22. But the ignorance, in this case, was a willing ignorance. They desired to be ignorant.

Another effect of original sin upon the understanding as including the conscience is: (b) Insensibility. It does not render conscience extinct, but it stupefies it. 1 Tim. 4:2, "having cauterized their own conscience." (c) Pollution. Titus 1:15, "Even their reason and conscience are polluted," or stained. Rom. 1:21, "They became vain in their reasonings," or speculations. The pollution of reason is seen in the foolish speculations of mythology. The myths of polytheism are not pure reason. The pollution of conscience is seen in remorse. The testifying faculty is spotted with guilt. It is no longer a "good conscience:" spoken of in Heb. 13:18; 1 Pet. 3:16, 21; 1 Tim. 1:5, 19; Acts 23:1; nor a "pure conscience:" mentioned in 1 Tim. 3:9. It is an "evil conscience": a conscience needing cleansing by atoning blood "from dead works," Heb. 9:14. Dead works, being no fulfilment of the law, leave the conscience perturbed and unpacified.

Considered with respect to the *will*, original sin is: (a) Enmity. Rom. 8:6; James 4:4, "The friendship of the world is enmity towards God;" Deut. 1:26, "They rebelled against God;" Job 34:37; Is. 1:1; 30:9; 45:2; Ezek. 12:2. (b) Hatred. Rom. 1:29; Ps. 89:23; 139:21; Ex. 20:5; Prov. 1:25; 5:12; John 7:7; 15:18, 23, 24. (c) Hardness of heart, or insensibility. Ex. 7:14, 22; 2 Kings 17:14; Job 9:4; Is. 63:17; Dan. 5:20; John 12:20; Acts 19:9; Heb. 3:8, 15; 4:7. (d) Aversion. John 5:40, "Ye will not," ye are disinclined; Rev. 2:21. (e) Obstinacy. Deut. 31:27, "stiff-necked;" Ex. 32:9; Ps. 75:5; Is. 26:10; 43:4; Acts 7:51; Rom. 10:21. (f) Bondage. Jer. 13:23; Mark 3:23; John 6:43, 44; 8:34; Rom. 5:6; 6:20; 7:9, 14, 18, 23; 8:7, 8; 9:16; 2 Pet. 2:14.—*Dogmatic Theology*, II, 196–98

Following this exhaustive statement regarding the condition of the understanding and will as influenced by the fallen nature, Dr. Shedd writes with equal force on the question of the fallen nature and its guilt. This issue which has so divided the two major schools—Calvinists and Arminians—is not only clearly stated by Dr. Shedd in defense of the Calvinistic view, but that which he has written serves to expose the shallow rationalism which the Arminian notion presents. Dr. Shedd declares:

Original sin, considered as corruption of nature, is sin in the sense of *guilt*. ... "Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and made subject to death, temporal and eternal." Westminster Confession, VI.vi. "Corruption of nature doth remain in those that are regenerated, and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself and all the motions thereof are truly and properly sin." Westminster Confession, VI.v. The Semi-Pelagian, Papal, and Arminian anthropologies differ from the Augustinian and Reformed, by denying that corruption of nature is guilt. It is a physical and mental disorder leading to sin, but is not sin itself.

Corruption of nature is guilt because: (a) The scriptures do not distinguish between sin proper, and improper. ἁμαρτία, as denoting the principle of sin, is exchanged with παράπτωμα, denoting the act of sin, and vice versa. Rom. 5:13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21. (b) ἁμαρτία is the equivalent of ἐπιθυμία and σάρξ. Rom. 7:7, "I had not known sin, except the law had said, Thou shalt not lust." Rom. 8:3, 5. (c) The remainders of corruption in the regenerate are hated as sin by the regenerate himself, Rom. 7:15; and by God, who slays them by his Spirit, Rom. 8:13. (d) Evil desire is

forbidden in the tenth commandment, Ex. 20:17. Compare 1 John 2:16. The tenth commandment ... prohibits that internal lusting which is the chief characteristic of the corrupt nature. It is also forbidden by Christ in his exposition of the seventh commandment. Matt. 5:28. 1 John 3:15, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." (e) Corruption of nature is guilt, because it is the inclination of the will. It is "voluntary" though not "volitional." It is conceded that the inclination to murder is as truly culpable as the act of murder. "The thought of foolishness is sin," Prov. 24:9. (f) Corruption of nature is guilt, upon the principle that the cause must have the same predicates as its effects. If actual transgressions are truly and properly sin, then the evil heart or inclination which prompts them must be so likewise. If the stream is bitter water, the fountain must be also. If the murderer's act is guilt, then the murderer's hate is. (g) If corruption of nature, or sinful disposition is not guilt, then it is an extenuation and excuse for actual transgressions. These latter are less blameworthy, if the character which prompts them and renders their avoidance more difficult is not self-determined and culpable. (h) If corruption of nature is not culpable, it is impossible to assign a reason why the dying infant needs redemption by atoning blood. Christ came "by water and blood," that is, with both expiating and sanctifying power. 1 John 5:6. But if there be no guilt in natural depravity, Christ comes to the infant "by water only," and not "by blood;" by sanctification, and not by justification. Infant redemption implies that the infant has guilt as well as pollution. The infant has a rational soul; this soul has a will; this will is inclined; this inclination, like that of an adult, is centred on the creature instead of the Creator. This is culpable, and needs pardon. It is also pollution, and needs removal. (i) God forgives original sin as well as actual transgression, when he bestows the "remission of sins." The "carnal mind," or the enmity of the heart is as great an offence against his excellence and honor, as any particular act that issues from it. Indeed, if there be mutual good-will between two parties an occasional outward offence is less serious. "Suppose," says Thirlwall (*Letters*, p. 46), "two friends really loving one another, but liable now and then to quarrel. They may easily forgive the occasional offence, because their habitual disposition is one of mutual good-will; but should the case be the reverse—hatred stifled, but occasionally venting itself by unfriendly acts—how little would it matter though they should forget the particular offence, if the enmity should continue at the bottom of the heart." This illustrates the guilt of sin as a state of the heart towards God, and the need of its forgiveness and removal.—*Ibid.*, II, 198–200

Defining the sin nature, Melancthon wrote that it is "the present disturbed constitution of our nature" (*Apologia*, Art. i, pp. 51, 53, cited by Müller, *op. cit.*, II, 268). Comparing fallen man with the animals, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas (*Op. cit.*, p. 157) states, "The certainty and consciousness of this in man is a characteristic of him in relation to other animals, for of none else can it be said that they are out of harmony with the law of their nature."

Were it not for a secondary meaning of the word *nature*, it would not be a proper designation as it is now being used. A nature, primarily, is a thing created by God, such as the unfallen human nature which reflected the image and likeness of God. In its secondary meaning, the term *nature* designates the perversion, with its unholy dispositions, which the fall engendered.

Concerning the general unwisdom of discursion respecting the mere metaphysical aspects of the fallen nature, Dr. James Denney says, "It is a mistake, in all probability, in discussing this subject, to enter into metaphysical considerations at all; the question of man's inability to any spiritual good

accompanying salvation is a question as to matter of fact, and is to be answered ultimately by an appeal to experience. When a man has been discovered, who has been able, *without Christ*, to reconcile himself to God, and to obtain dominion over the world and over sin, *then* the doctrine of inability, or of the bondage due to sin, may be denied; *then*, but *not till then*” (*Studies in Theology*, p. 85, cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *ibid.*, p. 164). And, having this same nature in mind under the term *depravity*, Dr. Denney points out, also, the important truth that the nature of fallen man is a unity and every part is injured equally. He states, “What it means is not that every individual is as bad as he can be, a statement so transparently absurd that it should hardly have been attributed to any one, but that the depravity which sin has produced in human nature extends to the whole of it. There is no part of man’s nature which is unaffected by it. Man’s nature is all of a piece, and that which affects it at all affects it altogether. When the conscience is violated by disobedience to the will of God, the moral understanding is darkened, and the will is enfeebled. We are not constructed in water-tight compartments, one of which might be ruined while the others remain intact; what touches us for harm, with a corrupting, depraving touch, at a single point, has effects throughout our nature none the less real that they may be for a time beneath consciousness” (*Ibid.*, p. 83, cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas, *ibid.*, p. 165).

Added to those passages which have been cited earlier in proof of the universality of personal sin—most of which applies as fully to the sin nature—are uncounted passages which speak of moral evil as a characteristic, or distinguishing mark, not of individual or classes of men in certain localities, but of human nature as it is under all circumstances—excepting only those who are regenerate, of whom specific facts are revealed bearing on that nature. The unregenerate man is styled the *natural* man; certainly not natural in the sense that he reflects his original unfallen state, but natural, or soulish, in the sense that he, being perverted in all his ways, is true to the fallen racial condition which is ever the same. Only illustrative passages need be cited. These will serve to represent what is the invariable witness of the Bible concerning the estate of fallen man in the sight of God.

Genesis 8:21. “And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.” Strangely, this direct and conclusive estimation of fallen man is uttered by Jehovah in the midst of His promise of

everlasting mercy. This evil state to which Jehovah refers, is not originated by each individual for himself; it was thus from the beginning.

Psalm 14:2–3. “The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” This revealing passage is quoted by the Apostle in the midst of the extended indictment against the whole race which is recorded in Romans 3:9–19, and the Apostle’s statement is of such importance that it too should be quoted in full: “What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” While this and other passages name the various manifestations of the sin nature, they also imply the existence of that nature as the source of evil in man.

Psalm 51:5. “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Of all the Old Testament testimony, none is more convincing than this. In verse 3 David has confessed his great sin. In verse 4 he sees it as a sin against God alone, regardless of the fact that he had committed so great a crime against certain individuals and outraged the whole kingdom of Israel. Compared to this, however, in verse 6 he states that which is well-pleasing to God.

Jeremiah 17:5, 9. “Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD. The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” The divine estimation of fallen and degenerate man could hardly be spoken more clearly. In the one passage the declaration is made that man is, in character, opposite to Jehovah. In no sense is dependence to be placed on man. In the other passage, it is directly said that man is not moderately evil. As Jehovah sees him, he is “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” It is also indicated that, with all his vanity and baseless conceit, man does not know the truth respecting himself.

John 3:6. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” What Dr. Julius Müller has written as a comment on this passage is worthy of reprint. He says:

As to the New Testament, with the older theologians and with some of our modern divines, John 3:6 has been regarded as the standard authority for the doctrine of man’s inborn sinfulness: “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.” Taken in connection with what precedes, this declaration of Christ clearly proves the fact of corruption attaching to human nature, seeing that He makes participation in His kingdom dependent upon a thorough renewal, wrought by the Holy Spirit. This universal necessity for a new birth (see John 3:3, 5, 1:12, 13; Tit. 3:5; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23), this beginning and development of a new life, implies not only that sin is already present in every human being, but that it has struck its roots deep into the nature which man inherits from his birth. In like manner, the Apostle Paul regards renewal in Christ Jesus as a universal law of human life, and describes it as the “putting off,” or “death” of “the old man,” Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:9, compare v. 3; Rom. 6:3–6. Attempted explanations of these passages, which really explain nothing—*e.g.*, that the old man is “the power of vice, confirmed by habit,”—do not require refutation.—*Op. cit.*, II, 276

Romans 1:18–8:13. In this context—too extensive for quotation—as is fitting in view of the truth that this epistle presents the central revelation concerning salvation from the sin nature as well as from personal sin, the corruption of the whole race is pictured more fully than elsewhere in the Bible. The passage should be weighed with this consideration in view.

1 Corinthians 7:14. Special attention is given to this text—partly because it contributes much to this general line of proof, and partly because it is but seldom employed in this connection. The passage reads, “The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the [believing] wife, and the unbelieving wife sanctified by the [believing] husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.” The uncleanness mentioned is clearly the state at birth of every child except for the influence of even one Christian parent. The Christian parent does not remove the sin nature from the child, but the child is *set apart* as different by the Christian parent. If, however, the parent cannot remove the sanctified child’s fallen nature, how certainly those who are unclean are under the power of that nature!

Ephesians 2:3. “Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.” Direct and conclusive testimony is not wanting in this Scripture. It is a matter of *nature* which classifies the whole human family as “children of wrath”—as all are apart from the redeeming grace of God.

Galatians 5:17–21. “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit

against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” The Apostle here defines the works of the *flesh*. This term and its meaning have been developed previously at some length and must yet reappear under other aspects of doctrine. The ethical meaning of σάρξ, as used by the Apostle, carries it back to human nature and to its corruption. The works of the flesh are here set forth in contrast to the “fruit of the Spirit” (cf. vs. 18 with vs. 22). The works of the flesh have nothing to commend them. The conclusion of the matter is that man is by nature, as Jeremiah states, “desperately wicked.”

Additional Scriptures bearing on man’s fallen nature, which should be examined, are: Genesis 6:5; Job 11:12; 15:14, 16; Psalm 58:2–5; 94:11; 130:3; 143:2; Proverbs 21:8; Ecclesiastes 7:20; 9:3; Isaiah 64:6; Jeremiah 13:23; 16:12; Hosea 6:7; Matthew 7:11; 12:34; 15:19; 16:23; Luke 1:79; John 3:18–19; 8:23; 14:17; Romans 3:9; 6:20; 1 Corinthians 2:14; 3:3; Galatians 3:22; Colossians 1:13, 21; 2:13; 3:5–7; 2 Timothy 3:2; 1 Peter 1:18; 4:2; 2 Peter 1:4; 1 John 1:8; 2:16; 5:19.

II. The Remedy for the Sin Nature

Contemplation of the remedy for the sin nature at once involves issues wholly within that field of truth which belongs to the Christian and must, properly, be reserved for that division of this theme. The unregenerate may be told that upon becoming regenerate they will be accorded a twofold provision whereby the sin nature may be divinely dealt with. They may look on to such an experience the same as they may anticipate forgiveness and justification, though, since all that enters into the remedy for the sin nature so relates only to the problems of the Christian’s daily life, the divine dealing with the sin nature is not at any time included in the offers which the gospel of the grace of God extends to the unsaved. On the other hand, the sin nature enters largely into the need of salvation which is represented by all the unsaved. No more misleading message can be given by sincere men than when the unsaved are told that they are lost because of their personal sins. To this they might reply that, since they had never

been even one per cent as sinful as they might have been, they are only one per cent lost. Such reasoning naturally follows that form of preaching which bases man's lost estate on the personal sins committed. Man is lost by *nature*—born a lost soul, with no hope apart from the redeeming blood of Christ. A much more weighty appeal is made when the need of salvation is made to reach to the root of all the evil ever wrought. The twofold remedy is (a) the judgment for believers of the sin nature by Christ on the cross, and (b) the gift of the indwelling Spirit as One who is able to give victory over every evil disposition. God has judged the sin nature for believers, else it could not be said, as it is, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1).

In conclusion it may be restated that at the beginning God declared concerning man that he was "very good," but after fifteen hundred years of human history, Jehovah said of man "that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5), and more than two thousand years later He said, "They are all under sin ... there is none righteous, no, not one ... there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Rom. 3:9–12). This contrast is as strong as language can make it. Theologians have differed on certain phases of the doctrine of sin, but there is a notable agreement among them concerning the universality of sin. This agreement may be accounted for on the basis of the fact that the Word of God is exceedingly clear in its testimony with respect to the sinfulness of man, and, also, on the fact that human observation so fully corroborates the Scriptures. The doctrine of depravity is often rejected through misunderstanding. This doctrine does not imply that there is no good to be seen in men as men observe each other; it rather asserts that, because of the fallen nature, God sees nothing in them which commends them to Himself. They are only objects of His grace. It is significant that the drastic indictments against the whole race which appear in the New Testament are quotations from the Old Testament, thus demonstrating that the Bible is a unit in its testimony on the doctrine of depravity. There are special privileges and covenants which are extended to the Jew, but, in the matter of sin and a divinely provided remedy, "there is no difference." As Dr. Timothy Dwight states, when writing of the universality of sin, "In truth, no doctrine of the Scriptures is expressed in more numerous, or more various, forms; or in terms more direct, or less capable of misapprehension" (*Theology*, Sermon 29). Added to this, it may be observed that the fact of universal human sinfulness and depravity is implied in the provision of a sacrifice for sin whether typical or antitypical; in the Bible's emphasis upon

the universal need of regeneration; in the disclosure that the human body is injured and, in the case of the saved, will yet be redeemed; and in the fact that “God ... now commandeth all men everywhere to repent” (Acts 17:30).

From the original sin, as a fontal cause, far-reaching, universal results have been realized by Adam’s posterity. The doctrine of original sin divides into two branches of truth which are, notably, quite unrelated other than that they proceed from the same source. One branch has to do with original corruption, which is spiritual death, while the other has to do with original guilt, with its penalty of physical death. Though the term *original sin* is more frequently used in reference to the former, it is, also, as properly a designation of the latter. The first division of the doctrine of original sin, which is original corruption, or spiritual death, contends that the whole race has inherited from its first progenitor a vitiated nature which is ever and incurably at enmity with God, being, in His sight, wholly depraved and spiritually dead, and is the root from which, as fruit, evil thoughts, words, and actions spring. The doctrine contends that Adam is the first and only member of the race who has become a sinner by sinning; all other members from the first to the last are born sinners and sin, not to *become* sinners, but because they *are* sinners. They do not die spiritually by sinning, but are born spiritually dead. The doctrine contends, likewise, that this fact of corruption in nature and spiritual death is the first and all-important ground of divine judgment upon the race; and that evil works, as wicked as they may be, are but the reasonable manifestation of that corrupt nature. Similarly, apart from the fact of the corrupt nature, it is impossible to demonstrate to the lost the need of the full saving grace of God. On the other hand, the full saving grace of God is needed in the salvation of the lost because of the fact that the whole being of man is depraved and spiritually dead. It is beside the point to argue that man is not to blame for the nature received by birth. Though born in poverty and ignorance, the individual is justified in doing what may be done to correct these limitations; but how much more is one justified in claiming God’s relief from the lost estate in which he is born when it is remembered that God, in infinite love and at infinite cost, has provided that relief!

With various theories concerning man’s lost estate this study, for want of space, cannot be concerned. The fact that a fallen nature received *mediately* from Adam (a) is established by the Scriptures, (b) is observable in all history, and (c) is witnessed to by the consciousness of man, should terminate all argument. These evidences may be considered in their reverse order:

(a) Human consciousness of an evil nature or disposition is practically

universal, extending to the earliest records of human experience. Aristotle declared, "There appears another something besides the reason natural to us which fights and struggles against the reason." Kant said, " 'That the world lieth in wickedness,' is a lament as old as history, nay, as old as the oldest poetry." The Apostle Paul witnessed of himself, "The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." Such, indeed, is the consciousness of all thoughtful men relative to themselves.

(b) The record of history which demonstrates the evil nature of man is inexhaustible. "Man's inhumanity to man," war, inquisition, murder, prostitution, slavery, drunkenness, cruelty, falsehood, avarice, covetousness, pride, unbelief, and hatred of God, all, and very much more, have their share in the history of the race.

(c) To those who are subject to God's Word, the Scriptures are explicit and a final authority. The testimony of the Scriptures has been cited above.

Chapter XX

IMPUTED SIN

THE THEOLOGICAL meaning of the word *impute* is ‘to attribute or reckon over something to a person.’ It is usually vicarious in the sense that the thing attributed is derived from another. The nature of imputation is to be seen in the Apostle’s word to Philemon concerning Onesimus, “If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account” (Philemon 1:17–18). Similarly, the same Apostle writes of the Gentiles, “Shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?” Two original words appear in the New Testament text which carry the idea of imputation—ἐλλογέω, used but twice (Rom. 5:13; Philemon 1:18), and λογίζομαι, used 41 times, 16 of which are in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Though a broad field in the selection of words is observable in the Authorized Version translation, the essential thought of imputation is always present. In the matter of man’s relation to God, the Bible presents three major imputations: (a) imputation of the Adamic sin to the human race, (b) imputation of the sin of man to the Substitute, Christ, and (c) an imputation of the righteousness of God to the believer. Imputation may be either *real* or *judicial*. That which is real is the reckoning to one of that which is antecedently his, while judicial imputation is the reckoning to one of that which is not antecedently his. Had the trespass mentioned in 2 Corinthians 5:19 been imputed to those mentioned—as naturally it would have been—it would have been a real imputation. The trespasses were their own and the reckoning of those trespasses to them would have been no more than an official declaration of their accountability. Over against this, when the Apostle said “Put that to my account,” he referred to a debt that was not antecedently his own.

An immature judgment will usually conclude that each of the major imputations, listed above, is judicial in character. Such unconsidered estimation of truth has characterized certain schools of theology, from which schools much misleading doctrine has arisen. It is not germane to the present theme of imputed sin to dwell upon the other two major imputations—except it be by way of illustration of the principle involved. Those imputations belong to Soteriology. It will be seen, however, that the imputation of human sin to Christ is, since it could not be under any circumstances His own, a clear instance of judicial imputation. Likewise, the imputation of the righteousness of God to the believer,

while it provides a ground so equitable that God is said to be *just* when He justifies those who believe on Christ, does not bestow upon the believer anything which is antecedently his own. This imputation is also easily identified as being *judicial* in character. However, in the case of the imputation of Adam's initial sin to each member of his race (Christ excepted in all such reckonings), there is a wide difference of opinion on the part of various schools of doctrine. The general theme of imputed sin is subject to subdivisions: (a) the scope of the doctrine of imputation, (b) theories of imputation, and (c) the divine remedy for imputed sin.

I. The Scope of the Doctrine of Imputation

The scope of the doctrine of imputation controversy centers upon the one most theological context in the Bible—Romans 5:12–21. This context is, in the main, an elucidation of the primary declaration set forth in verse 12. It therefore follows that any interpretation of verse 12 which is not harmoniously unfolded in verses 13 to 21 is proved by so much to be wrong. The worthy student of theology will spend much time on this portion of the Scriptures. It will not do to accept merely the findings of the best of men, but painstaking exegetical effort must be bestowed. Writing on this very point, Stearns, in his *Present Day Theology* (p. 321), suggests: “If you wish to know whether a man is a theologian, turn to his Greek Testament, and if it opens of its own accord to the fifth chapter of Romans, and you find the page worn and brown, you may safely set him down as a devotee of the sacred science” (cited by W. H. Griffith Thomas in *Principles of Theology*, p. 163). Upon this passage the greatest minds have been focused and to the best purpose. A rationalistic interpretation is dangerous here, as always. The question at issue is one of revelation, and that alone.

In further preparation for a right exegesis of Romans 5:12, it is important to observe that the one initial sin of Adam—properly styled *the original sin*, so far as humanity is concerned—is the main subject under discussion. As before stated, the original sin of Adam is the fontal source from which two widely different lines of influence proceed. The previous thesis has dealt with the transmitted sin nature which is received *mediately* from generation to generation, which nature is so closely allied to spiritual death. The present objective is to trace the other line of influence arising from Adam's initial sin, which line is that of imputed sin and is the only reason assigned in the Word of God for the imposition upon the race of physical death. The first line of inference mentioned

has to do with *corruption*, while the second, now in view, has to do with *guilt*. Added to the revelation that guilt is the portion of all, is the truth that the penalty—physical death—is imposed on each member of the race *immediately*, that is, directly from Adam to each individual without reference to intermediate generations. It is as though but two persons existed—Adam and any particular member of the race. To use a modern figure of speech, each human being stands related to Adam immediately and individually as by a *private wire*. A diagram may be drawn consisting of two lines starting downward from one point, which point may represent the Adamic sin. One of these lines is an arc bending to the right and the other an arc bending to the left and both converging again at one point, which point may represent the individual human being of any time or place as this twofold effect of Adam's sin reaches to every member of the human race. One line may be made to represent the Adamic nature—akin to spiritual death—which reaches the individual *mediately*, or by transmission from parent to child. This line may be divided in many sections which will suggest intervening generations between Adam and the individual person. The other line may be made to represent imputed Adamic sin which reaches the same individual *immediately*, or directly from Adam without recognition of intermediate generations. Though this personal relationship with Adam is shared by all in every generation, the isolated individual character of it is not lessened or confused in any instance. The Bible's answer to the question why each person is subject to physical death is that each one had his share in the sin that injured Adam himself and caused him to die physically, and they share the penalty, also. Physical death is not an inheritance, much less an infection which parents pass on to their children. It is a penalty for that form of impersonal, unconscious joint action with Adam in his disobedience.

Great confusion has resulted when the Adamic nature and its corruption is confounded with the idea of individual guilt and its punishment due to participation in that sin. It is not forgotten that the sin nature does engender a form of guilt, but it is that which arises from a *state* of being while the guilt of the participation is due to *action*. Some writers who have entered into this difficult field of doctrine have taught, with attending disarrangement of vital truth, that the sin nature is the cause of physical death. The Scriptures lend little sanction to that impression.

Spiritual death is implied in Romans 5:12–21 (yet to be attended), but beginning with Romans 6:1, where the sin nature is seen to be in conflict with spiritual living and sanctification, spiritual death is altogether in view. Naturally,

the sin nature and spiritual death are closely related here as always. To bear fruit unto that nature is to be in the way, or on the side, of spiritual death, whereas to be empowered unto good by the Spirit is to be in the way, or on the side, of life and peace (cf. Rom. 6:16, 21, 23; 7:5; 8:2, 6, 13). Of the hundreds of references in the Bible to death, but the merest fraction concern spiritual death. So great is the preponderance of texts which relate to physical death that multitudes of people are not aware of the truth as pertains to spiritual death. The central passage bearing upon physical death—which passage is intensely theological—is Romans 5:12–21.

This context, as has been noted, consists in a primary declaration, restricted to verse 12, while all that remains—verses 13 to 21—is explanatory. It is therefore reasonable that consideration be given first to the precise meaning of verse 12. Every school of theology which attends at all upon the Scriptures seeks by its own interpretation of this passage to justify its claims, or beliefs, concerning the reality of sin and death as well as of righteousness and life. Few portions of the Bible have endured a more varied treatment. It is probable that some degree of truth will be found in each attempted interpretation, and there may be some error in each; but the objective in every case is to eliminate the error and establish the truth.

The setting of this passage (5:12–21) is an important factor in the right evaluation of it. Preceding is the portion (3:21–5:11) with its message of justification by faith, and following is the portion (6:1–8:13) with its message of sanctification by faith. Both justification and sanctification are said to be based on the death of Christ. The intermediate portion, now being considered, is a consummation of that which goes before and a preparation for that which follows. In this passage the dark picture of sin and of its penalty, death, is presented in contrast to the marvelous glories of righteousness and life. The two federal headships—that of Adam and that of Christ—are set side by side in their similarities and dissimilarities. The first Adam wrought the ruin of his race; the Last Adam wrought the eternal salvation and glory of His people. In the parallels in which these similarities and dissimilarities appear, there are many details. These, though of immeasurable importance, do not at any point change, but rather strengthen, the central theme, namely, what was lost in the first Adam is more than regained for those who receive the saving grace of the Last Adam. Many exceedingly valuable works, both expository and exegetical, are extant. Only a brief investigation of this passage is possible here.

Verse 12. Demonstrating that it is a consummation of the preceding section on

justification (3:21–5:11), this portion opens with the connecting word *wherefore*. The thought is that, since the facts about justification are what they are, it follows that certain conclusions and added truths are in sequence. On the vital connection between these divisions of Scripture as implied in the word *wherefore*, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas has written:

The close connection of this section with that which immediately precedes it must be carefully noted. The first word “Wherefore” is literally “on this account,” showing that the thought remains unbroken. Justification has been shown to be permanent (vers. 1–11), and the fundamental proof and guarantee of this is God Himself in Whom we boast (ver. 11). This primary reason is now elaborated in the section before us by pointing out that as man’s connection with Adam involved him in certain death through sin, so his relation to Christ insures to him life without fail. Thus, these verses give us the logical centre of the Epistle. They are the great central point to which everything that precedes has converged, and out of which everything that follows will flow. The great ideas of Sin, Death, and Judgment are here shown to be involved in the connection of the human race with Adam, but over against this we have the blessed fact of a union with Christ, and in this union righteousness and life. This double headship of mankind in Adam and Christ shows the significance of the work of redemption for the entire race.—*St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans*, I, 202

The second word, *as*, is no less important since it indicates the first of a series of contrasts, which contrasts characterize this portion of the Scriptures. The two members of this comparison are justification through One Man over against ruin through one man. The *as* connects that which has gone before with the idea of sin entering by one man. It may be paraphrased: Wherefore as the case of justification is, being by one man, so the case of ruin is, being by one man. Such, indeed, is the substance of the more detailed argument which follows in the context.

The words, “as by one man sin entered into the world,” imply that sin had already had its manifestation in other spheres and that the one man, Adam, became the avenue or open door by which it entered into the *cosmos* world. But more is added, since the text goes on to state, “and death by sin.” Though a close relation exists between spiritual death and physical death—they both begin with the one initial sin of the first man and converge alike on each individual of Adam’s race—the reference in verse 12 is to physical death. It is possible that some reference is made before the end of this context is reached to death on so broad a scale that it may include both of its forms; but the meaning of the word in the primary statement is of physical death. The universal character of physical death requires no defense. Thus the Scriptures declare, “It is appointed unto men once to die” (Heb. 9:27), and it is no different message when the Apostle states here, “And so death passed upon [spread through] all men, for that all have sinned.” Since the aorist tense is used in the last clause and thus a single,

historical act completed in the past is indicated, the phrase “all have sinned” is better rendered *all sinned*. The effort of language at this point is to say that each member dies physically because of his own part in Adam’s sin. Since one complete, single, historical act is in view, the words *all sinned* cannot refer to a nature which results from that act, nor can it refer to personal sins of many individuals. It is not that man became sinful. The assertion is that *all sinned* at one time and under the same circumstances. In like manner, the penalty—*death*—is not for pollution, which would indicate spiritual death, but for guilt, or for participation in an act; and that indicates physical death. The statement is clear, the issue being that all had a part in Adam’s initial sin. A parallel passage in that grammatical construction is the same as found in Romans 3:23, which is translated, “For all have sinned,” but the same correction is indicated and it may be better rendered *all sinned*. Without warrant, this passage is almost universally interpreted to mean personal sin. *The International Revision Commentary*, edited by Dr. Philip Schaff, gives the following, “A single historical act is meant, namely, the past event of Adam’s fall, which was at the same time virtually the fall of the human race as represented by him and germinally contained in him. ... As regards the interpretation of the words, it may be insisted that ‘sinned’ is not equivalent to ‘became sinful.’ There remain two views: (1) As a historical fact, when Adam sinned all sinned, because of the vital connection between him and his posterity. (2) When Adam sinned, all were declared sinners, he being the representative of the race. The objection to this is, that ‘sinned’ is not equivalent to ‘were regarded as sinners.’ It makes the parallel between Adam and Christ more close than the passage thus far appears to warrant” (*Romans*, VI, 81–82). Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown in their *Commentary* (Zondervan Pub. House, 1934) state concerning this same phrase, “Thus death reaches every individual of the human family, as the penalty due to *himself*” (*in loc.*). The construction is so demanding that exegetes are largely of one mind. Strangely, however, Calvin missed the force of the passage when he restricted it to a matter of being born in sin. It should be emphasized, also, that but one interpretation will carry through the remaining explanatory context, and that, naturally, the required rendering of the primary statement of verse 12. An *actual* imputation of the Adamic sin is denoted by the right rendering of the text. Whether it can be explained or understood is quite aside from the fact that the words declare an actual imputation with its attending individual guilt and penalty of physical death.

Dr. Charles Hodge (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1854 ed., pp. 167–68) states:

The doctrine of imputation is clearly taught in this passage. This doctrine does not include the idea of a mysterious identity of Adam and his race, nor that of a transfer of the moral turpitude of his sin to his descendants. It does not teach that his offence was personally or properly the sin of all men, or that his act was, in any mysterious sense, the act of his posterity. Neither does it imply, in reference to the righteousness of Christ, that his righteousness becomes personally and inherently ours, or that his moral excellence is in any way transferred from him to believers. The sin of Adam, therefore, is no ground to us of remorse; and the righteousness of Christ is no ground of self-complacency in those to whom it is imputed. This doctrine merely teaches that, in virtue of the union, representative and natural, between Adam and his posterity, his sin is the ground of their condemnation, that is, of their subjection to penal evils; and that, in virtue of the union between Christ and his people, his righteousness is the ground of their justification. This doctrine is taught almost in so many words. in ver. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. It is so clearly stated, so often repeated or assumed, and so formally proved, that very few commentators of any class fail to acknowledge, in one form or another, that it is the doctrine of the apostle.

This, for the most part, is an acceptable and illuminating declaration; however, the impression could be gained from Dr. Hodge that there is not an actual responsibility resting on each member of the race sufficient to warrant the penalty of death.

The difficulty arising in almost every mind regarding what seems to be the apparent message of this verse is the universal inability to comprehend what is properly involved in a federal-headship relationship. Such inability is most natural since no other such relationship exists in the sphere of human experience generally. Adam contained the race in himself in a manner which is not true of any succeeding progenitor in his line. No other man stood first in the generations of humanity nor did any other receive a divine commission to this unique responsibility. There is a less perfect headship to be seen in the case of Abraham as progenitor of the one race Israel—the reality is traced only in Jacob's line. Yet, again, there is a perfect headship in the resurrected Christ over the New Creation. All typology in Adam respecting Christ is built on the fact of the two perfect headships. Abraham, however important in his relation to Israel, does not appear in this typology. Nevertheless, the most illuminating Scripture bearing on the fact of federal headship concerns Abraham. The passage not only implies headship, but declares that, when but seminally represented in the federal head, the offspring is divinely reckoned as having acted in the federal head. Reference is made to Hebrews 7:9–10, which reads: “And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.” Levi, who in his own lifetime by divine arrangement received tithes, notwithstanding, paid tithes to Melchizedek when in the loins of his great-grandfather Abraham (Gen. 14:20). None would claim that Levi consciously or purposefully paid tithes to Melchizedek, yet God

declares that he did pay tithes. Such is the divine estimation. Likewise, none will claim that each individual in Adam's race consciously or purposefully sinned in Adam; yet there can be no doubt that God reckons that each member of the race sinned in Adam's transgression. In 1 Corinthians 15:22 this statement appears: "For as in Adam all die," and this implies the same federal coercion as is asserted in the words *all sinned*. In reality, God sees but two men and each member of the race is either *in* one or the other. The unregenerate are *in Adam*; the regenerate are *in Christ*. Such inability to understand the outworking of this line of truth arises from the incapacity to fathom all that is asserted when it is said that some of the human family are *in Adam* and some *in Christ*. The mind can grasp the specified results, but cannot discern the deep reality which enters into a federal-head relationship. In the further development of the context—Romans 5:12–21—it will be seen that, as declared by Christ (John 14:20) and elucidated by the Apostle Paul, measureless blessings flow out to the believer on no other ground than that he is *in Christ*, and by so much the principle of the federal-headship imputation is established and is acknowledged by all. That injury and disaster—even death—are the portion of the natural man on no other ground than the position *in Adam*, should, in the interests of consistency, be as freely acknowledged by all. To the same end, and concerning the third major imputation—human sin to Christ—it is said that "if one died for all, then were all dead" (2 Cor. 5:14). The sinner's share in the death of the Substitute is thus counted as the sinner's own death for himself (here the student may note that, though translations are not always satisfactory, certain passages declare that the action of Christ in dying as a substitute is referred to as though it were the very action of the sinner himself—Rom. 6:2, *We who died to sin*; 6:6, *Our old man was crucified with Him*; Col. 3:3, *Ye died*; and Eph. 4:22, *Ye did put off*; cf. Col. 3:9).

The principle of imputation is thus seen to be one in which certain realities are reckoned from one to another. The story is complete as represented in the three major imputations. Man's need is indicated in the imputation from Adam to his posterity; man's salvation is secured in the imputation of man's demerit to Christ; and man's eternal standing and felicity are established through the imputation of the righteousness of God to man when he is placed in Christ by the baptism of the Spirit. If the imputation of Adam's sin to the race be resisted, consistency demands that both salvation and standing shall be resisted also.

It is conceded that there are slight differences to be noted in certain particulars when these three major imputations are compared. These are largely

developed by the truth that two are *judicial* imputations and one is *real*. No sinner is ever said to have acted consciously or otherwise in the imputation which flows out of Christ's death, or in the imputation which secures the standing of a perfect righteousness, but it is declared that in Adam's sin all his posterity sinned. This particular feature, involving some degree of participation on the sinner's part, not found in the other two, but strengthens the reality of the Adamic imputation.

It may be deduced, then, that the words *all sinned* assert that all humanity—save One—are divinely reckoned to have participated in Adam's sin and that the penalty for that participation is, in each individual, physical death. It is natural to suppose from the Authorized English translation that the words *all sinned* refer to personal sin in each individual's life experience. So general is this tendency, regardless of translations, that the Spirit of God has led the Apostle to present conclusive proof that there is no reference here to personal sin. This proof is in the next two verses of the context.

Verses 13–14. “(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.” Bishop Moule, writing of the two uses of the word *law* as it appears in verse 13, states, “Both these words in the Greek are without the article. In spite of some difficulty, we must interpret the first of the Mosaic Law, and the second of Law in some other sense; here probably in the sense of the declared Will of God in general, against which, in a particular case, Adam sinned, and we ‘in him’” (*Cambridge Bible, Romans*, p. 105). The phrase “Sin was in the world” indicates that the character of God was then, as always, that against which men sin, but as no elaborate written statement of God's requirements had been given, men were not held guilty of having broken that which did not exist. A very helpful illustration of this situation is to be seen in Christ's words to His disciples concerning the Jewish rulers, “If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin. ... If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father” (John 15:22, 24). The Apostle continues with the words, “Nevertheless death reigned,” which fact proves that death is not due to personal transgression of law in its revealed form; and death came, likewise, to those “who had not sinned” against law. Some expositors hold that the proof that verse 12 does not refer to personal sin is demonstrated in the fact that there was no law against which man

might sin. Others hold that the evidence that personal sin is not in view is found in the truth that infants and incompetent persons died, as all others; yet these had not sinned willfully as Adam sinned. The latter argument, though conclusive, is not restricted to the age in question. Probably both interpretations are true and the evidence is complete that physical death is not the penalty for personal sin, but rather the penalty for participation, in the federal-headship sense, in the sin of Adam. Verse 14 closes with the declaration that Adam is the figure ('type') of Him that was to come. A few make this to be the second advent, in which sense Christ is yet to come. It must be remembered that the first advent was a very vital hope and in the period in question. The Rabbis believed that the Last Adam is the Messiah. This the Apostle, no doubt, believed before he knew Christ as Savior.

Verses 15–19. “But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”

After having asserted the truth that Adam is a type of Christ, the Apostle goes on in this portion to enumerate certain parallels and contrasts between them. Comment has been made on these verses by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas as follows:

Trespass and Gift (ver. 15).—There is no need to regard vers. 13–17 as a parenthesis. It is much simpler and more natural to regard vers. 15, 16 as giving the details of the analogy mentioned in general terms in vers. 12–14, and it will be in every way clearer and more in harmony with the argument to adopt the interrogative form in these verses and render thus: “But shall not, as the offence, so also be the free gift?” If Adam is a type of Christ will there not be some correspondence between the fall of one and the free gift of the other? Surely they resemble each other in their far-reaching effects, for if by the lapse of the one the many connected with him were involved in death, it is much easier to believe that by the free sacrifice of One Man, Christ Jesus, God’s loving favour and His gift of righteousness abounded unto the many connected with Him.

Condemnation and Justification (ver. 16).—Again we render by means of a question: “And shall not the gift be even as it was by one that sinned?” That is to say, Is there not also a correspondence between God’s gift and man’s ruin in respect of its being caused by the agency of one man? For indeed the free gift which led to the just acquittal of man was occasioned by many

lapses; the judgment which led to condemnation was occasioned by one man's single lapse.

Death and Life (ver. 17).—There is undoubted correspondence here, for if by virtue of that one man's single lapse the reign of death was established through the agency of the one man, it is much easier to believe that a reign of a far different kind (that is, more in harmony with God's heart) will be established through the agency of One Man, Christ Jesus.... Of course there are remarkable contrasts between the sin of Adam and the work of Christ, but the very contrasts strengthen the argument for the analogy which is the great point St. Paul wishes to emphasise. The first resemblance between Adam and Christ is that in both Fall and Redemption we have far-reaching effects, for in both "the many" are involved (ver. 15). The second resemblance is that in both the result is brought in through the agency of "one man" (vers. 16, 17).

Trespass and Righteousness (ver. 18).—Now various points of comparison are gathered up into one conclusion. We have on the one side as the cause one lapse, and the effect extending to all men for condemnation. We have on the other side as the cause one just sentence of acquittal, and the effect extending to all men for a justifying which carries with it life. These differences, however, only strengthen the argument for the correspondences, for grace is stronger than sin. If "the many" were involved in sin and death through the agency of the one man, Adam; "much more" may we believe that "the many" will be involved in righteousness and life through the agency of the One Man, Christ Jesus.

Disobedience and Obedience (ver. 19).—One point in the comparison is still incomplete. Adam's sin has not been contrasted with Christ's obedience, but with the cause of that obedience, grace (ver. 15), and with the result of it, a gift (ver. 17, 18). It is now shown that these effects were wrought by means of Christ's obedience, the exact contrast of Adam's disobedience, for as through the disobedience of the one man, Adam, the many connected with him were set down in the class of sin, so through the obedience of the One Man, Christ Jesus, the many connected with Him shall be set down in the class of righteousness. —*St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, I, 206–9

Verse 20. "Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."

The two features consummated in verse 20, namely, *one man's disobedience*, and *one man's obedience* (each subject to imputation as this context declares), having alone been in view to this point, the Jew may reasonably inquire, If there is only a condemnation for Adam's sin and a justification in Christ, wherefore serveth the Law? To this it may be replied, that the Law entered ('came in beside,' as over and above the truth that men were already sinners) that the offence might abound, or be multiplied. The Law's reign began at Sinai and ended with Christ's death and resurrection. It is an *ed interim* dealing "till the seed should come." It is a temporary economy and should never be treated as the principal divine objective—as too often it has been treated. "The law was added" (Gal. 3:19). On the seeming unrighteousness of introducing that which at once increases the ground of condemnation, F. W. Grant writes: "'Law came in by the way that the offence might abound:'—did that need? one might ask; was it not to add difficulty to difficulty—to make greater the distress that it could not relieve? So it would indeed seem, and not only seem, but so it really was: law, as we shall see fully in the argument of the seventh chapter, by its very opposition to

the innate evil only arouses it to full activity and communicates to it new strength: ‘the strength of sin is the law’ (1 Cor. 15:56). This was indeed its mission; which if that were all, would be but disaster—a ministration of death and condemnation indeed! (2 Cor. 3:7, 9); but it came in by the way, says the apostle,—to fulfil a temporary purpose, in making manifest the hopeless condition of man apart from grace, when every command on God’s part arouses the hostility of man’s heart against it: ‘the law entered that the offence might abound’!” (*The Numerical Bible, Acts to II Corinthians*, p. 223). But where sin was thus multiplied, grace did superabound. The disease was brought to the surface in overt acts. The two words translated *abound* are quite different in the original. Sin was multiplied, but grace superabounded.

Verse 21. “That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.”

In closing this discussion, the Apostle again restates the contrast—sin reigned in death; grace reigns in life. Thus the last contrast is drawn and it is between *death* and *life*—the former through Adam, and the latter through Christ. As always in the Bible, the dark picture of sin is painted only that the glories of God’s healing grace may more clearly be seen. The picture as drawn by Besser is, “*Sin, death, grace, righteousness, life*. These five stand thus: Grace rises highest in the middle; the two conquering giants, sin and death, at the left; the double prize of victory, righteousness and life, at the right; and over the buried name of Adam the glory of the name of Jesus blooms” (cited by M. B. Riddle, *Romans*, p. 88).

As an additional comment on this context, the remarks appended by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown in their *Commentary (in loc.)* and at the close of their illuminating exegesis of Romans 5:12–21 are reproduced here in full:

On reviewing this golden section of our Epistle, the following additional remarks occur: (1) If this section does not teach that the whole race of Adam, standing in him as their federal head, “sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression,” we may despair of any intelligible exposition of it. The apostle, after saying that Adam’s sin introduced death in the world, does not say “and so death passed upon all men for that” *Adam* “sinned,” but “for that *all sinned*.” Thus, according to the teaching of the apostle, “the death of all is for the sin of all,” and as this cannot mean the personal sins of each individual, but some sin of which unconscious infants are guilty equally with adults, it can mean nothing but the one “first transgression” of their common head, regarded as *the sin of each* of his race, and punished, as such, with death. It is vain to start back from this imputation to all of the guilt of Adam’s first sin, as wearing the appearance of *injustice*. For not only are all other theories liable to the same objection, in some other form—besides being inconsistent with the text— but the actual *facts of human nature*, which none dispute, and which cannot be explained away, involve essentially the same difficulties as the great *principle* on which the apostle here explains them. If we admit this principle, on the authority of our apostle, a flood of

light is at once thrown upon certain features of the Divine procedure, and certain portions of the Divine oracles, which otherwise are involved in much darkness; and if the principle itself seem hard to digest, it is not harder than the *existence of evil*, which, as a fact, admits of no dispute, but, as a feature in the Divine administration, admits of no explanation in the present state. (2) What is called *original sin*—or that depraved tendency to evil with which every child of Adam comes into the world—is not formally treated of in this section (and even in ch. 7 it is rather its nature and operation than its connection with the first sin which is handled). But indirectly, this section bears testimony to it; representing the one original offence, unlike every other, as having an *enduring vitality* in the bosom of every child of Adam, as a principle of disobedience, whose virulence has gotten it the familiar name of ‘original sin.’ (3) In what sense is the word “*death*” used throughout this section? Not certainly as mere *temporal* death, as Arminian commentators affirm. For as Christ came to undo what Adam did, which is all comprehended in the word “*death*,” it would hence follow that Christ has merely dissolved the sentence by which soul and body are parted in death; in other words, merely procured the resurrection of the body. But the New Testament throughout teaches that the salvation of Christ is from a vastly more comprehensive “*death*” than that. But neither is death here used merely in the sense of *penal evil*, *i.e.*, “any evil inflicted in punishment of sin and for the support of law” (Hodge). This is too indefinite, making death a mere figure of speech to denote “penal evil” in general—an idea foreign to the simplicity of Scripture—or at least making death, strictly so called, only one part of the thing meant by it, which ought not to be resorted to if a more simple and natural explanation can be found. By “*death*” then, in this section, we understand the sinner’s *destruction*, in the only sense in which he is capable of it. Even temporal death is called “*destruction*” (Deuteronomy 7:23; 1 Samuel 5:11, &c.), as extinguishing all that men regard as life. But a destruction extending to the *soul* as well as the body, and *into the future world*, is clearly expressed in Matthew 7:13; 2 Thessalonians 1:9; 2 Peter 3:16, &c. This is the penal “*death*” of our section, and in this view of it we retain its proper sense. Life—as a state of enjoyment of the favour of God, of pure fellowship with Him, and voluntary subjection to Him—is a blighted thing from the moment that sin is found in the creature’s skirts; in that sense, the threatening, “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” was carried into immediate effect in the case of Adam when he fell, who was thenceforward “dead while he lived.” Such are all his posterity from their birth. The separation of soul and body in temporal death carries the sinner’s “*destruction*” a stage farther, dissolving his connection with that world out of which he extracted a pleasurable, though unblest, existence, and ushering him into the presence of his Judge—first as a disembodied spirit, but ultimately in the body too, in an enduring condition—“to be punished (and this is the final state) with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.” This final extinction in soul and body of all that constitutes life, but yet eternal consciousness of a blighted existence—this, in its amplest and most awful sense, is “*DEATH*!” Not that Adam understood all that. It is enough that he understood “the day” of his disobedience to be the terminating period of his blissful “*life*.” In that simple idea was wrapt up all the rest. But that he should comprehend its *details* was not necessary. Nor is it necessary to suppose all that to be intended in every passage of Scripture where the word occurs. Enough that all we have described is in the bosom of the *thing*, and will be realized in as many as are not the happy subjects of the Reign of Grace. Beyond doubt, the whole of this is intended in such sublime and comprehensive passages as this:

“God ... gave His ... Son that whosoever believeth in Him *might not* PERISH, *but have everlasting LIFE*” (John 3:16). And should not the untold horrors of that “*DEATH*”—already “reigning over” all that are not in Christ, and hastening to its consummation—quicken our flight into “the second Adam,” that having “received the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, we may reign in *LIFE* by the One, Jesus Christ”?

II. Theories of Imputation

As might be expected, the context—Romans 5:12–21—has drawn out many interpretations of this teaching concerning *imputation*. Some have entered strange avenues of speculation. It is essential that the student shall be informed about the more general views men have advanced. The brief introduction to the study of Romans 5:12–21 and the summarization (abridged) of this great field of truth as given in the *International Revision Commentary*, edited by Dr. Philip Schaff, is appended here in full:

The universal dominion of sin and death over the human race is a fact, clearly taught by the Apostle here, and daily confirmed by our religious experience. This dominion extends in an unbroken line to our first parents, as the transgression of Adam stands in a causal relation to the guilt and sin of his posterity. The Apostle assumes this connection, in order to illustrate the blessed truth, that the power and principle of righteousness and life go back to Jesus Christ, the second Adam. However explained, the existence of sin remains a stubborn, terrible reality. Least of all can it be explained by the denial of the parallel, yet contrasted, saving facts which are prominent in the Apostle's mind throughout this section. The leading points which he asserts, and which therefore must enter into any consistent theory respecting his view of original sin, are: (1.) That the sin of Adam was the sin of all his posterity (see ver. 12); in what sense this is true, must be determined by the passage as a whole. (2.) That there is parallel and contrast between the connection of Adam and his posterity, and Christ and His people (see vers. 14–19). (3.) That this parallel applies to the point which has been so fully discussed in the previous part of the Epistle, namely, that believers are *reckoned* righteous (see vers. 12–18). (4.) That the connection with the two representative heads of the race has moral results; that guilt and sin, righteousness and life, are inseparably connected (see vers. 17–19).

The various theories may be reviewed in the light of these positions:—

I. The PANTHEISTIC and NECESSITARIAN theory, which regards sin as an essential attribute (a limitation) of the finite, destroys the radical antagonism between good and evil, and has nothing in common with Paul's views of sin or grace.

II. The PELAGIAN heresy resolves the fall of Adam into a comparatively trivial, childish act of disobedience, which sets a bad example. It holds that every child is born as innocent and perfect, though as fallible, as Adam when created. This view explains nothing, and virtually denies all the assertions made in this section. Its affinities, logically and historically, are with Socinianism and the multifarious forms of Rationalism. It, and every other theory which denies the connection with Adam, fails to meet the great question respecting the salvation of those dying in infancy. Such theories logically exclude them from the heaven of the redeemed, either by denying their need of salvation, or by rejecting the only principle in accordance with which such salvation, if they need it, is possible, namely, that of imputation.

III. The theory of a PRE-ADAMIC fall of all men, which implies the preexistence of souls, as held by Plato and Origen, is a pure speculation, and inconsistent with ver. 12 as well as with Gen. 3. It is incidentally opposed in chap. 9:12.

IV. The AUGUSTINIAN or REALISTIC theory holds that the connection between Adam and his posterity was such, that by his individual transgression he vitiated human nature, and transmitted it in this corrupt and guilty state to his descendants by physical generation, so that there was an impersonal and unconscious participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam. There is this difference, however: Adam's individual transgression resulted in a sinful nature; while, in the case

of his descendants, the sinful nature or depraved will results in individual transgression. This view accords in the main with the grammatical exegesis of ver. 11, but Augustine himself incorrectly explained “for that,” as “in whom” *i.e.*, Adam. It accepts, but does not explain, the relation between genus and species. Like all other matters pertaining to life, it confronts us with a mystery ...

V. The FEDERAL theory of a vicarious representation of mankind by Adam, in virtue of a covenant (*faedus*, hence “federal”) made with him. It supposes a (one-sided) covenant, called the covenant of works (in distinction from the covenant of grace), to the effect that Adam should stand a moral probation on behalf of all his descendants, so that his act of obedience or disobedience, with all its consequences, should be accounted theirs, just as the righteousness of the second Adam is reckoned as that of His people. This transaction, because *unilateral* (one-sided), finds its ultimate ground in the sovereign pleasure of God. It is a part of the theological system developed in Holland, and largely incorporated in the standards of the Westminster Assembly. Yet here, too, a distinction has been made.

1. The founders and chief advocates of the federal scheme combined with it the Augustinian view of an unconscious and impersonal participation of the whole human race in the fall of Adam, and thus made imputation to rest on ethical as well as legal grounds. This view, which differs very slightly from IV., seems to accord best with the four leading points of this section, since it recognizes Adam as both federal and natural head of the race.

2. The *purely federal* school holds, that by virtue of the federal headship of Adam, on the ground of a sovereign arrangement, his sin and guilt are justly, directly, and immediately imputed to his posterity. It makes the parallel between Adam and Christ exact, in the matter of the imputation of sin and of righteousness. “In virtue of the union between him and his descendants, his sin is the judicial ground of the condemnation of the race, precisely as the righteousness of Christ is the judicial ground of the justification of His people.” This view does not deny that Adam is the natural head of the race, but asserts that “over and beyond this natural relation which exists between a man and his posterity, there was a special divine constitution by which he was appointed the head and representative of his whole race” (Hodge, *Theology*, ii., pp. 195, 197).

VI. In sharp antagonism to the last view, most of the recent New England theologians have virtually rejected imputation altogether. They “maintain that the sinfulness of the descendants of Adam results with *infallible certainty* (though not with necessity) from his transgression; the one class holding to hereditary depravity prior to sinful choice, the other class teaching that the first moral choice of all is universally sinful, yet with the power of contrary choice.” In this view a nice distinction is made between natural ability and moral inability. When consistently held, it denies that “all sinned” (ver. 12) refers to the sin of Adam, taking it as equivalent to the perfect, “all have sinned,” namely, personally with the first responsible act.

VII. The SEMI-PELAGIAN and kindred ARMINIAN theories, though differing from each other, agree in admitting the Adamic unity, and the disastrous effects of Adam’s transgression, but regard hereditary corruption as an evil or misfortune, not properly as sin and guilt, of itself exposing us to punishment. Arminianism, however, on this point, inclines toward Augustinianism more than Semi-Pelagianism does. The latter fails to give full force to the language of the Apostle in this section, and to sympathize with his profound sense of the guilt and sinfulness of sin. The advocates of neither theory present explicit and uniform statements on this doctrinal point.

Those views which seem to keep most closely to the grammatical sense of the Apostle’s words involve mysteries of physiology, psychology, ethics, and theology. Outside the revelation there confronts us the undeniable, stubborn, terrible fact, of the universal dominion of sin and death over the entire race, infants as well as adults. No system of philosophy explains this; outside the Christian redemption, the mystery is entirely one of darkness, unilluminated by the greatest mystery of love. Hence the wisdom of following as closely as possible the words which reveal the cure, as we attempt to penetrate the gloom that envelops the origin of the disease. The more so when the obvious purpose of the Apostle here is to bring into proper prominence the Person and Work of the

Second Adam. Here alone can we find any practical solution of the problem respecting the first head of the race; only herein do we perceive the triumphant vindication of Divine justice and mercy. The best help to unity in the doctrine of Original Sin will be by larger experiences of the “much more” which is our portion in Christ Jesus. Only when we are assured of righteousness and life in Him, can we fearlessly face the fact of sin and death in Adam.—Pp. 88–91

III. The Divine Remedy for Imputed Sin

The divine cure for that phase of the Adamic sin which is reckoned to all human beings by an *actual* imputation resulting in their physical death, appears in a sequence of divine accomplishments which are finally consummated in the complete disposition of death itself. Being a divine judgment which was imposed on the human race subsequent to creation, death is foreign to the first stage of the divine plan for this earth. As created, man was as enduring as the angels. Though some of the angels sinned, it has not pleased God to impose the sentence of death upon them. Their judgment is of another form. The first angel to sin was not a federal head of the angels, nor is there among them any procreation with its problem of heredity. Therefore, there could be no parallel experience with respect to judgments from God for sin set up between the human race and the angels. It is to be observed, however, that as the divine cure for human sin extends to the earthly creation, death is now the lot of the creature as it is the lot of man. The Scriptures predict the coming day when death will be banished from the universe forever. The Apostle Paul declares that as a result of Christ’s reign over the millennial earth, death, the last of the enemies of God’s creation to be destroyed, will disappear forever (1 Cor. 15:26). Similarly, the Apostle John, when enumerating the things which, though characterizing the present order, will be absent from the final and future order, writes these emphatic words, “And there shall be no more death” (Rev. 21:4). After that time, it is implied, no living thing, including unregenerate individuals of the human race, being raised as indeed they will be, will have any promise of relief from their estate through death. Turning now to the various and progressive aspects of divine dealing with physical death, it may be observed:

1. THE DEATH OF CHRIST. The careful student of doctrine, when examining the Scriptures, soon becomes aware of the imperative need of discriminating between physical death and spiritual death, and in no aspect of this great theme is the human mind more impotent than when considering the death of Christ in the light of these distinctions. There could be no doubt about Christ’s physical death, even though He, in His humanity, being unfallen, was in no way subject

to death; nor was He, in His death, to see corruption (Ps. 16:10); nor was a bone of His body to be broken (John 19:36). On the other hand, Christ's death was a complete judgment of the sin nature for all who are regenerated, and He, as substitute, bore a condemnation which no mortal can comprehend, which penalty entered far into the realms of spiritual death—separation from God (cf. Matt. 27:46). In His death, He shrank back, not from physical pain, nor from the experience of quitting the physical body, but, when contemplating the place of a sin bearer and the anticipation of being *made* sin for us, He pleaded that the cup might pass. The death of Christ was wholly on behalf of others; yet, while both the physical and the spiritual aspects of death were demanded in that sacrifice which He provided, it is not given to man, when considering the death of Christ, to disassociate these two the one from the other.

2. THE KEYS OF DEATH. Through His death and resurrection, Christ became possessed of “the keys of death.” That He had not before His death wrested this specific authority from Satan is intimated in these words: “that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14); however, after His resurrection and ascension He spoke from heaven saying, “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death” (Rev. 1:18). The nullification on the part of the Son of God of this great authority which had been before accorded to Satan is in agreement with Christ's word that “all power is given unto me,” and represents a transfer of authority which must mean much indeed to every member of this death-doomed race.

3. DEATH AND THE UNSAVED. Whatever is available to the unsaved as a relief from sin and its judgments through the saving grace of God, they remain in the bondage of sin and under the sentence of death in all its forms until they are saved—if ever they are saved. Concerning physical death, the penalty for man's share in Adam's sin, they remain under death as a judgment; concerning spiritual death, they remain separate from God; concerning the second death, they are doomed to eternal separation from God. Great, indeed, is their need of the Savior!

4. DEATH AND THE CHRISTIAN. This extended theme belongs to a later division of this thesis. It may be said, however, that, though death, as the only way of departure out of this world, continues even for the believer until the coming of Christ, its judgment aspect is lifted forever. Of Christians it is said, “There is

therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1, R.V.), and for the Christian death is described as a sleep so far as the body is concerned, and as a departure to be with Christ so far as the soul and spirit are concerned.

5. DEATH IN THE MILLENNIUM. But one passage seems to bear upon this division of the doctrine of the divine cure for physical death within the thousand-year reign of Christ on the earth. In Isaiah 65:20 it is written and most evidently of the coming kingdom age: “There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed.” Obviously, physical death is much restrained in the age of the glory of this earth. In like manner, it is in that same age that the reigning Messiah shall put down all rule and all authority and all power. “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:24–26). Thus the reign of so terrible a curse and so dreaded a foe, though permitted to continue its blight over even the redeemed and through all the ages, is finally banished forever by the irresistible authority and power of the Son of God.

Conclusion

Though both arise from the initial sin of Adam and alike converge on each member of his race, a crucial distinction must be maintained between the transmitted sin nature received *mediately*, and imputed sin received *immediately*. It will be noted, also, that both the sin nature and imputed sin are distinct from personal sin. In the one case, the nature to sin is not the act of sin, and in the other case, though men are held individually responsible and under the penalty of physical death for their share in what was, in Adam’s experience, a personal sin, imputed sin is held in the Scriptures to be unlike personal sin and this unlikeness is demonstrated with extended argument. There yet remains in the field of universal conditions which are to be recognized in the whole field of hamartiology, the one category, namely, man’s estate under sin.

Chapter XXI

MAN'S ESTATE UNDER SIN AND HIS RELATION TO SATAN

I. The Fact

THE PHRASE “under sin,” as an English rendering, occurs but three times in the New Testament—“We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin” (Rom. 3:9); “But I am carnal, sold under sin” (Rom. 7:14); “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin” (Gal. 3:22)—and with far-reaching significance in each instance. Romans 3:9 and Galatians 3:22, having reference to the estate of the unregenerate, are germane to this division of the doctrine of sin. The force of this phrase may be seen when compared with the similar expressions, *under law* and *under grace* (Rom. 6:14). The word *under* as used in these passages does not imply merely that a system —sin, law, or grace—holds an inherent dominion over the individual; it rather implies that, in addition to dominion, there is a divine reckoning that the relationship is true. In the matter of supremacy, the reckoning of God is far more important than the mere force of circumstances growing out of any situation.

Man, who has been under condemnation for sin since the beginning of the race, is, in the present age (which is bounded by the two advents of Christ), under a specific divine decree of condemnation, and this condemnation is itself the necessary background for the present far-reaching offers of divine grace. Each of the three aspects of sin already considered has been seen to be universal in character, and man's estate “under sin” is no exception. In fact, it is this universal character which provides the basis for the understanding of the precise meaning of the phrase.

That the estate of man “under sin” is peculiar to the present age is disclosed in Romans 3:9, and by the declaration there set forth that unregenerate Jews and Gentiles are now alike in respect to their relation to God, being equally fallen and condemned under sin. Similarly, the Apostle declares that both Jews and Gentiles are now alike in the fact that the same gospel of divine grace is offered to them and by this alone can they be saved. We read: “For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek [Gentile]: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever [Jew or Gentile] shall call upon the name

of the Lord shall be saved” (Rom. 10:12–13; cf. Acts 15:9; Rom. 3:22). During the period from Abraham to Christ, which in the Scriptures is characterized by Jewish history, the Jew with ever increasing conviction asserted his superior position and importance over the Gentile, and with the fullest divine attestation as regards his superior position. The Israelites were and are God’s chosen above all the people of the earth (Ex. 19:5; Deut. 7:6–7; 10:15; Ps. 135:4). Of them the Apostle declares: “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. 9:4–5); but of the Gentiles he asserts: “That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world” (Eph. 2:12). Language could hardly serve to set forth a greater difference between two peoples than is indicated by these two passages. Such, indeed, was the divinely appointed difference between Jew and Gentile in the 2000 years between Abraham and Christ. On the basis of his place of privilege, the Jew, so far from being humbled by his blessings, had developed a national pride and arrogance toward the Gentile which prompted him to refuse to have any personal contact with a Gentile, or to enter his house, and he termed the Gentile a *dog*. Perhaps no Jew of his generation was more saturated with this unholy prejudice than was Saul of Tarsus; yet, under the transforming, illuminating power of the Spirit, Saul became Paul the “apostle to the Gentiles,” and the voice of God to declare the message—at that time more revolutionary than almost any other could be—that there is now “no difference between Jew and Gentile.” There is abundant prophecy announcing the fact that in the coming kingdom age the Jew will again and forevermore be divinely exalted above the Gentiles (Isa. 14:1–2; 60:12). It therefore follows that since in the past ages the Jew by divine authority and appointment held a position superior to the Gentile, and since in the ages to come he will again be exalted above all other peoples, this is the age, unique indeed, when by divine authority and arrangement it is declared that there is “no difference between Jew and Gentile.” Jewish national and covenant standing before God is, for the present age, set aside. The Jew is not now urged to recognize his Messiah, but he is urged to believe on a crucified and risen Savior.

The common position of Jew and Gentile “under sin” may be defined as one wherein they are both absolutely condemned and utterly without merit before God. Immediately following the statement of Romans 3:9 that both Jew and

Gentile are all “under sin,” the context goes on to define the condemnable condition of the entire race. It is written: “There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes” (Rom. 3:10–18). With the same all-inclusiveness, comprehending both Jew and Gentile, it is declared in John 3:18, “He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” In their vanity men are ever prone to imagine that their estate before God may yet prove to be to some degree acceptable. However, God declares that they are *already* condemned, which fact must take its course leading on to eternal woe unless, through grace, they are saved.

Two passages declare that the position under sin is due to a divine decree. It is written, “But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (Gal. 3:22). Romans 11:32 presents a parallel statement: “But God hath concluded them all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all.” In each of these passages the position described is one which is there said to be due to a divine decree. In the former passage it is the Scriptures which are said to have concluded all under sin, while in the latter passage it is God who is said to have concluded all in unbelief. The word συγκλείω, here translated *concluded*, is in Luke 5:6 translated *inclosed* and in Galatians 3:23 it is translated *shut up* in the sense of being restricted to definite limitations. These limitations, it will be observed, are, in each case in question, divinely imposed. As divine justification is the public declaration by God of the fact that the believer stands justified in His sight since he has attained to the righteousness of God, being in Christ, so to be under sin is to be not only without merit before God, but it is to be declared so by God. In Galatians 3:22 man is said to be restricted by divine decree to the estate which is thus without merit in order that the promise which is by faith of Jesus Christ—salvation wholly and only through the merit of the Savior—might be given to those who have faith; and faith as here indicated is the antipodes of meritorious works. Similarly, in Romans 11:32 God is said to have confined all in unbelief, or that, again, which is the antipodes of faith, that they might thus become the uncomplicated objects of divine mercy. While these Scriptures emphasize the

removal of special blessings which before belonged to the Jew, it is also true that the Gentile, like the Jew, is now under sin even though no previous blessings were his to be forfeited. God must remove from both Jew and Gentile every vestige of supposed human merit from the issue in order that the way may be clear for mercy to act apart from every complexity that arises when two opposing principles—faith and works—are intermingled. That this immeasurable privilege of attaining to all divine blessing on the principle of faith apart from human merit might be the portion of all—Jew and Gentile alike—they are all, and without exception, concluded under sin.

II. The Remedy

The remedy for this meritless and therefore hopeless estate is the saving grace of God through Christ in all its magnitude and perfections. This has been implied in the passages cited above. The two positions—under sin or under grace, with all that grace secures—are polarities as far removed the one from the other as the east is from the west, as holiness from sin, or as heaven from hell. All men have been placed under sin, these passages declare, to the end that the grace of God may be exercised in their behalf without complication or restraint. Though the benefit to man is knowledge-surpassing (not only is sin forgiven for the one who is saved, but he is justified *freely* without the slightest compensation to God—Rom. 3:24, and made to stand in all the perfection of Christ—Eph. 1:6; Col. 2:10), yet the advantage to God in the salvation of a soul is even greater. To satisfy the love of God is a greater achievement than to bring measureless blessing to men. Thus the supreme objective in the death of Christ is discovered. Because of infinite love for lost men, the gratification of that holy desire to redeem—which is common to all three Persons of the blessed Trinity—constitutes the supreme reason for the divine sacrifice. That the Father's love might be manifested which would give His Only Begotten Son that men might be saved (John 3:16), that the Son might see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied (Isa. 53:11), and that by the Spirit many sons might be brought into glory (Heb. 2:10)—is of immeasurable import. There was that in God which could never before have been expressed, nor could it now be expressed apart from His redeeming grace. Angelic hosts and all created intelligences could have seen the power of God, the wisdom of God, and the glory of God as disclosed in creation; but, apart from the demonstration which sin and redemption have supplied, none could have conceived of the love and grace of God toward hell-

deserving sinners. Thus it is revealed that salvation is provided and its priceless benefits secured not merely as an advantage to men, but as an even greater boon to the One whose infinite love is satisfied thereby. That the one who is saved might really be conformed to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2) and be a faultless representation of His grace (Eph. 2:7), God reserves every aspect of salvation unto Himself. "Salvation is of the LORD" (Jonah 2:9; Ps. 3:8). Being, as it is, supernatural in its every phase, none but God could achieve it.

It may be concluded, then, that men are either lost, being under sin, which is to be meritless before God in the issues related to their salvation, or they are perfected forever in Christ by the saving grace of God, which salvation is divinely secured to all who believe.

To be without merit in relation to salvation is to be in possession of nothing which might be credited to one's account. It is according to human reason to suppose that a moral, cultured person would have something which God might accept and incorporate into His saving work, but such is not the case. To be under sin is not only to be hopelessly condemned because of the sinful state, but to be without merit, or utterly void of any good which might be credited to one's account. In Romans 11:32 the Apostle states that "God hath concluded them all in unbelief," which unbelief, as has been seen from John 3:18, is the ground of the present condemnation of all men. It is probable that the first reaction of the human heart to this revelation, that God has now decreed that the good which men believe they possess will not accrue to their account to the slightest degree, is a feeling that God is unjust in rejecting even the good one may possess. Has not man become accustomed to a meritorious standing by home discipline in childhood, by the recognition of personal qualities in all the field of education, and by the advantages which are accredited to him in society and government because of a correct manner of life? The passage (Rom. 11:32) goes on to state, not only that God has concluded all in unbelief, which is condemnation, but that this is done in order "that he might have mercy upon all." Salvation by grace is according to a plan which is wholly within God and therefore cannot incorporate anything, even human merit, into its execution. It is a standardized whole, complete in all its parts, which proceeds from God and, being itself infinitely perfect, leaves no place for any human contribution. A bridge may be condemned when there is much in it of value, and the engineer may have to determine whether it should be merely repaired by adding support to its weak parts, or whether it ought to be torn away to make place for a wholly new structure. One thing is sure: if the old bridge is torn away, its good parts are not

left intact to be incorporated into the new structure. The good is set aside along with the bad. Salvation by grace is a wholly new structure into which no human goodness may be incorporated. God has concluded all in unbelief, which is the wrecking of the first structure without regard to its relative worthiness, in order that His exceeding mercy, which provides a structure of infinite perfection, might be available to all. It naturally follows that if one persists in demanding that his own merit shall be credited he cannot be saved by grace, since God is not patching up imperfect structures. In the salvation of men, God has undertaken two stupendous purposes which render impossible the acceptance of any patched-up and imperfect structures. (a) It is declared that, through His saving grace, the believer shall be conformed to the image of His Son. This excludes any mere revising of the old creation. At this point neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but only a *new creation*. (b) Salvation has for its primary objective the demonstration before all the universe of beings the exceeding grace of God. It is true that men are saved “unto good works” (Eph. 2:10), and that God loved them enough to give His Son that they might not perish but have everlasting life (John 3:16), but the highest divine motive in the salvation of men is that in the ages to come the grace of God may be demonstrated before all created beings. Were that salvation to incorporate any fraction of human merit, it would by so much be imperfect as a demonstration of God’s grace. Thus, again, the very purpose of God in salvation precluded the mere patching up of an old structure or the salvaging of any part of it. It would be folly indeed to contend that a good life is not more beneficial to the state, to society, or the home than a bad life; but this question under discussion does not involve the state, society, or the home directly: it is a matter of getting sinners so perfected that they may enjoy the presence of God in heaven forever. Fallen man is condemned root and branch. He could be credited with nothing for the good that he imagines he possesses. Such supposed good, at best, would not be of the same quality as the perfection of Christ, nor is it required since Christ’s merit supplies all that a sinner could ever need. “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God” (2 Cor. 5:17–18. Observe the force of the word *all* in each use of it in this passage). Indeed, one thus saved has a new and superhuman obligation to live as one who is perfectly saved in Christ should live; but even Christian faithfulness, though full of blessing for the one who so lives, can add nothing to the new creation wrought of God.

It will be observed, however, that, since God is Himself infinitely righteous,

He cannot accept anything which is not perfect in His own sight. He could not base the salvation of a sinner upon a mere fiction; He therefore bases it upon the merit of His Son whose perfection is, through infinite grace, rendered available for every sinner. The sinner, then, in the last analysis, is saved on a meritorious basis, but it is the merit of the One who is *made* unto him the very righteousness of God.

No misapprehension of gospel truth is more prevalent than the sentiment that the grace of God that saves the lost is an adjustable device which adapts itself to the varying degrees of human worthiness—that it requires less grace to save the moral individual than it requires to save the immoral individual. All such conceptions are based on the wholly erroneous idea that human merit or works combine with divine grace to the end that a soul may be saved. Resisting this very impression, the Apostle declared, “And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (Rom. 11:6); “Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4:4–5).

Thus, it may be observed that the phrase “under sin” refers to an estate of man which is constituted by a divine decree and which has obtained in no other age than this, since by it Jews and Gentiles are alike leveled to the position of abject objects of divine grace to the end that they may be saved upon a wholly different principle than that of a divine recognition and acceptance of human merit. God undertakes and secures a *new creation* to the glory of His grace. Thus it is also seen that the reckoning of all in unbelief is a necessity if all human beings are to be placed before God as those whose meritorious structure has been torn away and who are now eligible to receive as a gift from God all that enters into the new creation. None but God can accomplish a new creation, and He can undertake it only as His Son has borne the demerit of sinners and offered Himself without spot unto God that His merit might be available to them.

The only attitude that a meritless person under sin could reasonably maintain toward so great and supernatural a salvation is to trust Another who is mighty to save to accomplish it *all*. This is saving faith; and no more is, nor reasonably could be, required of any unsaved person. Therefore, we read in Galatians 3:22: “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”

III. The Relation of the Unsaved to Satan

The present relation of the unregenerate to Satan as described in the Bible and when added to the four aspects of sin already named, comprises a dark picture. No reference is made here to the eternal estate of those who die without the salvation which is in Christ. Little indeed are the unregenerate prepared to recognize their present relation to Satan. Satan is described as the one who deceiveth the whole world (Rev. 12:9; 20:3, 8); and the inability of the unsaved to discern the revelation regarding themselves is the result of this satanic deception. While there are many passages of Scripture bearing on the present relation of the unsaved to Satan, four present this important body of truth in its main features:

Colossians 1:13, which reads: “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.” In this Scripture it is revealed that God’s saving power is exercised to the end that those who are saved are “delivered ... from the power of darkness.” Adam’s scepter of authority and dominion (Gen. 1:26–28) was evidently surrendered to Satan to some extent and has been held by Satan by right of conquest. Fallen man must be rescued from the power of darkness, which is the estate of all who are unsaved.

Ephesians 2:1–2. Writing of the former estate of those now saved, the Apostle states: “And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh [energizeth] in the children of disobedience.” The classification, “the children of disobedience,” refers to Adam’s federal disobedience and includes all of the unregenerate as disobedient and energized by Satan (note the use of ἐνεργέω in both Eph. 2:2 and Phil. 2:13).

2 Corinthians 4:3–4, which states: “But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them,” discloses the fact that the unregenerate are restricted by Satan in their capacity to understand the gospel of Christ. The effectiveness of this blinding every soul-winner soon discovers.

1 John 5:19, which reads: “And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” A more literal translation develops the revelation that the unregenerate are now unconscious of their relation to Satan. They are as

those who are being carried asleep in the arms of the wicked one.

Finally, the estate of unregenerate man may be summarized, (a) as being subject to death in all its forms, because of participation in Adam's sin; (b) as being born in depravity or spiritual death and forever separated from God unless regenerated by the saving power of God; (c) as guilty of personal sins, each one of which is as sinful in the sight of God as the first sin of Satan or the first sin of Adam; (d) as under sin, in which estate all—both Jew and Gentile—are now placed by divine decree and in which estate every human merit is disregarded to the end that the uncompromised saving grace of God may be exercised toward those who believe; and (e) as under the influence of Satan who is in authority over them, who energizes them, who blinds them concerning the gospel, and who deceives them concerning their true relation to himself.

The problem of relief from the immeasurable tragedy of sin is never solved by minimizing any aspect of sin; it is solved by discovering a Savior whose salvation is equal to every need for time and eternity.

Chapter XXII

THE CHRISTIAN'S SIN AND ITS REMEDY

NO DIVISION of the Biblical doctrine of sin is more extensive or vitally important than that which contemplates the Christian's sin; yet, it will be observed, Systematic Theology, as set forth in written standard works and as taught in seminaries generally, does not recognize this feature of the doctrine. The loss to the theological student is beyond calculation, for when graduated and ordained to the ministry of God's Word he is at once constituted a doctor of souls and the majority of those to whom he ministers will be Christians who are suffering from some spiritual injury which sin has inflicted upon them. Indeed, what Christian, waging, as all Christians do, a simultaneous battle on three fronts—the world, the flesh, and the devil—is not often, if not almost constantly, in a state of spiritual injury? The soul doctor himself does not escape this conflict and sad indeed is his plight if he is so ignorant of the essential truths regarding the Christian's sin and its divinely provided cure, that he cannot diagnose even his own case or apply the healing to his own stricken heart! Though the pastor is a doctor of souls, his first responsibility to others is so to teach the members of his flock with regard to the whole subject of sin as related to the Christian, that they may themselves be able to diagnose their own troubles and apply intelligently to their own hearts the divine cure. The Bible proposes no intermeddling human priest or Romish confessional for the child of God. It does propose an instructed pastor and teacher and a worthy ministry on his part in that field of truth which concerns the spiritual progress, power, prayer, and potency of those of God's redeemed ones who are committed to his spiritual care. The blight of sin upon Christian experience and service is tragic indeed, but how much more so when pastor and people alike are ignorant about the most elementary features of the well-defined and divinely revealed steps to be taken in its cure by Christians who are injured by sin!

In approaching this great theme, it will perhaps tend to clarify this aspect of doctrine if the Christian's relation to each of the four major features of sin, which have just been pursued, is considered separately.

Because of its unlikeness to God, personal sin is always equally sinful and condemnable whether it be committed by the saved or the unsaved, nor is there aught provided in either case for its cure other than the efficacy of the all-sufficient blood of Christ. Unregenerate men "have redemption" through the

blood of Christ; that is, the blood has been shed and its saving, transforming application awaits faith's appropriation. Over against this it is written of the Christian that "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). Most significant indeed is the use here of the present tense. It is while the Christian is walking in the light that he has both fellowship (fellowship which is with the Father and His Son, cf. vs. 3) and perpetual cleansing by the blood of Christ. The cleansing, it is evident, depends upon the walk—as does the fellowship—but all that the walk implies must be discerned if the doctrine involved is not to be distorted. To *walk in the light* is not to be sinless; that would consist in *becoming* the light. Walking in the light is responding to, and being guided by, the Light—and *God is Light* (vs. 5). In a practical way, it means that when the Light, which God is, shines into the heart and reveals sin or darkness that is there, it is judged and put away by His grace and power. This conception is in harmony with verse 9, that "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The blood of Christ must be applied, and it is when the Christian confesses his sin to God. It must be observed, however, that while sin is always exceedingly sinful and its cure is by the blood of Christ alone, the divine reckoning and consequent method of remedial dealing with the Christian's sin, because of his background relationship to God, is far removed from the divine reckoning and remedial dealing with the sin of unregenerate persons who sustain no such relationship to God.

The divine forgiveness of sin for unregenerate men is available only as it is *included* in the sum total of all that enters into their salvation. At least thirty-three divine undertakings, including forgiveness, are wrought simultaneously and instantaneously at the moment the individual is saved and this marvelous achievement represents the measureless difference between those who are saved and those who are not saved. Deeply in error, indeed, and dishonoring to God are those current definitions which represent the Christian to be different merely in his ideals, his manner of life, or his outward relationships, when, in reality, he is a new creation in Christ Jesus. His new headship-standing being in Christ, every change which is needed has been wrought to conform him to his new positions and possessions. Forgiveness, then, in its positional aspect (Col. 2:13), is final and complete, and of the Christian thus forgiven it may be said, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). However, this is but a part of all that God accomplished in His salvation.

Unregenerate men are not encouraged to seek the forgiveness of sin alone, or any other individual feature of saving grace. If they secure forgiveness, it must come to them as a part of, and included in, the whole divine undertaking. Forgiveness of sin and salvation are not synonymous terms. On the other hand, when sin has entered into the life of a Christian it becomes a question of sin and sin alone which is involved. The remaining features of his salvation are unchanged. This truth is well illustrated in Chapter XVIII in which the remedy for the personal sin of the unregenerate was seen to be both forgiveness and justification, that is, not only forgiveness which cancels the offense, but justification which secures a perfect standing before God. It is never implied that a Christian should be justified again after he is justified by his initial faith in Christ, but he must be forgiven as often as he sins. Thus, the terms of cure which are divinely imposed respectively upon these two groups—the saved and the unsaved—must be different, as indeed they are.

The difference between the divine method of dealing with the sins of regenerate men as in contrast to the divine method of dealing with the sins of unsaved members of the human family is a major distinction in doctrine which if confounded cannot result in anything short of spiritual tragedy for all concerned. The preaching of the Arminian notion that, having sinned, the Christian must be saved again, has wrought untold injury to uncounted millions; but even a greater disaster has been wrought by the careless and misguided preaching to unregenerate people of repentance as a divine requirement separate from believing, of confession of sin as an essential to salvation, and of reformation of the daily life as the ground upon which a right relation to God may be secured.

The Scriptures distinguish with great clarity the divine method of dealing with the sins of these two classes. In 1 John 2:2 we read: “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” No consideration can be given here to the interpretation of this passage which is offered by the advocates of a limited-redemption theory. Without question, the passage sets up a vital contrast between “our sins,” which could not refer to those of the mass of unregenerate human beings, and “the sins of the whole [*cosmos*] world,” which classification as certainly includes more than the sins of the regenerate portion of humanity, unless language is strained beyond measure in the interests of a theory. This passage is a great revelation to unregenerate men. Because of Christ’s death, God is now propitious toward them. But who can measure the comfort to the crushed and bleeding heart of a Christian when it is discovered to that heart that already the very sin so much

deplored has been borne by Christ, and that, on the most righteous basis, the Father is now *propitious* toward the suffering saint—a propitiation so real and true that the Father’s arms are outstretched to welcome the returning Christian who, like the Prodigal, makes unreserved confession of his sin? It will be remembered that, according to the infinite accuracy of the Scriptures, the Prodigal is kissed by the father even *before* any confession is made. Thus it is disclosed that the Father *is* propitious toward His sinning child even before that child can be supposed to have merited anything, either by repentance, restitution, or confession. How persistent is the thought that God’s heart must be softened by our tears! And, yet, how marvelous is the assurance that Christ is already the propitiation for our sins!

Again, the first five chapters of the Letter to the Romans present the fact of the unregenerate world’s position before God and set forth the ground of the gospel of God’s saving grace, but chapters six to eight are addressed to regenerate men and have to do with the problem of a holy walk and the divine provisions thereunto. The sin problem as it concerns the believer is not in view in the first five chapters of Romans, nor is any phase of salvation as it concerns unbelievers to be found in Romans, chapters six to eight. Similarly, the hortatory portions of all the epistles are addressed to those who are saved. They could not be addressed to unsaved men since the issue between God and them is not one of an improved manner of life; it is rather the reception of the gift of salvation through Jesus Christ, which gift is conditioned not upon any manner of works or human merit but upon saving faith in Christ alone.

In the case of the Christian, as in contrast to the unregenerate, the field of possible sin is greatly increased. Having come into the knowledge of the truth, the Christian, when he sins, offends against greater light. Likewise, he sins against God in the sphere of that new relationship which exists between a son and his father. It will also be seen that the Christian, being a citizen of heaven, is normally called upon to walk worthy of that high calling (Eph. 4:1). That high standard is no less than the ideal of Christlikeness. It is written: “For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain” (Phil. 1:21); “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 2:5); “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light” (1 Pet. 2:9). Such an ideal is wholly unknown to those who are unregenerate and who make up this *cosmos* world. It is not unreasonable that requirements which are impossible to human ability are addressed to the Christian since he is given

the Holy Spirit whose power is ever available; but the range for possible failure is here, as in the instances cited above, wide indeed. That the manner of life which becomes the child of God is supernatural, is constantly implied in the Scriptures which guide him in his manner of life. It is written: "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5); "That ye should shew forth the praises [virtues] of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (1 Pet. 2:9); "Giving thanks always for all things unto God" (Eph. 5:20); "That ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called" (Eph. 4:1); "Walk in the light" (1 John 1:7); "Walk in love" (Eph. 5:2); "Walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:16); "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God" (Eph. 4:30); "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5:19). A greater responsibility of daily life and service, due to the exalted position which he occupies, implies that, in the usual experience, the Christian will need a constant recourse to divine forgiveness and to be restored by grace to divine fellowship. Recognizing this imperative need, the Word of God presents its extended teaching regarding the cure of the believer's sin—a doctrine which has no counterpart or parallel in the truth which belongs to the unregenerate.

Continuing the contemplation of the stress which is imposed upon the Christian because of his position and relationships, certain conflicts are emphasized in the struggle which is common to all who are saved. It is generally and properly taught that the Christian's conflict is threefold, namely, (a) against the world, (b) against the flesh, and (c) against the devil. By this it is asserted that the Christian's solicitation to evil will arise from any or all of these three sources. It is of supreme importance, then, that the child of God be intelligently aware of the scope and power of each of these mighty influences. Only the most restricted treatment of these forces can be undertaken here, and that in the light of the fact that much has been written previously on these general themes.

I. The World

Of the three Greek words which in the Authorized Version are translated by the English word *world*, but one—κόσμος—presents the thought of a sphere of conflict. This word means *order*, *system*, *regulation*, and indicates that the world is an order or system, but in every instance—and there are many—where a moral feature of the world is in view, this *cosmos* world is said to be opposed to God. It is declared to have originated—in its plan and order—with Satan. He promotes it

and is its prince and god. This *cosmos* system is largely characterized by its ideals and entertainments and these become allurements to the Christian who is in this *cosmos* though no part of it. These features of the *cosmos* are often close counterfeits of the things of God and in no place does the believer need divine guidance more than when attempting to draw a line of separation between the things of God and the things of Satan's *cosmos*. In their far-flung realities, the things of God are wholly unrelated to the things of Satan. It is at the border line that Satan confuses the issues. It is indeed true, as just stated, that the believer is *in* the world, but not *of* it. Taken out of the world system by the New-Creation relationship, believers are no longer any more a part of the world than is Christ; but Christ has sent them into the world even as the Father sent Him into the world, not to be conformed to it, but to be witnesses in it (John 17:18). One, and only one, plan is provided for a victory over the world. It is stated in 1 John 5:4, "And this is the victory that overcometh [lit., overcame] the world, even our faith." Reference here is not to a present vacillating faith; the past tense is used looking back to that faith which identified the believer with Christ. Thus the Apostle goes on to say, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Though there is a need that it shall be claimed as a present experience, the victory is *Christ*, and all in Christ are already equipped by the indwelling Spirit to be more than conquerors. The world presents a constant hazard to the child of God and his liability in the direction of that form of sin which is worldliness is ever a reality.

II. The Flesh

The recurrence of this subject at various points in an orderly system of doctrine is necessary and indicates its immense importance. In its moral significance, it denotes that which is the very structure of the being of the unregenerate man. It remains as a vital part of the regenerate person's being and abides and is the occasion of an unceasing conflict against the indwelling Spirit so long as there is life in the mortal body. Proof has been adduced that the flesh, in its moral significance, is incurably evil in the sight of God. From it all manner of evil thoughts, evil desires, and evil actions arise. It is only as the believer experiences the larger restraining power of the Spirit of God that he will be able to live above the incitements and proclivities of the flesh. It was subsequent to his experience of regeneration that the Apostle testified of himself, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18). He also

asserted that the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and that these are always contrary the one to the other (Gal. 5:17). He also enumerated “the works of the flesh” (Gal. 5:19–21). All this, it will be observed, is said to be the experience of regenerate persons. Galatians 5:16 discloses the one and only relief, “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” The passage is not an instruction to unregenerate persons, nor does it imply that the fallen nature, which is the evil principle in the flesh, will ever be eradicated. God is no more proposing eradication of the flesh than of the world or of the devil. The divine method is the same in each of these conflicts. The victory is gained by the superior, overcoming power of the Spirit.

III. The Devil

Closely related, indeed, are the Christian’s three enemies—the world, the flesh, and the devil. Especially related are the world, or the satanic system, and Satan who is the “god” and “prince” of that system. However, the world and the flesh are impersonal influences, while Satan, the wisest of all created beings, is personal. He it is who exercises μεθοδεία—*circumvention of deceit, wiles, or artifices*—against the children of God. There is no conflict between unregenerate men and Satan; they are *energized* by him (Eph. 2:2). On the other hand, the Christian is in the center of the most terrible, supernatural warfare. It is described in Ephesians as a *wrestling*. The word implies the closest life-and-death struggle, hand to hand and foot to foot, of a tug of war. Nor is the uttermost device and power of Satan inspired by any enmity against regenerate men as such. His enmity is against God as it has been since his fall in the unknown ages past, and against the believer only on the ground that he has partaken of the divine nature. The “fiery darts” of the wicked one are aimed at God alone. To possess the priceless indwelling presence of the divine nature is to become so identified with God that His enemy becomes the enemy of the one who is saved.

Solemn, therefore, is the divine revelation that the wisest of all created beings, and the most powerful, is ceasing not to study the strategy by which he may snare the child of God, and, were it in his power, to bring that one to destruction. How unconcerned, unconscious, and ignorant Christians are! How ungrateful they are, because of their limited understanding, for the divine deliverance wrought in their behalf every hour of every day! Yet, how much of defeat, especially in the spiritual realm, is suffered by all who are saved because

of their failure to wage their warfare in “the power of his might,” who alone can give victory, and to “put on the whole armour of God”! No more vital injunction was ever addressed to the Christian than that he must “be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.” He must put on the whole armor of God that he may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil (Eph. 6:10–11 —on the meaning of *wiles* cf. Eph. 4:14). Faith, it has been seen, is the only way of victory over the world and the flesh, but it is equally certain and according to the Word of God that faith is the only way of victory over the power of Satan. How assuring is the word, “Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world” (1 John 4:4)! Even Michael the archangel, when contending with Satan, did not in his own strength bring a “railing accusation” against him, but said, “The Lord rebuke thee” (Jude 1:9). True, James states, “Resist the devil, and he will flee from you”; but that is a word of admonition to those who have first submitted themselves unto God (James 4:7). Likewise, Peter declares in reference to Satan, “whom resist stedfast in the faith” (1 Pet. 5:9; cf. 2 Cor. 10:3–5; Phil. 2:13; 4:13; John 15:5).

Quite apart from human opinion or experience which is of a contrary nature, it must be concluded that, in his threefold conflict, there is nothing but defeat and failure in the path of the Christian should he not pursue the way of faith or dependence upon the Spirit of God. The child of God must “fight the good fight of faith.” His responsibility is not to war with his enemies in his own strength, but rather to maintain the ever triumphant attitude of faith.

IV. The Threefold Provision

In recognition of the believer’s conflict while in the world, God has, in marvelous grace, provided a threefold prevention against the Christian’s sin. If the Christian sins, it will be in spite of these provisions. These great requisites are a revelation found in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament.

1. THE WORD OF GOD. The Psalmist states, “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee” (Ps. 119:11), and in 2 Timothy 3:16–17 it is declared, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” It is as His Word abides in the believer that he is in the place of spiritual achievement (John 15:7). There is little hope for victory in daily life on the part of those believers who, being ignorant of the Word of God, do not know the nature of their conflict

or the deliverance God has provided. Over against this, there is no estimating the sanctifying power of the Word of God. Our Savior prayed, “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth” (John 17:17).

2. THE INTERCEDING CHRIST. Again, the Psalmist records, “The LORD is my shepherd, I shall not want” (Ps. 23:1), and the New Testament revelation of the interceding Christ is also broad enough to include His shepherd care. Little did Peter know of the testing that was before him or of his own pitiful weakness, but Christ had anticipated it all. He could say in assurance to Peter, “I have prayed for thee” (Luke 22:32), as in fact, He prays for all whom He has saved. It is probable that His High Priestly prayer recorded in John, chapter 17, is but the beginning of His prayer for “those whom thou hast given me,” which prayer is now continued without ceasing by Him in heaven. On the ground of this unceasing intercession, the believer is assured of his security forever. In Romans 8:34 it is written that there is none to condemn since, among other efficacious forces, Christ “maketh intercession for us.” In like manner, the writer to the Hebrews discloses the truth that Christ as Priest, in contrast to the death-doomed priests of the old order, will never again be subject to death. He therefore has an unchangeable or unending priesthood; and, because He abideth forever as a sufficient priest, He is able to save eternally (or as long as He remains a priest) those who come unto God by Him, since He ever lives to make intercession for them (Heb. 7:23–25). This guarantee of abiding endurance, based, as it is, upon the absolute efficacy of the interceding Christ, is final and complete. But, as has been seen, the intercession of Christ is ever a preventative against failure as well as a security for the children of God.

3. THE INDWELLING SPIRIT. The saints of the old order were reminded that it is “not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the LORD of hosts” (Zech. 4:6). So, as has been indicated before, every defense and protection as well as every victory for the Christian is dependent upon the power of the indwelling Spirit.

V. The Twofold Effect of the Christian’s Sin

In its effect, the Christian’s sin reaches into two spheres, namely, (a) himself and (b) God. There could be no question about the relative importance of these two results of the Christian’s sin. That which is so evidently of least import will be considered first.

1. THE EFFECT OF THE CHRISTIAN'S SIN UPON HIMSELF. Though including in its realities all that is experiential, this phase of the doctrine of the Christian's sin is secondary, indeed, to the crucial and all-determining aspects of the doctrine which are confronted when contemplating the effect of the Christian's sin upon God. The First Epistle by John is the portion of the Scriptures which records the damaging effect of the Christian's sin upon himself. In that Epistle, believers are contemplated as children in the Father's family and household, and the effect of sin on the child of God is there seen to be, not the dissolution of the abiding fact of sonship, but rather an injury to those normal experiences and relationships, exalted and glorious, which are wholly within the family circle. Inaccuracy of doctrine on this point cannot but impose immeasurable misconceptions of the truth, and the injury will be inflicted within the realm of the believer's experience wherein all spiritual suffering originates and thrives. The Apostle John enumerates at least seven distressing experiential penalties which together constitute the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself.

First, the light of God, which in normal conditions falls upon the believer's mind and upon his path, is turned to darkness (1 John 1:6). John dwells particularly upon the truth that the believer may walk either in the dark or in the light. As he walks in the light other realities are secured which enter into his spiritual blessing, but specifically the Apostle states that when walking in the light there is no occasion of stumbling (2:10).

Second, in 1 John 1:4 it is implied that sin in the Christian will result in the loss of joy. This joy is none other than the imparted, celestial joy of Christ (John 15:11; Gal. 5:22). The prayer of David in the midst of his confession of his sin was, "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation" (Ps. 51:12). It is not the salvation but rather its normal, celestial joy which is lost when the Christian sins.

Third, the loss of fellowship with the Father and with His Son is inevitable for those among the children of God who walk in darkness. On the other hand, the riches of His presence is the experience of those who walk in the light (1:3, 6-7).

Fourth, the loss of the experience of imparted divine love will be the portion of those Christians who do not keep the Word of God and who love this world (2:5, 15-17; 4:12). The perfecting within the child of God of divine compassion is one of the greatest themes of this Epistle and the experience of that perfected love is supreme amid all spiritual ecstasy.

Fifth, the loss of peace, according to 3:4-10, is another penalty which the believer must suffer when he sins. This passage, previously considered, states that the Christian cannot sin lawlessly without that anguish of heart which is the

total loss of peace. It is on the ground of this reaction to sin on the part of the Christian, that he is to be distinguished from those that are unregenerate who sin lawlessly and without conscience (3:10).

Sixth, the loss of “confidence” toward God in the experience of prayer is also certain for the believer who sins (3:19–22). This, indeed, is serious, and is immediately the conscious experience of all who fail to do the will of God.

Seventh, the loss of “confidence” at the coming of Christ (2:28) is to be anticipated by Christians who sin. Either to have “boldness” (4:17) or to be “ashamed” at His coming are two possible experiences widely separated the one from the other.

The truth regarding the Father’s discipline or chastisement of His unyielding child—a doctrine of great importance and its understanding is most vital to each Christian—could be introduced here with propriety. It is reserved, however, for the next chapter which deals with the divine punishment where some vital distinction may be drawn more at length between chastisement and punishment.

Other aspects of spiritual power and blessing which are sacrificed by the Christian when he sins might be named. All the gracious fruit and ministry of the indwelling Spirit are hindered when the Spirit is grieved because of sin. By all this it may be seen that sin is a tragedy of immeasurable proportions in the Christian’s experience. The cure which is divinely provided is both natural, in view of the believer’s relationships in the household of God, and explicit.

The responsibility resting upon the unregenerate man who would avail himself of the forgiveness of *all* trespasses and be saved is expressed in the one all-inclusive word—*believe*, while the responsibility resting upon the regenerate man who would be forgiven and restored to right relations with God is expressed in the one word—*confess*. These two words are each specifically adapted to the situation, relationships, and circumstances with which they are associated. Untold confusion follows when unregenerate men are told to *confess* as a condition of forgiveness and salvation, which confusion is equalled when a regenerate man is told to *believe* as a condition of securing a renewal of right relations to God. Hymnology is sometimes misleading at this point. By such hymns, words are put into the lips of the unsaved which encourage them to conceive of themselves as wanderers who are returning to God. As a matter of fact, the unregenerate man has never before been in any favorable relation to God. When, as a part of his salvation, he is forgiven, it is unto a hitherto unexperienced *union* with God which abides forever; but when the Christian is forgiven it is unto the restoration of *communion* with God which may be broken

again all too soon. The saints of all the ages have returned to the blessings of their covenant relation to God by the confession of their sin. This, however, is far removed from those terms upon which they entered the covenant at the beginning. The loss of the blessing within the covenant is different, indeed, from the loss of the covenant relation itself. In the case of a believer related to God by the New Covenant made in His blood, restoration to communion, as always, is by confession of sin to God. We read in 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 11:31–32 it is stated that "if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world." Since confession and self-judgment refer to the same action on the part of the believer, these passages emphasize the same important truth. Confession and self-judgment are the outward expression of heart-repentance; and repentance, which is a change of mind or purpose, brings the sin-burdened Christian back into agreement with God. While practicing sin, he was opposed to the will and character of God; by repentance, expressed to God in the confession of sin and self-judgment, he returns to agreement with God. "Two cannot walk together, except they be agreed," nor can the Christian have fellowship with God who is Light and at the same time be walking in darkness (1 John 1:6). To walk in the light is not to *become* the light, which would mean attainment to infinite holiness. God alone is Light. Nor does walking in the light mean that one never does wrong. It is rather that when the searchlight, which God is, penetrates the heart and life and discloses that which is contrary to His will, the wrong thus disclosed is by a true heart-repentance at once confessed and judged before God. Assurance is given to the believer that when thus adjusted to the light (which is "walking in the light"), the sin is forgiven and its pollution cleansed by the blood of Christ. Both 1 John 1:8 and 10 are in the nature of a parenthesis. The word of assurance presented in 1:7 is continued in 1:9 which states that, "If we confess our sins [which is adjustment to God who is the Light], he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Confession of sin, it should be observed, is first and always to God and is to be extended to others only as they have been directly injured by the sin. So, likewise, this divine forgiveness and cleansing are not said to be acts of divine mercy and kindness, being wrought rather on the basis of absolute righteousness which is made possible through the fact that the penalty which the sin merits has fallen upon the Substitute—God's provided Lamb. Since the Substitute has endured the penalty,

God is seen to be *just* rather than *merciful* when He justifies the unsaved who do no more than to “believe in Jesus” (Rom. 3:26), and *just* rather than *merciful* when He forgives the Christian who has sinned, on no other condition than that he “confess” his sin (1 John 1:9). In forgiving the Christian who confesses his sin, God is “faithful” to His eternal character and purpose and is “just” in so doing because of the penalty which Christ has endured. The basis for this provision whereby the Christian may be forgiven and cleansed in the faithfulness and justice of God is found in the declaration which consummates this context (1 John 2:2), where it is said that “he is the propitiation for our sins.” Since this context is concerned only with the sins of Christians, the great aspect of propitiation for a lost world is mentioned here only incidentally. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that Christ *is* the propitiation for *our* sins. By His death He has rendered God propitious and free to forgive and cleanse the Christian who confesses his sin.

It is evident that the divine forgiveness of the believer is household in its character. It contemplates, not the once-for-all forgiveness which is a part of salvation (Col. 2:13), but the forgiveness of the one who already and permanently is a member of the household and family of God. Vital union with God, which is secured by Christ for the believer, has not been and cannot be broken (Rom. 8:1, R.V.). This renewal is unto fellowship and communion with God. At no point in Christian doctrine is the specific and unique character of the present grace-relationship to God more clearly seen than in household forgiveness. The divine dealing with men under grace, like any complete economy of government, provides at least four essential features: (a) a setting forth of the manner of life which is desired—this is contained in the grace injunctions of the New Testament; (b) a penalty for wrongdoing—this has been pointed out above under the seven warnings contained in the First Epistle by John; (c) a cure for the wrong with specific revelation of its terms—this has been seen to be a genuine heart-repentance expressed in confession of sin and self-judgment; and (d) a motive for right action.

Identification of the divinely conceived reason for right action under the governmental economy of grace is of supreme import since the motivating principle under grace is diametrically opposite to the motivating principles set forth in all legal systems of government. Under a legal system, a thing is done that standing and merit may be secured. The legal aspect appears in the form of a contract or necessity imposed. Under the grace economy, a thing is done in recognition of the fact that perfect standing and merit have already been secured

through the imputed merit of Christ. This motive is gracious in character and void of all contracts or necessities. Earlier in this discussion it was demonstrated that the child of God, being in Christ, is justified before God forever, to which standing human merit could add nothing. True to the grace motive for right action and in accordance with his household relationships, which are the distinctive relationships under grace, the believer is directed to forgive those who injure him on the basis of the fact that God has already freely forgiven him. Of this we read in Ephesians 4:32, "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." And again in Colossians 3:13, "Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." This, indeed, is far removed from a system of divine dealing in which the blessing of forgiveness is made to depend, in the most absolute terms, on the offender's forgiveness of others. As a feature of one legal system we read, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses" (Matt. 6:14–15). It is a serious error when one, who through saving faith in Christ has been for Christ's sake once-for-all forgiven all trespasses, assumes the attitude before God which implies that he is not forgiven until for his own sake or merit he has forgiven those who have trespassed against him. Doubtless both Ephesians 4:32 and Colossians 3:13 are not referring to oft-repeated household forgiveness, but rather to once-for-all forgiveness accompanying salvation. However, Matthew 6:14–15, being Christ's own enlargement on a clause in the kingdom prayer which He taught His disciples, is often confused with household forgiveness. Of various distinctions to be observed between the kingdom aspect of forgiveness and household forgiveness, but three will be mentioned here:

First, in the one case (Matt. 6:12), forgiveness is made to depend to some degree upon *asking* for it, which implies that propitiation is not complete, or that God must be besought and persuaded to forgive. In the other case (1 John 1:9), forgiveness is made to depend on *confession*, which implies that God is wholly propitious and awaiting only that adjustment to His holy will which confession provides. It is doubtful in the light of 1 John 2:2 with 1:9 if a Christian is to ask for forgiveness for present sins any more than he was called upon to ask for once-for-all forgiveness when he was saved. When saved he was forgiven upon *believing*, and, being saved, he will be forgiven upon *confessing*. Both confessing and believing are efficacious and represent the uncomplicated human obligation

in their respective spheres apart from human pleading since Christ is “the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John 2:2). No objection could be raised against the declaration that 1 John 1:1–2:2 is the central passage in the Scriptures on household forgiveness, and it is far from accidental and of more than passing significance that in this context neither by precept, nor by example, nor by implication is asking constituted any part of the believer’s obligation when in need of forgiveness.

Second, the second indication that Matthew 6:14–15 is not to be classed as household forgiveness may be introduced by asking the usual hypothetical, abstract question, namely, Will God forgive a Christian who does not first forgive those who have sinned against that Christian? The answer need not be complicated. Unforgiveness in a Christian is a sin which calls for confession, and when it is confessed it is forgiven by God because it *is* confessed and not because the unforgiving Christian has merited forgiveness of the sin by a self-changed heart. In fact, no one is able of himself to command a forgiving spirit in his own heart which by nature is unforgiving. Tenderheartedness and longsuffering are divine characteristics which are secured not by human effort but by faith in the indwelling Spirit whose power and fruit are available to those who, having confessed all known sin including an unforgiving heart, are empowered unto every right attitude before God. The principles and requirements set forth in Matthew 6:14–15 will obtain in the kingdom, but under grace relationships the deeper question is raised and answered: How may a heart of compassion be secured at all? The answer is that all sin must first be confessed and that a forgiving heart is then possible only through the enabling power of God.

Third, the place and importance of human merit is a feature which serves to demonstrate the fact that Matthew 6:14–15 is not household or grace forgiveness. The forgiveness required in this passage precedes and determines divine forgiveness and is therefore meritorious in character; whereas 1 John 1:9 suggests a situation in which all supposed merit is abandoned in abject confession of failure and grace reigns, based, as it must be, upon that propitiation which Christ is.

The confusion which may arise through failure to distinguish truths which differ is illustrated in the case of certain teachers who, in one instance, earnestly contend that, according to Matthew 6:14–15, no Christian will be forgiven who does not himself forgive, and, in another instance, as earnestly contend that the Christian, in conformity to the divine pattern, must not forgive those who have

injured him until they are penitent. The logic of these positions is obvious: If a Christian can be forgiven only when he forgives and if he must not forgive until those who have injured him are penitent, then he cannot himself be forgiven of God for his own sins until *all* those who have injured him repent—a dubious prospect indeed, to say the least.

The obligation of a Christian toward his brother in Christ is on a plane so exalted that none could hope to attain to it by dependence upon his own resources, which dependence is the substance of the merit relationship. Who, indeed, could by unaided human strength comply with Christ's new commandment: "Love one another, as I have loved you" (John 13:34; 15:12)? Each Christian's obligation toward every other Christian is expressed in such terms as "longsuffering, forbearing one another in love" (Eph. 4:2); "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:32); "kindness, ... longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity [love], which is the bond of perfectness" (which is the goal of a spiritual life—Col. 3:12–14). Such high standards cannot be attained or maintained apart from the power of the indwelling Spirit. If they are thus wrought of God, they are not based on merit, and Matthew 6:14–15, because it is based on merit, is, in the *light* of these standards, seen to be foreign to the divine administration under grace.

There are yet three important portions of the Scriptures to be mentioned bearing on the fact that God has always dealt specifically and constantly with the defilement of His covenant people. (a) In Numbers 19:1–22 the ordinance of the law of Jehovah provided for the sacrifice and burning of a red heifer and specified that the ashes of the heifer should be preserved, and, when mingled with water, and as occasion might arise, should serve for the cleansing by sprinkling of any in Israel who had become unclean. The ashes of the heifer preserved in a vessel and serving over a long period of time for cleansing became a type of the perpetual cleansing of the child of God by the blood of Christ (1 John 1:7, 9). (b) In Exodus 30:17–21 the record is given of Jehovah's commandment to Moses concerning the laver of brass which, by the appointment of Jehovah, stood at the entrance of the holy place and at this laver the priests were to bathe their hands and feet before each service in the holy place. Failure on the part of the priest to comply with this statute merited the penalty of death. The priest, though born to his office, being of the house of Aaron and of the tribe of Levi and having been completely bathed ceremonially

by the high priest when inducted into his priestly service, was, nevertheless, compelled to observe the ceremonial bathing of his hands and feet—the members which contact the defilement of the world—before every service. The Old Testament priest is a type of the New Testament believer and the constant bathing on the part of the Old Testament priest typifies the constant cleansing of the New Testament believer who is born to his position by the new birth and is once and for all washed by the washing of regeneration (Titus 3:5; cf. 1 Cor. 6:11). (c) In John 13:1–17 the record is given of the bathing of the disciples’ feet by Christ. By the use of the word νίπτω Christ distinguishes the bathing He was performing as a *partial* bathing and quite different indeed from the *whole* bath, to which He refers in verse 10 by the use of the word λούω. This partial bathing implies that these disciples, excepting Judas whom Christ dismisses from the company, were wholly bathed and had no further need in the way of cleansing save the washing of the feet. Similarly, this partial bathing was unto the maintenance of fellowship as indicated by the words, “If I wash thee not, thou hast no part [μέρος] with me” (verse 8).

It may be concluded, therefore, that there has been a continual cleansing in addition to the once-for-all, initial cleansing which God has provided and prescribed for His people in other ages, and that, in the present age, a true repentance or change of mind with its outward expression, which is confession, represents the sole human responsibility; but, on the divine side, the forgiveness and cleansing of the believer is made possible only through the *propitiatory* blood of Christ.

2. THE EFFECT OF THE CHRISTIAN’S SIN UPON GOD. Far deeper in their import are the issues related to the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God than those related to the effect of the Christian’s sin upon himself. Rationalistic systems of theology have contended that, since God is infinitely holy, the effect of the Christian’s sin upon God must be that salvation is forfeited and the cure for that situation is a re-regeneration of the one who has sinned. Since so-called lesser sins are so constantly the experience of the believer, it has been necessary to attribute only to great and flagrant sins the power to unsave. Apparently the generous nature and forbearance of God is depended upon to pass over or forgive the lesser sins. However, the Word of God lends itself in no way to the support of the notion that some sins are good and some bad, or that God can forgive apart from the substitutionary work of Christ. Sin, even in its inoffensive form, is exceedingly sinful in the sight of God and, were it not for the efficacious

blood of Christ, would have the power to separate a Christian from God forever. But since Christ's sacrifice for sin extends to *all* sin, sin's power to separate a believer from God is annulled, though, as has been seen, there may be for the believer because of his sin the tragic loss of fellowship with God, of celestial joy, confidence, and peace.

Having presented the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself and having stated the human responsibility in the directing of its cure, the Apostle John goes on (1 John 2:1) to present the fact that there is also a divine remedy for the effect of the Christian's sin upon God, but wholly apart from any human responsibility or cooperation. God alone can solve His own problem which the Christian's sin creates in its relation to His holiness and governmental authority. The salvation which is offered through Christ is eternal, which means that every aspect of possible condemnation that might arise will be anticipated and met. The Christian can cooperate in no way in the sphere of the provision of a righteous ground either for his salvation or safe-keeping. The one verse (1 John 2:1) presents a vast field of closely related doctrines. We read: "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not [be not sinning]. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Five contributive aspects of truth are to be discerned in this verse:

First, "My little children." By this salutation it is evidenced that the message is addressed only to the children of God. It must be emphasized that the safe-keeping which the passage reveals and the divine working to that end have to do only with those who are born again. There is an ever increasing company of professors of religion who, it would seem, may never have passed from death unto life. What this passage discloses applies only to those who are saved.

Second, "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not" (be not sinning). Reference is probably made in this clause to that which has gone before as well as to that which follows. As anticipated by the Apostle, the effect of this message upon true believers will be to deter them from the practice of sin. Eternal security for all who are saved is abundantly assured in the New Testament and nowhere more fully than in this verse, yet the doctrine is by many thought to provide a license to sin. In opposition to this rationalistic notion, the Apostle here presents the great fact of eternal security as a motive for not sinning, and the fact of eternal security when intelligently grasped by the believer has ever proved in practical experience to be just such a restraint.

Third, "If any man sin." There can be little doubt that the Apostle is referring to the same limited group of those who are saved. The phrase "little children"

which constitutes the salutation and the word “we” which follows give sufficient evidence that only saved persons are included in these benefits. The fact that Christians do sin is patent. The source of sin in the Christian, as has been observed, is the sin nature and the force of its tendency is seen in that the impulse to sin often rides over all restraint. God has provided three restraining factors—His Word (Ps. 119:11), His indwelling Spirit (Gal. 5:16), and the interceding Christ (Luke 22:31–32)—but He has also revealed that the child of God may, if he persists, disregard to some extent these restraining forces. However, when the believer’s will is in agreement with the will of God, these same divinely provided restraints become the very factors which enable the believer to live unto God.

Fourth, “We have an advocate with the Father.” The designation, Παράκλητος, is used of both the Holy Spirit (John 16:7) and of Christ (1 John 2:1). When Christ referred to the Spirit as “another” Παράκλητος, He implied that He Himself was then to the disciples a true helper. However, His present ministry in heaven as Παράκλητος assumes a legal aspect. As Advocate He espouses the cause of another in the open court. Christ *defends* rather than prosecutes those whom He has saved. The scene is of a court in session. The Father is the Judge. In Revelation 12:10 it is stated that Satan ceases not day and night to accuse the brethren before God. The issue before the court is one of actual sin on the part of the child of God. Since God is infinitely holy, He must act in absolute righteousness toward all offenders. The accuser of the brethren is presenting no false charges. It should be observed that, as Intercessor, Christ contemplates and supports the believer in the sphere of the believer’s weakness, immaturity, and ignorance; but, as Advocate, He confronts the most serious situation that could ever arise concerning a child in the Father’s household. As Advocate He defends the believer when charged with actual sin. This He does *while* the believer is sinning and not sometime afterwards. The assurance is given that, if a Christian sins, he *has* an Advocate with the Father. It might be supposed by some that the Advocate is begging the Father to be lenient toward the offender; but God cannot be lenient toward sin. Likewise, it might be supposed that the Advocate is making excuses for the one He defends; but there are no excuses. In like manner, it might be supposed that the Advocate is able to confuse the issue and make out a case that would divert the natural course of justice; but that unworthy conception is answered in the very title which He gains as Advocate, which title is nowhere else applied to Him.

Fifth, “Jesus Christ the righteous,” is the title which He gains as Advocate.

Thus it is disclosed that the thing which the Advocate does, not only saves the offender from the holy judgments of God, but that defense is wrought upon a ground so equitable that the Advocate, because of His advocacy, is given the title, Jesus Christ *the Righteous*. This title does not refer to Christ's own holy character, which is righteous to an infinite degree; it rather refers to the righteous basis upon which the offender is delivered by the Advocate—a deliverance wrought in full view of the unalterable demands of holiness and in spite of the truthful accusations of Satan. As Advocate in heaven and in behalf of a Christian who is sinning, Christ presents the evidence of His own death and proves the fact that He bore that sin on the cross. The removal of the penalty from the believer on the ground of the Advocate's having borne it is a transaction of unsurpassed equity.

There is no appeal that can be made to the child of God that he refrain from sin, which could be more effective than that which results from even a partial knowledge of all that his sin imposes on the Advocate in heaven. Such knowledge does not tend to carelessness, nor does the deliverance wrought by the Advocate lower the standards of the holy judgments of God. The child of God is preserved by the abiding, propitiatory value of the death of Christ. Here, as in the case of the divine freedom to deal with the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself, the effect of his sin upon God is also annulled by the fact that, as the context goes on to say, "He is the propitiation for our sins."

It may be concluded, therefore, that the cure of the Christian's sin is based upon that aspect of the propitiatory work of Christ which contemplates the Christian's sin, and, on that basis, the effect of the Christian's sin upon himself may be removed on no other ground than that he confess his sin; and that the effect of the Christian's sin upon God is cured by the same propitiatory work of Christ, but upon no human terms whatsoever, since Christ, as Savior, undertakes not only to *save* but to *keep* those whom He saves.

As a consummation of the specific theme, the Christian's personal sin, it may be restated that sin is as evil when committed by a Christian as when committed by the unsaved, that the Christian sins against greater light, against a more intimate relation to God, from a higher position, being in Christ, and against a more exalted standard of holy living which is no less than that which pertains to a heavenly citizenship and a manifestation of Christ's own character. It is also declared that the Christian is more beset than the unregenerate since he wages a conflict against the world, the flesh, and the devil. It has also been pointed out that the Christian has the divinely provided help which is contributed by the

Word of God, the interceding Christ, and the indwelling Spirit. And, finally, the Christian's sin reacts upon himself to his spiritual injury, which may be cured by confession of his sin to God, and it reacts against God, who, being propitious through the death of Christ for the Christian's sin, continues the Christian as His child through that infinite grace which provides a righteous satisfaction for every wrong.

VI. The Christian's Sin Nature

Though the *fact* of the sin nature has been attended at length in Chapter XIX, it yet remains to consider the divine remedy for that nature. That there is no provided remedy for it as pertains to the unregenerate would hardly be disputed. The whole divine revelation respecting the remedy is exclusively a message to believers. In approaching the truth respecting the remedy, a brief survey will first be given of the origin, character, and propagation of this nature.

As a faithful warning, God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or, *dying thou shalt die* (Gen. 2:17). Though his physical death was delayed for centuries, Adam died spiritually on the day in which he disobeyed and repudiated God. The whole character of his being was abruptly changed; it was not merely that he was *charged* with the guilt of sin, but he was *changed* in every part of his being. He who was, in his creation, satisfying to his Creator became a degenerate and depraved man in himself, capable of generating only after his kind, and through fallen Adam a spiritually dead race has been propagated who are blighted by a death which is none other than separation of the soul and spirit from God. Indicative of this great change in Adam, he is seen hiding from God, as a confession of his own change of heart, and, likewise, the record is given of a divine expulsion from the garden, with other penalties, as an expression of the judgment of God. No longer did God come down and walk with Adam in the cool of the day. This spiritually dead condition, which is termed a fallen, or Adamic, nature, is transmitted without diminution from father to son throughout all generations.

That Christians are wont to sin and do sin is observable on every hand. This is equally true of those who, through erroneous teaching, have been encouraged to profess that they have attained unto sinless perfection. In arriving at an understanding of the problem of the source from which sin proceeds in a Christian, and the issues involved in its cure, it is essential to recognize the meaning and force of three terms which are employed in the New Testament:

1. “FLESH” (σάρξ). On the precise meaning of this term, Bishop Moule writes:

In New Testament usage, on the whole, this word bears in each place (where its meaning is not merely literal) one of two meanings. It denotes either (a) human nature as conditioned by the body; (e.g. ix.3, 5, 9; 2 Cor. 7:5, &c. &c.;) or (b) human nature as conditioned by the Fall, or in other words by the dominion of sin, which then began, and which works so largely through the conditions of *bodily* life that those conditions are almost, in language, identified with sinfulness. ... In the *first* connexion “the flesh” may bear a neutral, or a holy, meaning; (John 1:14;) in the *second*, it means a state which is essentially evil, and which may be described with practical correctness as (1) the state of man unregenerate, and (2), in the regenerate, the state of that element of the being which still resists grace. For manifestly (see Gal. 5:17) “the flesh” is an element still in the regenerate, not only in the sense of *corporeal* conditions, but in that of *sinful* conditions. But, in the latter sense, they are no longer *characterized* by it; they are not “fleshly,” because the *dominant* element is now not “the flesh,” but the renewed will, energized by the Divine Spirit.—*Cambridge Bible, Romans*, p. 140

The life impulses and desires are called “lusts of the flesh.” “Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh” (Gal. 5:16, R.V. See also, Eph. 2:3; 2 Pet. 2:18; 1 John 2:16; Rom. 13:14). That the Bible use of the word *lust* is not limited to inordinate desires is evidenced by the fact that the Holy Spirit is said to “lust against the flesh,” according to the next verse in this context (see, also, James 4:5). The Scriptures are still more explicit concerning the breadth of the meaning of this word. Reference is made to “fleshly wisdom (2 Cor. 1:12), “fleshy tables of the heart” (2 Cor. 3:3), and “fleshly mind” (Col. 2:18, cf. Rom. 8:6). The Apostle does not say that either his body or nature are “fleshly”; he says, “I am carnal” (fleshly, Rom. 7:14), and “In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing” (Rom. 7:18). The unregenerate self is, within itself, hopelessly evil and condemned; but it is subject to the present control and ultimate transformation provided for in the grace and power of God.

Into this whole “natural man” a new divine nature is imparted when the individual is saved. Salvation is more than a *change of heart*. It is more than a transformation of the old. It is a regeneration or creation of something wholly new which is possessed in conjunction with the old nature so long as the child of God is in this body. The presence of two opposing natures (not two personalities) in one individual results in conflict. “The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other” (Gal. 5:17). There is no hint that this divine restraint upon the flesh will ever be unnecessary so long as the Christian is in this body; but the Bible bears a clear testimony that the believer may experience an unbroken “walk in the Spirit,” and “not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” To secure all of this, no removal of the “flesh” is promised. The human spirit, soul, and body abide, and the victory

is gained over the “flesh” by the power of the indwelling Spirit.

2. **“OLD MAN”** (παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος). Similarly, Bishop Moule begins his study of this word in Romans thus: “Cp., for illustrative passages, 7:22; 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 3:16, 4:22, 24; Col. 3:9; 1 Pet. 3:4. In view of these the word ‘*self*’ in its popular use (‘a man’s true self,’ &c.) appears to be a fair equivalent for ‘*man*’ here. Meyer here gives ‘*unser altes Ich,*’ (‘our old Ego’). Here the Apostle views the Christian before his union to Christ as (figuratively, of course,) *another person*; so profoundly different was his position before God, as a person unconnected with Christ” (*Ibid.*, p. 114).

This term is used only three times in the New Testament. Once it has to do with the present *position* of the “old man” through the death of Christ (Rom. 6:6). In the other two passages (Eph. 4:22–24; Col. 3:9–10) the fact that the “old man” has been put off forever is made the basis of an appeal for a holy manner of life.

In Romans 6:6 it is written: “Knowing this, that our old man is [was] crucified with him.” There can be no reference here to the *experience* of the Christian; it is rather a cocrucifixion “with him” and most evidently at the time and place when and where Christ was crucified. In the context this passage follows immediately upon the statement concerning the individual’s transfer in federal headship from the first Adam to the Last Adam (Rom. 5:12–21). The first Adam, as perpetuated in the believer, was judged in the crucifixion of Christ. The “old man,” the fallen nature received from Adam, *was* “crucified with him.” This cocrucifixion, it will be seen, is of the greatest importance, on the divine side, in making possible a true deliverance from the power of the “old man.”

In the second passage in which the term “old man” is used, the fact that the old man is already crucified with Christ is the basis for an appeal: “That ye [did] put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye [did] put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Eph. 4:22–24).

In the third passage the position suggests again the corresponding experience, “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him” (Col. 3:9–10). *Positionally* the “old man” has been put off forever. *Experimentally* the “old man” remains as an active force in the life and

can be controlled only by the power of God. There is no Biblical ground for a distinction between the Adamic nature and a “human nature.” Unregenerate people have but one nature, while those who are regenerate have two natures. There is but one fallen nature, which is from Adam, and one new nature, which is from God. The “old man,” then, is the Adamic nature which has been judged in the death of Christ. It still abides with the Christian as an active principle in his life, and his experimental victory over it will be realized only through a definite reliance upon the indwelling Spirit. The “old man” is a part, but not all, of the “flesh.”

3. “SIN” (ἁμαρτία). The third Bible word related to the *source* of evil in the child of God is “sin.” In certain portions of the Scriptures, notably Romans 6:1–8:13 and 1 John 1:1–2:2, there is an important distinction between two uses of the word “sin.” The two meanings will be obvious if it is remembered that the word sometimes refers to the Adamic nature, and sometimes to evil resulting from that nature. Sin, as a nature, is the *source* of sin which is committed. Sin is the root which bears its own fruit in sin which is evil conduct. *Sin* is what the individual is by birth, while *sins* are the things he does in life.

There is abundant Biblical testimony to the fact that the “flesh,” the “old man,” or “sin,” is the source of evil. The child of God has a blessed “treasure” in the possession of the “new man” indwelling him, but he has this treasure in an earthen vessel. The earthen vessel is the “body of our humiliation” (2 Cor. 4:7; Phil. 3:21, R.V.).

Personality—the ego—remains the same individuality through all the operations of grace, though it experiences the greatest possible advancement, transformation, and regeneration from its lost estate in Adam, to the positions and possessions of a son of God in Christ. That which was, is said to be forgiven, justified, saved, and receives the new divine nature which is eternal life. That which was, is born again and becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus, though it remains the same personality which was born of certain parents after the flesh. Like physical death, the Adamic nature, which is the perpetuator of spiritual death, is not now dismissed, but, in the case of the redeemed, it is subject to gracious divine provisions whereby its injuries may be restrained. Salvation from the *power* of sin for the Christian, like salvation from the *penalty* of sin for the unsaved, depends upon two factors, namely, the divine provision and the human appropriation.

a. The Divine Provision. In each of these aspects of salvation the righteous basis

for the divine provision is found in the death of Christ. That lost men might be saved from the penalty of sin and unto eternal glory, “Christ died for our sins” (1 Cor. 15:3); that regenerated men might be saved from the power of sin unto a holy walk, Christ “died unto sin” (Rom. 6:10). Christ’s death *for* sin provides a finished work of God upon which He is able to remain just while He justifies the one who believes on Christ (Rom. 3:26). Christ’s death *unto* sin provides a finished work of God upon which He is able, by the unceasing energy of His Spirit, to advance the sanctification of those from among the saved who “walk in the Spirit.” Since Christ died for sin, there is, therefore, now no condemnation for those who believe, their *standing* and *safety* being perfected forever in Christ. Since Christ died unto sin, there is a walk upon a new principle made possible for those who are saved whereby their present *state* and *sanctity* may be according to the will of God for them.

The New Creation, organic union between the resurrected Christ and the believer, is based, according to the Scriptures, upon the substitutionary work of Christ in all its aspects and is accomplished by the regenerating work of the Spirit whereby Christ is begotten in the believer and by the baptizing work of the Spirit whereby the believer is placed in Christ. The words of Christ, “ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:20), announce both aspects of the Spirit’s ministry in relation to the New Creation. These great transformations are wrought by the Spirit at the moment of, and as a part of, salvation. Concerning the placing of the believer in Christ, it is said: “For by one Spirit are we all [including each and every one] baptized into one body ... and have been all made to drink into one Spirit” (1 Cor. 12:13); and, again, “For as many of you [with reference to all who are saved] as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ” (Gal. 3:27).

When seeking to apprehend what is wrought by the Spirit’s baptizing ministry, it is essential to determine the precise meaning of βαπτίζω. This is one of the great words of the New Testament and is used in relation to both *real* and *ritual* baptism—that is, both Spirit and water baptism. Being thus employed, whatever meaning is assigned to it in the one case should, reasonably, be assigned to it in the other case. Like βάπτω (used but twice in its primary meaning—to *dip*—Luke 16:24; John 13:26, and but once in its secondary meaning—to *stain*, or *dye*, by whatever means—Rev. 19:13; cf. Isa. 63:3 where the same event and situation is described), βαπτίζω is subject to both a primary and a secondary usage, and not a few exegetes contend that its New Testament usage is restricted to its secondary meaning. The primary meaning, according to practically all authorities, is *to submerge* in a physical envelopment, or an

intusposition, while the secondary may imply no more than that a person, a thing, or a power exercises a dominating or transforming influence over the object it is said to baptize. Thus, quite apart from an actual *intusposition*, it is possible for one to be baptized into repentance, into the remission of sins, into a name, into Moses, or into Christ. Baptism by the Spirit into Christ is far removed from a physical envelopment. βάπτω, like its English equivalent—to *dip*—implies both a putting in and a taking out, while βαπτίζω, like its English equivalent—to *submerge*, or *immerse*—implies only a putting in; and, in the case of a baptism into Christ, no removal is either desirable or possible. The one thus joined to Christ partakes of all that Christ is, with respect to meritorious standing, and all that Christ has done, with respect to substitution—His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection. Christ being the righteousness of God, the believer, when thus joined to Him, is “made” the righteousness of God in Him (2 Cor. 5:21), and, therefore, is “made” accepted in the Beloved (Eph. 1:6), and by the blood of Christ is “made nigh” (Eph. 2:13). Likewise, when, in His judgment of the believer’s sin nature, Christ has been crucified, has died, has been buried, and has been raised from the dead, the child of God, for whom Christ has thus wrought, is said to have been crucified, to have died, to have been buried, and to have been raised from the dead in his Substitute, and as completely as though he had himself personally experienced each feature of that judgment. This context (Rom. 6:1–14) is the central passage on sanctification, which is by the Spirit on the ground of Christ’s death unto the sin nature. In ascertaining the precise facts concerning the basis upon which God is free to control the old nature, too much emphasis cannot be put upon the truth that the old nature in each believer is already judged in the death of Christ. The unregenerate man is dead *in* sins (Eph. 2:1), but the regenerate man is dead *to* sin (Rom. 6:2).

The passage opens thus: “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin [we who have died to sin; so, also, vss. 7–8, 11; Col. 2:20; 3:3], live any longer therein?” It would not become the Christian as a child of God to do so, and it is not necessary for him to do so since he is now “dead to sin.” He cannot plead the power of a tendency over which there is no control. He still has the tendency, and it is more than he can control; but God has provided the possibility of a deliverance from its power both by judging the old nature and by giving him the presence and power of the Spirit. The believer is dependent upon God alone for deliverance by His Spirit, but He could not deliver until the sin nature is

righteously judged. This judgment He has accomplished, and He has also given to Christians the Spirit who is ever present and wholly able. Thus the necessity to sin is broken and saved ones are free to move on another plane and in the power of His resurrection life. The argument in this passage is based on this vital union by which believers are organically united to Christ through their baptism into His body. The passage continues, “Know ye not [or, are ye ignorant], that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” As certainly as Christians are in Him they partake of the *value* of His death. So, also, the passage states: “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death” (cf. Col. 2:12). Thus the saved are actually partakers of His crucifixion (vs. 6), death (vs. 8), burial (vs. 4), and resurrection (vss. 4–5, 8) and as essentially as they would partake had they been crucified, dead, buried, and raised. Being baptized into Jesus Christ is the *substance* of which cocrucifixion, codeath, coburial, and coresurrection are *attributes*. One is the cause, while the others are the effects. All this is unto the realization of one great divine purpose. “That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life,” or by a new life-principle. The Christian’s *walk*, then, is the divine objective. Christ died in the believer’s stead. The judgment belonged to him, but Christ became his Substitute. The child of God is thus counted as a copartner in all that his Substitute did. What He did forever satisfied the righteous demands of God against the “old man” and opened the way for a walk well-pleasing to God (cf. 2 Cor. 5:15).

As the passage proceeds, this truth of copartnership in Christ is presented again and with greater detail: “For if [as] we have been planted [conjoined, united, grown together; the word is used but once in the New Testament] together in the likeness [i.e., oneness; see Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7] of his death, we shall be [now, and forever] also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Those saved are already conjoined to Christ by the baptism of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:12–13), which places them positionally beyond the judgments of sin and they are therefore free to enter the experience of the eternal power and victory of His resurrection. “Knowing this [because we know this], that our old man is [was] crucified with him [for the same divine purpose as stated before], that the body of sin might be destroyed [our power of expression is through the body. This fact is used as a figure concerning the manifestation of sin. The body is not destroyed, but sin’s power and means of expression may be *annulled*. See vs. 12], that henceforth we should not serve [be bondslaves to] sin [the ‘old man’]. For he that is dead is freed [justified] from sin [they who have once died to sin,

as we have in our Substitute, now stand free from its legal claims]. Now if we be dead with Christ [or, as we died with Christ], we believe that we shall also live with him [not only in heaven, but *now*. There is as much certainty for the *life* in Him as there is certainty for the *death* in Him]: knowing [or, because we know] that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him [we are thereby encouraged to believe as much concerning ourselves]. For in that he died, he died unto sin [the nature] once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God” (and so the believer may live unto God).

As certainly as this passage does not enjoin self-crucifixion, self-death, self-burial, or self-resurrection, so certainly it does not enjoin a re-enactment of two out of four of these divine accomplishments—burial and resurrection—by an ordinance, regardless of the meaning with which the ordinance is supposed to be invested. The only thing the believer is enjoined to do, in view of Christ’s death unto the sin nature, is to *reckon* himself to be dead unto it; not, indeed, to reckon the nature to be dead, but to reckon himself, being in Christ and a partaker of all that Christ wrought in judgment of that nature, to be dead unto it. Apart from such reckoning, it is clearly implied that sin, as a living force, will reign in the mortal body (Rom. 6:11–12).

The fact that the sin nature is judged is a revelation of supreme importance and speaks of God’s faithfulness in behalf of His saved ones, but He also reveals to them the knowledge of His measureless provision for their sanctification and daily life. The record concerning Christ’s death unto the sin nature is not given merely to enlarge the individual’s knowledge of historical facts; it is given that he may be assured that there is deliverance from the reigning power of sin, as once unbelievers were assured through the revelation of the fact that Christ died for their sins that there is salvation from the penalty of sin. The death of Christ *unto* sin is the ground of a great confidence. Thus it may be concluded that the divine provision for the believer’s deliverance from the domination of the sin nature is twofold, namely, (a) a legal and righteous judgment of the sin nature and (b) the gift of the indwelling, victorious Spirit of God.

b. The Believer’s Responsibility. In gaining a deliverance from the power of sin, the believer’s responsibility is stated in one word—*faith* (a faith which not only reckons one to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God—Rom. 6:11—and which yields one’s self unto God—Rom. 6:13). Naught else remains for him to do since, as above stated, God has provided the righteous ground upon which the deliverance may be wrought by the Spirit and has caused that same victorious Spirit to indwell the believer for this very purpose. The requirement is not an *act*

of faith, such as once secured regeneration; it is an *attitude* of faith, which is renewed and pursued in every succeeding day. To walk by means of, or in dependence on, the Spirit is to be delivered from the lust of the flesh (Gal. 5:16). Here, as a life principle of procedure, faith is, as always, opposite to human works. The Apostle testified that the result of his struggle, when he strove in his own strength to realize spiritual ideals, was utter failure and he could only conclude that to will was present with him, but how to perform that which is good he found not (Rom. 7:18).

Before quoting this Scripture in Romans which reports the Apostle's contest, it should be noted that there is no erroneous supposition more universal and misleading than that a Christian can, in his own strength, command and control the old nature. The Apostle's experience and failure along this line are given in this Scripture as a warning to all Christians. No mention of the Spirit appears in this passage. The conflict is not between the indwelling Spirit and the flesh; it is rather a conflict between the new "I" and the old "I." The new "I" is the regenerated *man*, who, for the moment, is hypothetically isolated from the normal relationship to, and dependence on, the Spirit, and is seen in unaided human strength to be confronting the whole law, or will, of God (vs. 16), the vitiated flesh (vs. 18), and the humanly impossible demands for a holy life which are properly expected of every regenerate person (vss. 22–23, 25). The Apostle's experience answers the vital question, namely, Can the regenerate man, apart from dependence on the Spirit, do the will of God, even though he *delight* in that will (vs. 22)? In tracing the salient features of the Apostle's conflict and defeat, for clearer identification of the combatants, the Apostle's two names will be employed—Saul, the man of the flesh, and Paul, the regenerate man. The passage, with some comments, is as follows: "For that which I [Saul] do I [Paul] allow not: for what I [Paul] would, that do I [Saul] not; but what I [Paul] hate, that do I [Saul]. If then I [Saul] do that which I [Paul] would not, I consent unto the law [or will of God for me] that it is good. Now then it is no more I [Paul] that do it, but sin [Saul] that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me [Saul] (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I [Paul] would I [Saul] do not: but the evil which I [Paul] would not, that I [Saul] do. Now if I [Saul] do that I [Paul] would not, it is no more I [Paul] that do it, but sin [Saul] that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I [Paul] would do good, evil [Saul] is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members [Saul], warring against the law of my mind

[Paul, who delights in the law of God], and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin [Saul] which is in my members. O wretched [Christian] man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:15–24).

The answer to this great question and cry of distress with which the above passage closes is given in a following verse (Rom. 8:2): "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." This is more than a deliverance from the Law of Moses: it is the immediate deliverance from sin (Saul) and death (its results, cf. Rom. 6:23). The effect of this deliverance is indicated by the blessedness recorded in the eighth chapter, as in contrast to the wretchedness recorded in the seventh chapter. The helpless and defeated "I" is in evidence in the one case, and the sufficient and victorious "I" by the Spirit, is in evidence in the other. The Christian is, then, to be delivered by the "law [or power] of the Spirit." But attention must be called to the fact, stated in 7:25, that it is "through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Christian is delivered *by* the Spirit, but the deliverance is made righteously possible *through* Jesus Christ our Lord, because of the believer's union with Him in His crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection.

Similarly, two natures were still in evidence in the Apostle's experience since with the mind he desired to serve the law of God, but with the flesh he desired to serve the law of sin (Rom. 7:25). He did not remain a defeated Christian, for he found the faith principle of life, and this he states in Romans 8:4, which passage, with verse 3, is a consummation of all that has gone before from the beginning of chapter six: "That the righteousness of the law [the whole will of God for each believer to the last detail in every moment of life] might be fulfilled in us." It could never be fulfilled *by* us. This victory, he goes on to state, is only for those who walk not in dependence on the flesh but in dependence on the Spirit. Deliverance from the power of the old nature, it is thus discovered, is in no way dependent on human effort other than the effort which is required to maintain an attitude of *faith*. There is a "fight ... of faith," and in this conflict the combatant seeks by divine enablement to preserve only an unbroken reliance upon the Spirit of God.

Nor is a freedom from the power of the sin nature secured on the part of the Christian by a supposed eradication of that nature through a falsely imagined, second work of grace. Though embraced by multitudes of earnest people, there is no Scriptural basis for either the rationalistic notion of eradication or for a supposed second work of grace, arguments for which are drawn almost wholly from mere human experience—of all things most uncertain. The unscriptural

character of these theories is obvious: (a) Eradication is not the divine method of dealing with the Christian's foes. There is no eradication of the world, or of the flesh, or of the devil, nor is physical death, so closely related to spiritual death, eradicated in this life. In every case, including the Adamic nature, the believer has but one assured way of deliverance—dependence upon the indwelling Spirit. (b) Were the claims of the eradicationists true, there would be no reason for the maintenance of a faith position and the great body of Scripture which directs the believer into the realization of the victory which comes alone by faith would be rendered meaningless. The two phrases—*not able to sin* and *able not to sin*—represent widely divergent ideas. The Word of God teaches that, by the power of the indwelling Spirit, the child of God, though ever and always beset in this life by an evil disposition, may be, for a given moment and under a specific situation, able not to sin. Such, indeed, is the power of the indwelling Spirit; but no word of the Scripture sanctions the notion that any Christian ever attains to a place where he is not able to sin. The consciousness of sinfulness, or of a tendency to sin, has been the experience of the most spiritual saints of all generations and especially as they have come into closer fellowship with God. Having drawn near to God, Job, the upright in heart, abhorred *self*; and Daniel, against whom no sin is recorded, under like circumstances, said, "My comeliness was turned in me into corruption." Galatians 5:16–17 describes the method by which spirituality has ever been attained by any member of this fallen race. This passage reads: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." The method is not one of ignoring the power of the sin nature, much less supposing it to be eradicated; it is rather in discovering the counter agency for victory which is provided in the indwelling Spirit. "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die [or are in the way of death]: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify [reckon to be dead] the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (or, are in the way of life—Rom. 8:12–13). The opposite of spiritual death is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. In spite of the presence of the sin nature, every Christian is "alive unto God," having passed from death unto life; and, by the indwelling Spirit, every Christian is fully equipped unto every good work.

In *The Principles of Theology*, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, writing on Article IX of the Thirty-Nine Articles and of "the Permanence of Original Sin," declares:

This question of the permanence of original sin in the regenerate is important on two grounds: (a) in its opposition to all forms of what is called “sinless perfection”; (b) on the other hand, against any yielding to defeat and accepting it as inevitable. Something must be said on each of these two points.

(a) It is important to consider the relation of sin to our nature. The ultimate capacity in human nature is the capacity for feeling, for vivid impressions of pain and pleasure. These are called the primary sensibilities and have been disordered through sin, and are never entirely rectified in this life, though the Atonement covers their defect. Then come secondary sensibilities, leading to desires on the one hand and aversions on the other. It is at this point that Divine grace comes in. If the will does not consent there is no personal sin, but there is a disorder below the will which is sinful and needs to be dealt with. Personal responsibility is concerned only with that which the will determines. Atonement covers the rest, including incapacity and defect. It is also important to note the distinction between Adam and ourselves. He had the liability, but not the tendency to sin. We have both, and the tendency is what the Article calls the “corruption of the nature,” “infection of nature,” “concupiscence.” The weakness of what is known as the Methodist doctrine of “Perfect Love” is that it teaches that grace meets all the needs of human nature in the sense of eradication. But it does not. Scripture continually distinguishes between sin and sins, between the root and fruit, but though the root remains, as stated by the Article, there is no need for it to bring forth fruit.

(b) But the presence of inborn sinfulness in the regenerate, while real and powerful, is no excuse, still less justification for sinning. The Apostle clearly teaches that the redemptive work of Christ was intended to render inert or inoperative the evil principle within (Rom. 6:6, Greek). And thus we may say that while Scripture teaches something that is very near eradication, in order that we may not be satisfied with anything less than the highest type of Christian living, on the other hand, it as clearly teaches that the evil principle has not been removed. It loses its power over the believer, though the believer does not lose its presence. To the same effect is the Apostle’s word: “Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin” (Rom. 6:11). He thereby teaches that while we are to be dead to it, it is not dead to us. Sin is not dead, but we are to keep on reckoning ourselves to be dead to it. Such language would have been impossible if sin had been entirely removed. It is impossible to avoid noticing at this point the striking affinity between the Roman Catholic and Methodist doctrines of making sinfulness inhere in the will only. Our Article, in harmony with the Protestant Confessions of the sixteenth century goes much deeper, and shows that sin has affected the nature long before the will commences to act.

The question is vital to many of the most practical and important aspects of living, for if we are wrong here we are liable to be wrong everywhere. Superficial views of sin inevitably tend towards superficial views of the redemptive work of Christ. We must, therefore, be on our guard against the two extremes: on the one hand we must insist that even in the regenerate the evil principle remains and will remain to the end of this life; on the other hand, we must be clear that this evil principle need not and ought not to produce evil results in practice, since the grace of God has been provided to meet and overcome it.— Pp. 173–75

VII. The Christian’s Relation to Imputed Sin

Physical death, as has been observed, is the penalty of imputed sin, and though for the Christian its judgment aspect is wholly repealed, the experience of death as the only way of departure from this world is the portion of all believers until the return of Christ. The penalty or judgment feature of death has been so perfectly abrogated that it can be said of all believers, “There is

therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1, R.V.; cf. John 3:18; Rom. 8:38–39; 1 Cor. 11:32). The Apostle also declares, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 15:55–57). It is asserted that a mighty triumph has been gained over both death and the grave. “The sting of death is sin,” but death’s power to injure is canceled by the death of Christ. “The strength of sin is the law,” but the entire merit system is terminated by Christ in His death. He met the demands for merit by releasing His own perfect merit to all who believe. The strength of sin is seen in the truth that it is *lawlessness*; yet the strength of the law as a means of righteousness is turned to feebleness because of the weakness of the flesh (Rom. 8:3). Thanks, indeed, be unto God for this victory over the judgment aspect of death, which victory is gained by the Lord Jesus Christ. The only effectual cure for death is life, and though the wages of sin—the first Adamic sin—is death, the gift of God is eternal life “through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 6:23).

VIII. The Christian’s Relation to Man’s Estate Under Sin

This relationship is only a memory. The Apostle, writing to the Ephesian believers of this very thing, says, “Wherefore remember” (Eph. 2:11). The change from the lost estate *under sin* to the saved estate *under grace* could not be adequately estimated by any mind or fully described by any tongue. What was once a complete demerit is exchanged for the infinitely perfect merit of Christ; a place in the *cosmos* has been exchanged for a place in the kingdom of the Son of His love; and the doom of sin’s judgment has been exchanged for an immutable position in the sovereign grace of God—grace that not only super-abounds but never ceases. Those under sin are said to be without Christ, having no hope, without God, in the *cosmos* (Eph. 2:12); those that are under grace are described with respect to their unchanging estate by the words, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Eph. 1:3).

Chapter XXIII

PUNISHMENT

THE GENERAL theme of punishment, in its broad application, is divided into *chastisement*, *scourging*, and *retribution*. Of these, the first two relate to God's way of dealing with impenitent Christians, and the last to God's final dealing with the unsaved. These separate doctrines are to be treated more fully later in this work on theology. Only a brief outline will be introduced here.

I. Chastisement

The doctrine of chastisement is closely related to that of the Christian's suffering, though all suffering is not chastisement. When God uses suffering to correct His own, it becomes chastisement. Representing this line of truth as it obtained in the Old Testament, David said: "I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine eye. Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding: whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee" (Ps. 32:8–9). The harsh bit is applied to the willful, otherwise that one might be guided by His eye. In the same Psalm, David relates his own experience as a result of withholding his confession to God. He declares, "When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all the day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer" (vss. 3–4). Following this he made his confession and was restored. Of this he says, "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (vs. 5). There is a form of correction which may be avoided by confession. Of this it is written, "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:31–32). Confession is self-judgment and it serves to obviate painful discipline which must be inflicted upon the rebellious that they be not condemned with the *cosmos* world. None will be so afflicted who is not at the same time conscious that he is resisting God and of the reason why he is under correction. Discipline in one form or another is the universal experience of all who are saved; even the fruit-bearing branch is pruned that it may bear more fruit (John 15:2). The testimony of the central passage of the Bible on

chastisement (Heb. 12:4–15) is to the effect that every son is disciplined.

II. Scourging

The experience of scourging is closely related to that of chastisement, but seems, from the one passage in which it occurs (Heb. 12:6), to differ from chastisement. It is reasonably concluded that scourging refers to the conquering of the will and results in a surrendered life. It may be wrought but once in a believer's lifetime. On the other hand, chastisement may be repeated many times before the work of scourging is consummated. God is not satisfied with anarchy in His household.

III. Retribution

As every form of discipline has for its object the improvement or development of its subject with a view to the realization of the high and holy purposes which God has determined for those that are saved, there is no training or instruction intended in the retribution of the lost. The two classes are identified in two of the passages already cited. In 1 Corinthians 11:31–32, one class is preserved and the other is condemned. Similarly, in Hebrews 12:6–8, one class is addressed as “sons,” while the other class is designated “not sons.” In each case God is seen to be working for the betterment of one group, but only condemning the other group. No improvement is anticipated in God's dealings with those condemned, who are also called “not sons.” Judgment falls on them as a vindication of the dignity of the One to whom every creature owes his existence and whose will has been revealed, which will has been outraged by sin. It is well to remember that every member of the human family was once in the same condemnation and ever would be but for divine redemption. It is equally to be pondered that the offer of saving grace is now extended to the whole lost world. Punishment of the unregenerate is inflicted as a requital of offense against God, and thus becomes more than an imposition of sin's consequences. The moral order of the universe must be, and will be, upheld; but far beyond that is the vindication of the dishonor done to the Person of God. If the truth be recognized that the most enlightened of men are incapable of understanding the true nature of sin or its effect upon the One who is infinitely holy, it should be admitted by all that vindicating punishment is beyond human understanding. It is clearly disclosed in the Bible and more on the lips of Christ than any other. The revelation stands not only on the authority with which the

Bible speaks, but it stands, also, on the basis of the truth that no man is in a position to dispute it.

“Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord” (Rom. 12:19, R.V.). In this text, God asserts, first, His own reaction toward sin by the words *Vengeance belongeth unto me*; but He also implies the necessity for penalty when He says, *I will recompense*. The recompense or penalty is more than a mere abandonment of the sinner. It is true that the “second death,” which is eternal, is a separation from God and that that eternal estate is an immeasurable penalty in the light of the fact that the lost soul must know what grace might have wrought. The penalty is a definite imposition over and above the natural course of events—a retribution which corresponds to the punishment required. It is as certain as the character of God that whatever is imposed will be just and right, and it will be so recognized by all. God will not in this, any more than in any other undertaking, be the author of that which is evil.

Chastisement is a demonstration of divine love, but retribution is a manifestation of divine wrath. God has never proposed the amendment of sinners now, nor will He in eternity. He has provided at infinite cost a perfect regeneration and new creation through faith in Christ. This may be received or rejected by men. There is no word in the Bible which corresponds to extinction. The estate of the lost is both conscious and endless. Even physical death, on which they might depend for some relief, will have been destroyed and banished forever.

The dark picture of human failure and sorrow is drawn only that the good news of the gospel may be more readily received. All of God’s unveilings of the destiny of the lost is with the appeal that men turn to Him and live in His grace forever.

A very perplexing problem arises when retribution and redemption are not fully distinguished. It is whether punishment is remedial; if it is, why should there be redemption? At this point sincere men have lost their way and drifted into the rationalistic theories of Universalism and Restitutionism. Two extended quotations will throw light on this problem:

The distinctive purpose of divine punishment cannot be the improvement of the person punished, because this is the object of *redemption*. If punishment were the means appropriate to this end, there would be no need for redemption; or rather, if this object is attained by redemption, of what use is the severity of punishment? Are we to suppose that when redemption proves ineffectual for the improvement of man, punishment must be resorted to, to attain the object? It would then follow that punishment is more effectual for man’s regeneration than redemption. The conflict between the sphere of punishment and that of redemption becomes all the more perplexing, when

we recollect that the main feature of redemption is the doing away with punishment by the forgiveness of sins. If punishment is remedial, is it a kindness to free man from it before it has accomplished its work? And how is it possible that redemption, which is the removal of punishment, should renovate, if punishment itself does so also? And yet the influence of punishment in preserving, and re-establishing the power of moral goodness in the sufferer, must not be wholly denied. Punishment, on the one hand, acts as a barrier against the desolating inroads of sin by reasserting the fixed ordainments of the law; and, on the other hand, it bears witness to the sinner of the crushing power wherewith evil recoils upon himself, and makes him tremble when he surrenders himself to it. In these two ways, it *prepares* man for the work of redemption. But in its own distinctive nature, it is not adapted or calculated to produce a true improvement, an inward renovation of the sinner. On the contrary, the two spheres, that of redemption, which alone can accomplish a true renewal, and that of punishment, mutually exclude one another. Whenever a living participation in the blessings of redemption begins, punishment, properly so called—δίκη, ἐκδίκησις, τιμωρία—ceases; but, so long as man continues to be the subject of God's righteous punishment, he is excluded from those blessings, John 3:36.—DR. JULIUS MÜLLER, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, I, 246

Punishment is not a proper means of reformation; for true reformation can issue only from free self-determination. It is voluntary in its nature. But a self-determination that is brought about by the fear of pain would not be moral, and of the nature of virtue. Any reformation effected from a selfish motive is not genuine reformation. Furthermore if true reformation could be produced by punishment, why should not the legal and punitive method of the Old Testament have been the only one? The old economy was full of threatenings and penalties, and of fearful examples of their actual execution. Why did God send his Son, and make a new covenant and economy of mercy? Of what use is redemption, or the *remission* of punishment, if punishment is in itself healing and remedial? The Scriptures never represent punishment as reformatory. The proper punishment of sin is death. Rom. 6:23. As temporal death, which is the extreme penalty in human legislation, is not intended to reform the criminal, and reinstate him in human society, but forever cuts him off from it, so eternal death, in the Biblical representation, is not intended to be a means of educating the sinner and fitting him for the kingdom of heaven, but forever banishes and excludes him from it.—AUGUSTUS D. TWESTEN, *Dogmatik*, Th. II, Par. 39, both cited by W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 738–39

Akin to these problems is the one of the divine attitude toward the countless multitudes who have died having never heard the gospel of redemption. Again a temptation—too strong for many—is developed, and men contend that the heathen will be saved on the ground of their ignorance or that they will be saved if they have lived up to the light they have. These conclusions are grounded in the fallacy that man needs no regeneration which is based on efficacious blood. The nature of the plan of salvation is such that it does not incorporate partial compliance, nor can it be executed on the ground of good intentions. The problem assumes a deeper aspect when it is claimed that God, being sovereign, is able to do whatsoever He pleases to do. This idea relates redemption to sovereignty, whereas it is correctly related to righteousness. Even God cannot redeem apart from the blood of His Son. Should He do so, He would be unrighteous; for no other satisfaction exists which answers the wickedness of creatures. If it be claimed that God is free to save through Christ whom He will,

the answer is discovered at once in the Word of God. There His saving grace is always (apart from infants who die) a matter of a personal reception of it. The element of faith is never wanting: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (John 3:18). If it were true that the heathen are saved by ignorance or their faithfulness to such light as they have, there would be no call for a missionary program. In fact, the very act of taking the gospel to those who are saved by something within themselves is an imposition of colossal proportions; for by such an undertaking the heathen who are supposedly safe in their own virtues, are transferred to a system wherein they may, and probably will, be lost forever through the rejection of the gospel.

The heathen are pictured as utterly lost until the gospel is received by them. Without that truth every commission recorded in the New Testament is a useless enterprise, calculated to injure rather than help those to whom the message goes. The gospel does engender a responsibility and becomes for those who reject it a "savour of death unto death," as its reception is a "savour of life unto life."

At the root of these difficulties lies the rationalistic notion that all men are divinely appointed to be saved, and, if they are not, God has failed to that degree in His purpose. The clarifying truth is that He has an elect company from all nations and that not one of these will fail to hear and respond to the gospel. The larger problem of His purpose in other ages must be reserved for a later consideration.

Chapter XXIV

THE FINAL TRIUMPH OVER ALL SIN

REVELATION AND reason unite in one testimony that evil is a temporary thing in the universe of God. Reason declares that, since God is infinitely holy and the Designer and Creator of the Universe, evil must have begun its manifestation subsequent to creation by His permission and is to serve a purpose compatible with His righteousness. Reason also anticipates that, when that purpose is accomplished, evil will be dismissed from the universe of God, and that God, having undertaken to deal with evil, will complete His task to that degree of perfection which characterizes all His works. On the other hand, revelation predicts a coming victory over evil which no unaided finite mind can grasp. The student would do well again to pause and reflect on the marvelous character of a Book which with absolute accuracy and without hesitation unveils the eternity to come as it unveils the eternity past. This incomparable Book is given by divine inspiration to the end that the man of God (and how little it serves any other!) may be perfect, both in knowledge and in character, by its sanctifying power, and “thoroughly” furnished unto every good work (2 Tim. 3:16–17). Certain major passages are indicated when the final triumph of God is in view:

1 Corinthians 15:25–28. This portion of the Scriptures, which has the character of a parenthesis in the midst of the one exhaustive revelation concerning resurrection, presents the divine program for the purification of the universe in preparation for the eternal glory. Having declared that resurrection is common to all men and that there is an order or succession in resurrection—(1) Christ the First-Fruits, (2) they that are Christ’s at His coming, and (3) the end or consummating resurrection—the Apostle indicates that the second resurrection in this order, which resurrection is to occur at Christ’s coming, will be of a group designated as “they that are Christ’s.” This disclosure corresponds with the statement in 1 Thessalonians 4:16, which is that the dead in Christ are to be raised first, and the declaration in Revelation 20:4–6, where it is indicated that those upon whom the divine seal of blessing rests are raised *before* the thousand years begin, while “the rest of the dead” are to be raised *after* the thousand years are ended. In John 5:25–29 Christ’s own words are recorded in which He states that there are two groups in resurrection, but no mention is made by Him of the time that intervenes. According to Christ, these two groups are raised within that prophetic “hour” which has already continued almost two thousand years and,

according to prophecy, will continue a thousand years after Christ returns. The notion that there is one general, all-inclusive, simultaneous resurrection within one hour is more a product of Romish theology than a doctrine of the Scriptures.

In the period between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the company designated “they that are Christ’s,” there must be the securing of the complete number of those, the elect company, who comprise this group. At His coming for His own, Christ not only takes this company to Himself both by resurrection and translation, but He then terminates this specific divine undertaking. Similarly, the period between the resurrection of Christ’s own and the “end” resurrection is characterized by the exercise of power and authority on the part of Christ. This period, according to Revelation 20:4–6, is a millennium of years. At the end of this period and by virtue of His reign, Christ, it is asserted, will “deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father.” The kingdom referred to here represents the larger sphere of divine authority, for by His authority and power “all enemies”—angelic and human—will be put under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. By divine permission, this larger domain of government has come to be in a state of rebellion. A vast company of angels kept not their first estate and almost the whole human family have been or now are at enmity with God. Death, which was foreign to the first estate of man, has wrought its blight over the earth throughout all generations. In that millennial period, Christ, we are told, will put down all rebellion and restore to God the Father an undivided kingdom. The word παραδίδωμι is well translated by *deliver up* provided no intimation is superimposed on it which would imply that the Son ceases His own authoritative reign. This He could not do in the light of His eternal occupancy of the Davidic throne (Luke 1:32–33; cf. Isa. 9:6–7; Dan. 7:14). It should hardly be expected of those who see nothing in prophecy of Israel’s future and who fail to recognize the unending earthly reign of Christ, that they would observe the import of this passage. That his precise meaning may be understood, the Apostle goes on to state that all authority has been committed to the Son by the Father, with the all-important and reasonable exception that the Father who gave the authority to the Son is not Himself under the otherwise universal rule of the Son. Thus the Son, having put down all enemies, having destroyed death, and having presented a conquered universe to the Father, will continue, then as now, His everlasting reign. There will never again be an opposing voice in the universal kingdom of God; but God—Father, Son, and Spirit—as at the beginning shall be “all in all.”

In its eschatological bearing, few passages are of greater import than this.

Three determining facts appear in this context (1 Cor. 15:24–28): (a) During the period between the resurrection of those who are Christ's and the end resurrection the vast authority of the Son will be exercised to the end that all opposing rule and authority will be put down. All enemies are to be put under Christ's feet. Even "the last enemy"—death—shall be destroyed (καταργέω, which same word is in verse 24 translated *put down*; cf. 2 Tim. 1:10, where by the use of the same word it is asserted that Christ hath already *abolished* death for the believer; and Heb. 2:14, where it is disclosed that by His death Christ will yet destroy him that had the power of death; and 2 Cor. 3:13, where, with Rom. 7:4, the old order is said by Christ's death to have been *abolished*; and Eph. 2:15, where the enmity between Jew and Gentile is declared to be *abolished* by the same death; and, finally, Rom. 6:6, where it is said that on the ground of Christ's death the "body of sin" may be *disannulled*). (b) All authority being given to the Son by the Father (first, as Creator—Col. 1:16—second, as Preserver—Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:17—and third, as Ruler, by specific divine decree—Matt. 28:18—though the Father reserves certain powers to Himself—Acts 1:7), the Father is Himself excepted as not being at any time subject to the authority He has given to the Son (cf. Heb. 2:8). And (c) the Son, having exercised His power to the extent that all enemies to the authority of God have been put under His feet, continues His reign, then as now, by the unrevoked authority of the Father. The construction, according to worthy exegetes, does not necessitate the conclusion that in presenting a restored order to the Father (vs. 24) or that by continuing to reign in future ages by the authority of the Father, as He does now (vs. 28), the Son will resign His rule. This He could not do in the light of the many predictions that His reign will be everlasting. He whose relation to Israel and to this earth is that of a king and whose kingdom is everlasting, will, indeed, reign until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; but this is not the end, for of Him it is also said that "he shall reign for ever and ever" (Isa. 9:7; Luke 1:33; Rev. 11:15). Thus, by this important passage, the final triumph of God over all evil is disclosed.

Revelation 20:11–22:7. Of the several passages of Scripture bearing on the final triumph of God there is none more vital or exhaustive than the one now to be considered. A word-by-word exegesis of this entire context is a *desideratum*, but only a slight reference can be made to this passage.

When Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (John 14:2), He made reference, it would seem, to the entire universe in which there are various abodes. The passage under consideration indicates four such dwelling places: (1)

the new heaven, the abode of God; (2) the celestial city, which is distinctly identified as separate from the new heaven in that it comes down out of heaven (Rev. 21:2, 10); (3) the new earth, which is inhabited by glorified Israel, which nation is always related to the earthly sphere and whose existence is, by Jehovah's covenant, everlasting, and with Israel on the earth are "the nations of them which are saved" who bring their glory and honor into the city; and (4) the abode of those who are "without," whose characters and estates are rendered unchangeable and separate from God forever. Of these abodes, (1) the new heaven, the home of the Triune God, is shared by the Church (John 14:3) and the holy angels. Comparatively little is revealed regarding the specific character of the new heaven that is to be, and probably for the reason that no finite mind would be able to comprehend it. Much, however, is written concerning (2) the celestial city which is said to come down from God out of heaven—its character, its dimensions, its inhabitants or those who frequent its portals, the material which enters into its structure, and its glory. The patriarchs anticipated this city. Abraham, the tent-dweller, looked for "a city which hath foundations" (Heb. 11:10, 16). The city is cosmopolitan—a place frequented and enjoyed by those of other abodes. In fact, the Bride, whose home is so evidently to be in the new heaven where Christ will be, is so completely a part of this city that it bears the name, "The bride, the Lamb's wife." The presence and privilege of the Church in that city is also indicated by the fact that its twelve foundations bear the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Into this city enter, also, the angels, Israel, and the nations; for at the gates are twelve angels and its very portals are named after the twelve tribes of Israel. Likewise, the nations of them which are saved will bring their glory and honor into it. This city, even to its streets, is built of pure gold like unto crystal. Its length is twelve thousand furlongs, which according to present computation is fifteen hundred miles. Its length and its breadth and its height are said to be equal. The city will be aflame with the Shekinah light and glory of God. (3) The new earth will be the abode of the earthly peoples who are under the everlasting covenant of God. And (4) the final place where the unredeemed must abide.

Hebrews 12:22–24. Again the celestial city is described, but only in relation to its inhabitants, or those who pass its portals. It will be observed that, as there are various abodes in the Father's house, there are at least six classifications of the creatures of God—the holy angels, the Church, Israel, the nations of them which are saved, the fallen angels who with Satan are consigned to everlasting fire (Matt. 25:41; cf. Rev. 20:10), and unregenerate men who, because their

names were not written in the Lamb's book of life, are likewise cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:15; 21:8; cf. 21:27). The unregenerate, in relation to the abode of those who are under the eternal blessing of God, are also said to be "without" (Rev. 22:15).

According to Revelation 20:11–22:7, those within the celestial city are: God the Father, God the Son (mentioned under the suggestive title of the Lamb), the angels, the Church, and the earth-dwellers—both Israel and the nations. In Hebrews 12:22–24, the passage now under consideration, the same enumeration of inhabitants appears—"God the Judge of all"; "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant"; "an innumerable company of angels"; "the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven"; and "the spirits of just men made perfect," which last designation is evidently of Israel and the nations who will then have been purified by divine grace and on the ground of Christ's redemption and who are dwellers in the new earth. The redeeming blood of Christ is ever in view. In the enumeration of inhabitants given in the Revelation, Christ appears as *the Lamb*; and, in the enumeration given in Hebrews, He appears as the Mediator of a new covenant with its blood speaking "better things than that of Abel." From this evident emphasis upon the blood of Christ, it may be concluded that all God shall have wrought will have been based upon the value of that blood.

2 *Peter* 3:7–13. Two essential facts are presented in this passage, namely, (1) There is to be a new heaven and a new earth. The present heaven, being on fire, shall be dissolved and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. This same scene is described in Hebrews 1:10–12, where it is written that the heavens and the earth shall perish. They shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture they will be folded up and changed. Concerning the passing of the old, it is stated in Revelation 20:11 that the earth and the heaven are to flee away from the face of Him that sits upon the great white throne, and no place will be found for them any more. Peter also testifies, "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This expectation may be based as well upon the Old Testament. In Isaiah 65:17 we read: "For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." So surpassing will this new creation be, that the present order will never again be remembered. Likewise, in Isaiah 66:22, R.V., it is predicted: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith Jehovah, so shall your seed and your name remain." According to this prophecy, there is to be not only a new heaven

and a new earth, but Israel will abide to share in that glory as long as the new creation endures.

Returning to the passage under consideration, we observe that Peter dates the time of this great transformation as occurring in connection with “the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men” (2 Pet. 3:7), and this coincides precisely with the record given in Revelation 20:11–15, where it is said that, when the wicked dead are gathered before God for final judgment, the old order then passes away from the face of Him who sits upon the throne. Those dwellers in heaven and those dwellers on earth who are appointed of God to inhabit the new creation must stand aside in space and observe one of the most stupendous creative acts of God— “He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new” (Rev. 21:5).

Though little is recorded in the Bible about the character of the new heavens, much, as has been pointed out, is disclosed concerning the character of the city which comes out of the new heaven. Similarly, there are important revelations, though limited, concerning the new earth. The one extended passage bearing on the conditions which are to obtain on the new earth is as follows: “And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men [an earthly designation], and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away” (Rev. 21:3–4). Evidence that this is a description only of conditions in the new earth is twofold: (a) Tears, death, sorrow, crying, and pain, described as “the former things,” belong only to the old earth and these will have “passed away.” (b) God is seen to be dwelling among *men*. There He makes His tabernacle and they are said to be His people, and He shall be with them and be their God. He will dwell then as now with the holy angels (Matt. 22:30), and He will dwell with the saints in light (Col. 1:12); but marvelous indeed is the revelation that God will be in unhindered and unbroken communion with the dwellers of the earth. The new earth will be as holy as the new heaven. Peter states that there will be “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness” (2 Pet. 3:13). Thus it is declared that the three spheres of eternal glory—the new heaven, the celestial city, and the new earth—are each and all to be as pure as God is pure, and He abides in each forever. In like manner, the three orders of created beings—the unfallen angels, the Church of the firstborn, and the earth dwellers composed of Israel and the nations that are saved, will be

accorded complete and unending fellowship with God. Since no word of God can fail, every word of prophecy will be fulfilled and the final triumph of God over evil will be as perfect as are all His works.

The Scriptures thus predict a glorious, universal, divine triumph which is yet to be—a triumph on the plane of infinity and including the disposition of sin as a *principle*. Even a feeble analysis, such as a finite mind might undertake, must disclose the fact that, concealed in this aspect of the sin question, is the most important reason the human mind has ever discovered why sin was permitted to enter this universe with its injury to creation and its measureless imposition of sacrifice upon the Son of God. It is true that the grace of God cannot be manifested except as there are fallen creatures in existence who, because of the corruption of sin, are objects of grace, and that the demonstration of divine grace, the inestimable glory of which is observable not in time but in eternity (Eph. 2:7), constitutes an obvious reason for the permission of sin; but more far-reaching and all-inclusive is the fact that the principle of evil, as opposed to good, is brought out of that abstract form in which it existed before creation, and, upon the ground of its concrete fruitage in and through creation, is subject to divine judgment and to be dismissed forever. Incomprehensible, indeed, is the triumph of God when, through the cross of Christ, one lost soul is redeemed and by His saving power is so transformed as to appear in heaven conformed to the image of His Son; and every victory over sin in any of its forms must redound to His everlasting praise. Yet how exceeding in its infinite glory is the judgment and banishment of sin itself! How transcendently blessed will be that holy peace which will yet reign throughout the universe of God! More wonderful, it would seem, will it be than the peace which reigned in the eternal past, since to hold the experience and judgment of sin in retrospect is more conducive to peace than to hold them in prospect. Being engulfed in the din and darkness of the immediate phase of the conflict, the mind of man cannot extricate itself from its injuries and surroundings and thus fails to apprehend the assured divine triumph which God has determined and which He will execute with that perfection which characterizes all His works. Of all the marvels of divine achievement, none could surpass in glory the oncoming, sin-free universe in which righteousness is seen, not *contending* and *suffering* as now, nor even *reigning* as in the yet future earthly kingdom, but *dwelling* throughout the whole vast field of God's creation, except in the abode of fallen angels and lost men.

God, being infinitely holy, can sustain no relation to sin other than to judge it by that white flame of righteousness which He is. The death of Christ as the

Father's provided Lamb not only reveals the measureless love of God for sinners, but opens the way whereby God, because of the judgment of sin which Christ wrought, is free to act without restraint in behalf of the wider field of the universe itself.

A key to the understanding of God's ways in the ages of time is the fact that He is pleased to put every challenge to an experimental test. This method, without doubt, will secure the *desideratum* when every mouth will be stopped. It is reasonable to believe that evil in its abstract form and as an opposing principle, at whatever time it began to exist, was itself a challenge to God and that, on the largest conceivable scale, its claims are being subjected to a demonstration which will not only set forth the character of evil in all its magnitude but will also set forth the holy character of God—a revelation of surpassing import—and the exceeding grace of God. To this end it was necessary to permit sin to assume concrete form and run its course to its end. Under the permissive will of God, sin has wrought measureless injury within angelic spheres. It has wrought the complete ruin of the human race, apart from redeeming grace. But sin's incomputable cost is the blood of the Son of God which alone could provide a righteous ground for the judgments of God against evil in all its aspects, establish forever His holy character, and secure an accomplished redemption for those whom He had chosen from before the foundation of the world, through whom, also, He might show forth the unsearchable riches of His grace. Little, indeed, did the eyewitnesses of the death of Christ realize the stupendous thing that was transpiring before their vision. The cross was the complete verdict against sin for the individual believer; it reaches to Israel, to the Gentiles, to creation, to things in heaven, to angelic spheres, and to the very root of evil itself in its unlikeness to God. The triumph of God will be perfect and eternal.

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.”