

TEN  
LECTURES  
—  
A.H. ZILMER

SEND FOR SAMPLE COPY, FREE

---

---

# The Faith

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE  
DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION OF THE FAITH  
ONCE FOR ALL DELIVERED TO  
THE SAINTS

---

EDITED BY  
JOHN W. LEA AND A. H. ZILMER

---

---

Terms of Subscription:  
*United States and Canada:* 50 cents per annum, postpaid.  
*Great Britain and Other Countries:* Two shillings per annum.

Published by  
JOHN W. LEA, 1520 N. Robinson St., Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.

MR. & MRS. D. W. CHEATWOOD  
730 WASHINGTON ST.  
BEDFORD, OH 44146

3-13-1921 Free from Ruth Overhalseu

Leo B. Aldridge,  
Yelligmas Hall,  
May 1934

TEN LECTURES





# TEN LECTURES

UPON IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF  
DIVINE TRUTH

By A. H. ZILMER

PHILADELPHIA  
JOHN W. LEA, 1520 N. ROBINSON STREET  
1912

G. E. Marsh Memorial Library, Church of God  
General Conference: McDonough, GA; <https://cogc.org/>



## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The majority of the addresses contained in this volume have already appeared in *The Faith*, and although their republication has given opportunity for slight revision they remain substantially as they appeared in that magazine. Some are published from shorthand notes of lectures actually delivered, and others have been reproduced by the author from his own notes. Unimportant changes have been made here and there in order to adapt for readers lectures originally delivered to hearers.

The subjects comprised in this volume are among the most important that can engage the attention of thinking men and women. They have to do with the great plan of human redemption which the God of heaven has laid down and for some six thousand years has been working out among the children of men. They assume on the part of the reader a recognition of the Bible as the inspired Word of God and the only reliable source of information on matters pertaining to salvation from sin and death. On the basis of this assumption the author seeks to point out to those who are either uninformed or misinformed as to the teachings of that wonderful Book a more excellent way. May it prosper in the mission upon which it is sent by its author and publisher! May the eyes of many be enlightened and their hearts opened to receive the divine truths which alone are able to make wise unto salvation! And in the great day of God's kingdom that is soon to dawn with blessing for the earth and for mankind, may its fruit be seen to the honor and glory of His great name!





## CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION .....	11
A MINISTER'S REASONS FOR LEAVING HIS CHURCH....	19
DOES IT MATTER WHAT WE BELIEVE? .....	39
WILL ALL MEN BE SAVED? .....	51
BAPTISM DOETH NOW SAVE US .....	71
THE GOSPEL: ITS SUBJECT-MATTER AND DESIGN....	84
THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF THE SCRIPTURES AND HISTORY .....	106
THE OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD, PAST AND PRESENT .....	126
WILL THE WICKED BE ETERNALLY CONSCIOUS OF THEIR PUNISHMENT? .....	148
THE DEVIL: IS HE A PERSON? IS HE A FALLEN ANGEL?	170
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY RESPECTFULLY CON- SIDERED .....	195
SHORT ARTICLES:	
THE SPIRIT SHALL RETURN UNTO GOD WHO GAVE IT .....	210
THE SPIRITS IN PRISON .....	214
IN THE BODY; OUT OF THE BODY .....	217
WHO ARE THE CHRISTADELPHIANS AND WHAT DO THEY BELIEVE? .....	220



## INTRODUCTION

The addresses contained in this volume are in exposition of what the members of the community known by the name of "Christadelphians" believe to be foundation principles of saving truth. From a numerical standpoint the community is not relatively very strong, consisting of a few thousands of men and women scattered throughout the world, who either worship God in isolation or, where practicable, meet in assemblies called "ecclesias" for the purpose of worshipping God, of exhorting one another in matters of faith and conduct, and of proclaiming to all who will hear the truth as they understand it concerning God's redemptive plan.

The Christadelphian motto is "The Bible True," and with the babel voices of the higher critics, rationalists, atheists, and agnostics, they have no sympathy whatever, believing that there is sufficient evidence, both internal and external, to sustain the Bible's position as "the Book of Books," an authentic record of God's revelation to man concerning human origin, nature, and destiny—a book in which are history and prophecy, in relation to both men and nations, that cannot be gainsaid: history that is being confirmed by the results of oriental exploration, and prophecy that has been proved to be divine by the best of all proof, the corroboration of fulfilment during the past three thousand years. Much of

prophecy has been fulfilled already; some is being fulfilled at the present time, before the very eyes of the prophetic student; but the greatest of all the prophecies is yet to be fulfilled, when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of God and of Christ, when the millennium of universal blessing shall supersede the present patchwork government of frail and erring man, when peace like a river shall flow where for so many generations there has been naught but strife and war, and when the work of subduing every evil and eradicating every curse shall ultimate in the abolition of even death itself, and sorrow and pain shall be no more, but God shall be all in all.

The gospel of the kingdom of God was the theme of the Lord Jesus Christ, when for more than three years He preached in the cities and villages of Palestine to the Jewish people; and by the time of the Destruction of Jerusalem that gospel had been sounded through the Roman world by the apostles whom Jesus appointed and those converted by their preaching. The Jewish people had been for several generations looking for the appearance of a deliverer, as foretold by their prophets, who should free them from the yoke of their gentile oppressors and restore to them the kingdom which had been overthrown B. C. 587 when the city of Jerusalem was destroyed by King Nebuchadnezzar and the Jews were carried captive to Babylon. That kingdom had not been restored when Jesus Christ appeared in the Holy Land, and but few of the people believed His testimony concerning Himself as the King whom God had appointed to sit upon David's throne. It is true that the prophets had in glowing terms predicted the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, but it is equally true that they had foretold that He who should be their Deliverer and their King should also redeem them from their sins by



means of His sacrificial death. This part of Messiah's work they either did not understand or wilfully ignored, and in looking for a conquering Prince they did not recognize Him in the suffering Savior.

In the present day the position is reversed. The nominal gentile Christian church believes in Jesus as a Savior but either overlooks or ignores His glory as a Prince. He is both the Lamb of God and the Lion of the Tribe of Judah—an Offering for the sin of the world and the Prince of Peace to sit upon David's throne and therefrom rule the whole wide world in righteousness.

This twofold aspect of divine truth is tersely summarized as "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," and if we would be saved it must be by a recognition of the whole counsel of God as centered in the Lord Jesus Christ as a Prince and a Savior.

As a Savior Jesus has been on earth and has died on the cross, and as He bowed His head in death He said, "It is finished." The great redemptive work was done. His life of perfect obedience had been lived. He was obedient even unto death. Though rich, He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich. That the righteousness of His life might become effectual to the redemption of His fellowmen, He suffered as their representative. Because of His holiness it was impossible that He should remain in the tomb, and God raised Him from the dead. He lives again to die no more. His redemptive work is complete inasmuch as the great atonement has been made, and it remains now for all who will to avail themselves of the blessings that have been made gloriously possible. By faith in Him and obedience to His requirement of baptism into His name for the remission of sins, and lifelong association with Him in fulfilment of His commands, all

who will may in the day of His reappearing be exalted to the same perfection of being that He now enjoys. That the reader of these addresses may be helped to this end is the object for which they have been brought to his attention.

The Scriptures frequently refer to the twofold nature of the work of Christ: His work when on earth before as a Savior and the work that is before Him when He returns as a King. The apostle Peter, speaking of salvation says, "Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the *sufferings of Christ* and the *glory that should follow.*" A concrete illustration of the apostle's meaning may be found in the beautiful 53d chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah. The prophet describes Christ's work as a Savior in words that have been made familiar to almost all men through their incorporation into Handel's "Messiah": "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare His generation? for He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken. And He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death; because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put

Him to grief; when Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied; by His knowledge shall My righteous Servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong; because He poured out His soul unto death; and He was numbered with the transgressors; and He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

When Jesus was on earth nineteen hundred years ago He preached the gospel of the kingdom of God, but with the exception of the disciples and a very few more His hearers either did not or would not believe Him. At length He was put to death through the hatred of His countrymen, who did not know that they were at the same time fulfilling that 53d chapter of Isaiah. Though crucified, He was raised from the dead, and after a brief sojourn with His disciples He was received up into heaven to await at the right hand of the Majesty on high the set time in the divine plan for His return to earth. Then will be fulfilled the part of the prophecy that had reference to "the glory that should follow." Then will He see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied. Then will He restore the kingdom to Israel, and as King of Kings and Lord of Lords He will have dominion from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth and all nations shall serve Him. Then will He gather all the house of Jacob from their dispersion among the nations and deliver them from their oppressors and make them in their own land a center of blessing to the world. Then will the Jewish people be made the head among the nations where for so long they have been the tail. Then shall the law go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jer-

usalem, and the result of that righteous government shall be peace throughout the world. Then will the millennium indeed be here, the millennium which has long been the hope of the true Christian, though also an object of scorn to those who know not God's will.

The object of the gospel in this present dispensation is to take out from among the nations a people for the name of the Lord, not to convert the world at large; that is the object of the next, or millennial, age. Now the truth of Jehovah is for the preparation of a people who shall be ready for the high and noble work of assisting the Lord Jesus in the day of His power. Those who in these days of darkness and superstition, when the testimony of Jesus and the apostles has been obscured, yea, almost extinguished, by the traditions of men, have become subjects of the enlightenment which the truth brings, will be exalted to the positions of power and authority which will have been taken from the present rulers, and as kings and priests they will reign with Christ on the earth. But it is essential that all who aspire to such honor and glory fulfil the requirement of knowledge of, and obedience to, God's will—that they first learn the truth as it is centered in Christ Jesus and render obedience thereto in the divinely appointed ordinance of baptism, and spend their whole lives afterward in obedience to Christ's commands. The Lord Jesus distinctly told the disciples that when the Son of Man should sit on the throne of His glory they should sit on thrones judging the tribes of Israel; and the psalmist speaks of the multitude of those who shall be ransomed by Him who is to sit in Mount Zion as the Great King, as "His princes in all the earth." This is the glorious destiny in store for all who in the day of opportunity heed the gospel call.

For many centuries the gospel of the kingdom of God has been almost non-existent among professing Christians, and to-



day the vast majority of those who profess to follow Christ have no idea of His coming to earth again to reign. Instead they imagine that at death they are to be translated to Him in heaven. But the apostolic hope was for the Son of God from heaven. "From whence also," says Paul, "we look for the Savior the Lord Jesus Christ." The apostles, and with them the early Christians, looked for the return of the Lord Jesus to earth, and for their redemption at that time. As Paul again said in his second letter to Timothy: "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His Kingdom. . . . I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing."

The apostles foretold that there would come a falling-away from the truth, and that men would give heed unto fables. They even stated that the false teaching of the heathen philosophers was beginning to be introduced into the church in their own days, and hence the necessity for Paul to write such letters as those to Corinth to combat the heresies. After the removal of the apostles from the scene of action the false teaching increased and by the time of Constantine the Great the pagan philosophies had become so incorporated with the Christian teachings that it was no difficult matter for Constantine, himself a pagan, to proclaim a union of church and state with himself at the head. Some time later the headship of the church became vested in the pope, and the papal system was a continuation of the combination of a little Christianity with a great deal of pagan philosophy and superstition. Later again the Reformers protested against Romanism, but did not protest so

much against the doctrines of the church as against its ceremonial practices; with the exception of the doctrines of purgatory and transubstantiation the doctrines of the Reformers were substantially the same as those of Rome. And later still others protested against the practices of the Protestants, and numerous sects, differing mostly as to matters of church government, were formed among the reformed churches. All along there have doubtless been a few who in sincerity have held the true faith, though perhaps it is impossible to locate them in every generation. God has not left Himself without witness, and some have sealed their testimony with their blood, though in the estimation of the powerful churches they were but heretics. The Christadelphian contention is for a return to the apostolic teaching and practice.

JOHN W. LEA

## A MINISTER'S REASONS FOR LEAVING HIS CHURCH

Dear Friend: Kindly allow me to address these pages to you relative to my withdrawal from the Evangelical Association. When you read in the proceedings of the Platte River Conference, that "A. H. Zilmer was reported as having withdrawn from the Evangelical Association," no doubt the question arose in your mind, "Why did he do this?" It is but natural that this question should have arisen, and since I deem it proper that my former parishioners should know the reasons for my action, I shall now proceed to give these reasons. Let no one think that I acted unadvisedly as the result of rashly drawing conclusions. Nor is it my object in these lines to speak ill of anyone, but I wish, as far as I can, to set myself right before those whom I can reach, especially the members of the churches among whom I served as pastor. Though no longer in this relation to them, I still cherish the memory of the past, and frequently my mind reverts to the days when we mutually shared our sorrows and our joys. As for them, I may say they were upright, sincere, and willing to follow the admonitions of those who labored among them. As regards myself, I did for them the best I could, and they generously overlooked any faults or imperfections they might find in me. In this way our labors were lightened, and our associations made pleasant. In serving among them as their spiritual adviser, I faithfully preached the doctrines of the church which I had been taught from childhood. I had the utmost confidence in those doctrines, believing them to be the very essence of Bible teaching, and therefore able to bring

about the results contemplated in their promulgation. The reader may here inquire, "Is it on account of doctrine that you severed your connection with the church?" To which I am obliged to give an affirmative answer. As long as I remained in the church, it was my duty to preach its doctrines, but should I become convinced that these were not the whole truth, as taught by the Word of God, then I had no more right in the Evangelical church as a public teacher; and it behooved me to withdraw, or be liable to a charge of heresy. The *Book of Discipline* says (sec. 121, p. 133), "What shall be done with preachers who hold forth doctrines contrary to the Word of God and the articles of our religion? Answer: Let the same process be observed as in cases of gross immorality," etc., etc. Now, I confess that in the course of the study of the Scriptures which led to my withdrawal from the church I adopted views which were "contrary to the articles of our religion," and as for my relation to the latter, I was liable to the "process" indicated in the above-named section; but as to my views being "contrary to the Word of God," that was a different question, and I do not admit that they were at variance with the Word. Moreover, it was the Word which caused me to change my position with reference to the articles of faith. The Scriptures, as given by divine inspiration, are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished unto every good work" (II Tim. 3: 16, 17). But these articles of religion, though joined to "the Word of God" by the conjunction "and" in above-named section, can lay no valid claim to such origin. It is stated in the Introduction that "The Confession of Faith, and the Discipline of the Evangelical Association, were originally composed partly from the systems of other Christian denominations, and partly from the sacred Scriptures themselves." Thus it is seen that neither the articles of faith, nor the discipline rest wholly upon the Word of God as their authority. And yet it is also said on p. 32 that "the sacred Scriptures are our only and sufficient guide, both as to faith and practice." Would that this were altogether true; but in



view of the admission made in the Introduction, it is far from being true. If the Scriptures were the "*only guide*," then there was no need of copying from "the systems of other denominations." And since such copying has confessedly and manifestly been done, how can it be consistently said that the Scriptures are "our only guide?" I only introduce this to show that "the Holy Scriptures" and "the articles of our religion" do not have the same origin, and are not of equal binding force. The latter were taken from the works of fallible men. Most of these tenets were copied from the Methodist Episcopal confession of faith, and this in turn had been copied from the creed of the Church of England, which creed had been published in 1553. And this agrees, in its main features, with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church. This is the origin and genealogy of these articles in the Evangelical Discipline, although they are only a part of the 39 articles of the Anglican church. I hold today, more firmly than ever, that "the Holy Scriptures contain everything that is necessary for us to know for our salvation," as stated in sec. 7 of the Discipline; but I cannot believe that either the Catholic doctrine, or the 39 articles of the Anglican church, or the 25 articles of the Methodist Episcopal church, or the 21 "articles of our religion," contain "all that is necessary for us to know for our salvation." For if they contained all that is necessary, then what need would there be of the Scriptures? These are "perfect, entire, and wanting nothing," without the addition of a single one of those articles. So, as for myself, I stand upon good ground, believing "all that is written in the law and the prophets."

#### WHAT CAUSED ME TO CHANGE MY VIEWS

During the fifteen years of my membership in the Evangelical Association, with the exception of the last, I firmly believed the doctrines set forth in those articles. But at one of our ministerial meetings our presiding elder read a paper on "The Jews in History and Prophecy," in which he showed from the Scriptures that God's chosen people, Israel, have yet a glorious future before them, when they shall be regathered



from among the nations whither they be gone, into the land pledged to Abraham and his seed; when they shall neither be two nations, nor be plucked up any more at all. Though at first I did not take kindly to the views presented in that paper, they made a deep and lasting impression upon my mind. We had been accustomed to giving a "spiritual" meaning to those things, treating them as allegories. And here they were presented to us (and as far as this writer is concerned for the first time) with such simplicity and force, that to evade the doctrine they teach would seem as wilful rejection of the truth. The writer went home from that meeting, quietly pondering the matter with himself; sometimes delighted, sometimes chagrined, and for months unable to decide as to whether to accept or reject the views presented. They were so at variance with what was generally taught in the church on this subject. At length, after several months of close study and diligent search for the truth, it occurred to me that if Israel is really to be regathered in the land of Canaan, there to work out its destiny, this fact cannot stand alone, but must be related to some other great fact that had not been noted by the theologians whose works we had studied, and whose views we entertained. This "other fact" is the second coming of Christ. We had been taught that the coming of Christ would introduce the destruction of the earth whose "obsequies will be celebrated with melancholy grandeur" (Wakefield, *Theology*, p. 629). And here, instead of universal destruction of the handiwork of God, was presented to us a regathering and blessing of Israel, and through them the blessing of all the nations of the earth. No wonder there was halting here, and for some time a painful indecision! But it became clear to my mind that the coming of Christ was the hope and anticipation of the early church (I Thess. 1:9, 10) and their uplifted gaze witnessed their expectation of Him who is to come (Acts 1:11; Heb. 9:28; 10:37).

#### NO HOPE IN DEATH

In connection with this I saw that we must not expect anything in the way of rewards or punishments when we die,

but at the resurrection; for the Lord Jesus Christ will come to earth again to judge the living and the dead (II Tim. 4:1) and then will He give to every one according to his deeds (II Cor. 5:10; Rev. 22:12). I saw further that the resurrection from the dead was one of the most prominent subjects of the teaching of Jesus and His apostles; and this too will take place at His second coming (I Thess. 4:13-18).

#### WHAT ABOUT THE WICKED?

I also remember reading that "the wicked shall be cut off from the earth" (Prov. 2:22); and "all the wicked will He [God] destroy" (Ps. 145:20). "But," I queried, "how can this be in view of the immortality of the soul?" Yet, there it was in language plain and unmistakable, that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4, 20). I reasoned that if death is to be the doom of the wicked, then none of Adam's race is immortal. Or, if immortality be a present possession of the entire human race, it cannot be logically said that the sinner shall die. Either a thing is immortal, and cannot die; or it is mortal, and can die. Both these propositions cannot be true at the same time. There is no escape from this conclusion. The matter finally resolved itself into this: Adam had been made "a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). God said to Adam: "Eat not of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. In the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." Either I do not understand the term "thou shalt die," or a soul most certainly can die. If the words mean what they say, the doctrine of an immortal soul cannot be true; but if they do not mean to die, what do they mean? When life and death are involved, why deal with the subject in doubtful and ambiguous language? Why not speak in the plainest terms, that cannot be misunderstood? I could not believe that the Almighty intended to deceive in speaking thus of the result and fruit of sin. It is plain that continued *life* was in prospect in case of obedience; and *death* was threatened as the penalty of disobedience. If one course meant life to Adam, surely the other could not mean the same thing. Therefore, view it as we may, life and death cannot be the same thing; life

is one thing, death another—deprivation of life. Hence my conclusion of the whole matter was, that since God threatened Adam with death, he must have been capable of dying, and was therefore not immortal; and inasmuch as Adam was not immortal, and all being in him when he sinned, and thus coming under the power of death, none of Adam's descendants at present possesses immortality. I reached this conclusion before I fully knew what the Bible taught upon this subject; and a still greater surprise was in store for me when I learned of "the King eternal, immortal" (I Tim. 1 : 17); "the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who alone hath immortality" (I Tim. 1 : 15, 16); that "our Savior Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (II Tim. 1 : 10); that we are to "seek for glory, honor, and immortality" (Rom. 2:7—surely a very illogical thing if we were even now brimful of immortality—and lastly, when we shall be clothed with it (I Cor. 15 : 51-58). I rejoiced greatly at the discovery of this truth; and yet I was sad. I rejoiced because it was truth I had found, and was sad to think that truth had been withheld from us. I am not saying this to accuse anyone of wilfully withholding the truth from us, but notwithstanding our articles of faith, we were not in possession of the whole truth. Therefore it is true that those articles were not the whole truth—did not contain "all that is necessary for us to know in order to salvation."

#### THE GOSPEL

What constitutes the gospel, and what was it intended to accomplish? The term "gospel" occurs 102 times in the New Testament. The apostle Paul was "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1 : 16). Gospel means glad tidings, good news, joyful message. This being true, "the gospel" is a certain message or tidings, which is calculated to make glad and cause rejoicing.

What then is *the gospel* as preached by Jesus and His apostles? Jesus said, "I must preach the kingdom of God,

for therefore am I sent" (Luke 4:43). Thus "He went about all Galilee . . . preaching the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 4:23). "Afterward He went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God" (Luke 8:1). We see, therefore, that the subject-matter of the gospel, as preached by Jesus, was the kingdom of God. And He not only preached this Himself, but also commissioned His disciples to announce the same message. He "called the twelve disciples together . . . and sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. . . . And they departed and went through the towns, preaching the gospel and healing everywhere" (Luke 9:2, 6). It follows that to preach the kingdom is to preach the gospel, and vice versa. "And this gospel of the kingdom" was to be preached, not in Galilee merely, but "in all the world" (Matt. 24:14). Let it be noted also that there is but *one gospel*; and not even an apostle, or an angel from heaven, may alter its tone (Gal. 1:1-8). It is the gospel which relates to

#### "THE KINGDOM OF GOD"

What is required to constitute a kingdom? (1) A king; (2) subjects; (3) territory; (4) a capital city; (5) a constitution and laws. Jesus commanded the people to repent and believe the gospel; for the kingdom of the heavens (or kingdom of God, which is the same) is at hand—is the next thing in order after the selection of a people from the gentiles. A kingdom must have been promised by God and expected by at least some of the people. There were those in the days of our Lord who were "waiting for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15:43; Luke 2:25). The disciples asked the Lord, after His resurrection, "Wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom unto Israel?" (Acts 1:6). Were there no other Scripture relating to this subject, this much would appear from the question of the disciples:

1. Israel had had a kingdom.
2. Either it had been taken from them or destroyed.
3. A restoration of this kingdom was in prospect.



4. This restoration would be accomplished through the Lord Jesus Christ.

The only question with the disciples was as to the "time" of this restoration. This also appears from the Lord's answer when He said, "It is not for you to know the *times or seasons*, which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts 1 : 7). The kingdom preached by Jesus was the same kingdom whose restoration the disciples and devout Israelites were expecting. "The kingdom of the Lord" once had had existence in the days of David and Solomon (I Chron. 28 : 5; 29 : 23; II Chron. 9 : 8; 13 : 8). It had all the characteristics of a kingdom above mentioned. There was a line of kings: Saul, David, Solomon, etc.; the subjects of this kingdom, as originally constituted, were the twelve tribes of Israel; its territory, the land of Canaan; its capital, Jerusalem; and its constitution was the law as given at Sinai. Without these or similar elements a kingdom would not be complete. This being settled, let us go a step farther. After Solomon the kingdom was divided into two unequal parts. The larger part, consisting of ten tribes, constituted the "kingdom of Israel," while the remaining two tribes—rather three: Judah, Levi, and Benjamin—composed the "kingdom of Judah"; hence "the Jews." About 721 B.C. the people of Israel were carried by the Assyrians into the cities of the Medes, and not returning from thence they were "lost" as to their identity. Later the Babylonians made war against the remaining kingdom of Judah and carried the Jews with their king and the vessels of the temple into Babylon, where they remained for seventy years, after which, when the kingdom fell to the Medes and Persians, these returned the captive Jews to their own country, and authorized the reconstruction of their city and temple. But they were never, from that time to the present, an independent people with a government of their own. They were tributary to succeeding nations that had the power over Syria, namely, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. In the early days of New Testament history they were paying tribute to Caesar, and after the destruction of their city, Jerusalem, were carried captive into all the nations (Luke 21 : 24). These things



must be taken into account when considering the preaching of Jesus and His disciples about the approach of the kingdom of God. The people were expecting a restoration of power to Israel, in view of what the prophets had foretold and the glowing descriptions they gave of the future glory of Israel, when the tabernacle of David shall be as it was in the days of old (Amos 9 : 11).

#### THE KINGDOM IN THE FUTURE

1. Who will be the one to rule in righteousness in the future kingdom? "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder. . . . Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this" (Isa. 9 : 6, 7). It is He whose name is Jesus. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1 : 30-33). Jesus is the Lord and Christ (Acts 2 : 36; 18 : 5, 28). He was raised up to sit on David's throne (Acts 2 : 30).

2. The subjects are partly indicated in the above quotations. "Reign over the house of Jacob (the twelve tribes) for ever." "One King shall be over them," regathered and reunited Israel (Ezek. 37 : 21, 22). Yet not only Israel regathered, but "*all* dominions shall serve and obey Him" (Dan. 7 : 27). "His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth" (Ps. 72 : 8; Zech. 9 : 10).

#### THE TERRITORY OF THIS KINGDOM

3. Not only the land of Canaan, but even to "the uttermost parts of the earth" (Ps. 72 : 8). Here let us pause a little, and allow me to say that according to Scripture the earth is to be the sphere of man's activity. When God made the earth, He made it for man, and adapted them to each other. The means of subsistence, the atmosphere—everything was wisely

which until then I had not done, though for years I had preached what we had been taught as the gospel.

#### RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT

We had been taught from childhood that good men receive their reward in heaven at death, and wicked men in hell. Over against this the Scriptures teach: (1) That the righteous and the wicked shall be recompensed on the earth (Prov. 11:31); (2) that this shall take place at the appearing of Christ (Matt. 16:27; Rev. 22:12); (3) at the resurrection (Dan. 12:2; Luke 14:14; John 5:28, 29); and (4) on the day of judgment before the judgment-seat of Christ (Rom. 2:5; II Cor. 5:10). Now if the righteous and the wicked receive their reward at death, the former in heaven, and the latter in hell, the above testimonies cannot be true; then there is no need for the coming of Christ, the resurrection, and the judgment. But if these testimonies are true, no one, whether good or bad, receives his reward before the events indicated in these testimonies. Both positions cannot be true at the same time. Since the Scriptures cannot be broken (John 10:25), therefore the doctrine of reward at death, which makes the coming of Christ, the resurrection, and the judgment superfluous, cannot be true, and hence is to be rejected; and the belief of this doctrine is equivalent to the rejection of an essential part of the only saving gospel. Therefore as long as I had regard for the truth, I had but one choice: I accepted the doctrine of the Bible, and rejected the doctrine which, by its false assumptions, nullifies the doctrine of the Scriptures.

#### THE ONENESS OF GOD

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments teach that there is *but one God*; the articles of faith, in harmony with the Athanasian Creed, teach that there are three persons in the Godhead: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. And although there are, according to this doctrine, three separate and distinct persons in the Godhead, yet *three persons* are not three Gods, but *one* God. Three *human* persons

are three men, but this doctrine requires three *divine* persons to constitute one God.

Though this doctrine attributes deathlessness to each of these three persons, at the same time it teaches that the second person, the Son, not only *could* die, but *did* die. And yet those who hold this doctrine do not believe that Jesus *actually* died and, in death, like all the dead, knew not anything (Eccl. 9: 5), but they believe that during the interval between His death and resurrection He was not only conscious but in the presence of the other persons of the Godhead. The Scriptures teach that there is *but one God*, whose name is Yahweh (Deut. 6: 4; Mark 12: 29-32; Ps. 83: 18; John 17: 2; I Cor. 8: 4-6; I Tim. 2: 5; Eph. 4: 4-8).

#### WAS JESUS GOD OR MAN?

Jesus was the Son of God by being begotten of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1: 31-35; Matt. 1: 20), and was therefore the Son of God (II Cor. 1: 3), as well as the Son of Man (Matt. 16: 23.) He was "the Man, Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2: 5), but not the God, Christ Jesus.

The Scriptures teach that Jesus was in all things made like His brethren (Heb. 2: 14, 17), and that He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4: 15). Had He been God, He could not have been tempted, for "God cannot be tempted with evil" (Jas. 1: 13). Since Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, and each of us is tempted when drawn away of his own lust and enticed (Jas. 1: 14), therefore Jesus was not God, but Man, "The Man, Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2: 5).

The creed teaches that Jesus was God from eternity, and yet men teach that He was tempted of the devil. If Jesus was God, who as such knew all things, and hence also the devil and his devices, no suggestion from the devil could possibly have tempted Him to do that which was contrary to His own nature and His own laws.

#### THE DEVIL

The Scriptures not only teach that Jesus is to destroy the *works* of the devil (I John 3: 8), but that He partook of flesh

and blood that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (Heb. 2 : 14). To destroy anything is to put it out of existence. The above testimonies teach that both the works of the devil and the devil himself shall be destroyed. Therefore the works of the devil and the devil himself can be destroyed and shall at last cease to be. If the devil can be destroyed, he is not immortal and indestructible; and hence the doctrine of an eternal devil cannot be true. Besides, according to Heb. 2 : 14 the devil was to be destroyed through the death of Christ, which men do not affirm of the devil of popular belief; for it is taught that the devil is as active since the death of Christ as he was before. It is also assumed that the devil brought about the death of Christ in that he incited the participants to their evil deed. No personal devil was destroyed through the death of Christ; therefore the devil who was destroyed through the death of Christ must be something different from the personal devil of popular teaching. Who or what was this devil? Heb. 2 : 14 says that he "hath the power of death." Who has the power of death—a personal devil? If so, how did he obtain this power? Did God give it to him? The Scriptures are silent concerning any such transaction. But they teach uniformly that sin entered into the world, and death by sin (Rom. 5 : 12); that death is the wages of sin (Rom. 6 : 23), and that the sting of death is sin (I Cor. 15 : 56). Thus the power of death lies in sin. And Jesus was a partaker of flesh and blood, in order to destroy, through His sacrificial death, that which has the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*; in other words, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb. 9 : 26), God, in the death of Christ, condemned sin in the flesh of His Son (Rom. 8 : 3). Jesus, by obedience unto death, overcame sin, which is the sting of death; and therefore death no longer reigns over Him (Rom. 6 : 9), and Jesus is alive to the ages of ages (Rev. 1 : 18). Thus we see that the devil who was destroyed by Jesus was sin which dwells in the flesh; and finally this devil shall be completely destroyed from the earth, so that the will of God shall be done upon earth as it is in heaven, and God shall at last be all in all.



## BAPTISM

A further problem which presented itself to me for solution was the question of baptism. Had I not been baptized? True, I had been *sprinkled* in infancy. But as there is no command given in the Scriptures to even *baptize* infants, to say nothing of sprinkling water upon them under the pretext of baptism, I saw that that act, though conscientiously performed on me, had no binding force; and therefore I had not been baptized in the scriptural sense. While the Evangelical Association nominally accords to each candidate for baptism—provided he is an adult—the right to choose the “mode” that best suits his taste, yet a majority of the ministers favors sprinkling or pouring water upon the person as opposed to immersing him into the water. I had early imbibed these views, which were strengthened by theological textbooks and essays on baptism. I well remember a paper read by one of the ministers at a ministerial convention, on “The Scriptural Mode of Baptism.” Sprinkling was set forth as “*the* scriptural mode,” and immersion was ruled out as being *not* “scriptural.” Yet some of the ministers, though reluctantly, and as a last resort to gain or hold those demanding immersion, did immerse. So the matter rested until the question of obedience to the gospel presented itself. I was in a way desirous of obeying God’s will; however, through the prejudice that had been awakened in me against immersion, I at first was unwilling to submit to this scriptural ordinance, especially since we had been told from childhood that baptism is “not a saving ordinance.” But through the study of the Scriptures, together with history, I found that in the primitive church they practiced immersion exclusively. But I did not grasp the full meaning of this subject until I saw its relation to the gospel, and the Author of this gospel; how Christ died, was buried, and rose again from the dead; and that we are to be buried with Him in baptism, planted in the likeness of His death, that we may be also in the likeness of His resurrection (Rom. 6: 1-5; Col. 2: 12; I Peter 3: 18-21). How could we be buried by having a few drops of water sprinkled upon us? Where is the resemblance in such an act to a burial? It no more exists than sprinkling a few grains of dust upon the head of a corpse would constitute



a burial. But the question, "What must I do to be saved?" demanded settlement. "Repent and be baptized . . . in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). Notwithstanding my prejudice, I was obliged to admit that baptism, with faith and repentance, is a saving ordinance (Acts 3:19; 10:43; 22:16). Let no one think that it was an easy matter for one who for years had been preaching to others, to submit to this requirement. It was not easy or pleasant for a minister in full standing to admit and confess before the world that, though sincere, he had been wrong, and that he would begin with the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, at the lowest round of the ladder. "What would others say—my associates in the ministry, and the people to whom I had been preaching?" But how could I hope to obtain the salvation which is conditioned upon the faith of the gospel and baptism into Christ if I did not render the required obedience (Mark 16:16)? To submit to the truth fully and entirely would mean disapproval and rejection by my colleagues; while refusal and even failure involved the forfeiture of the blessings which can only be obtained upon condition of obedience (Heb. 5:9). No matter how much evidence there might be to cause me to believe as I did, and no odds how sincerely I believed, I knew full well from sec. 121 of the *Book of Discipline* that I would not be permitted to obey the truth as I saw it, or to proclaim it.

#### AN APPEAL TO THE READER

And now, kind reader, I have set before you the reasons of my action and my hope (I Pet. 3:15). I was obliged to withdraw from the church. I could not remain in the church, and proclaim the truth as I saw it; the church, by its discipline, made this forever impossible. I was liable to a "process" that is instituted against a thief, a fornicator, or a murderer, though I had done no wrong, but simply followed my convictions of the truth (II Cor. 13:6-8). I did study the Bible independent of tradition and theology and articles of faith—a thing not criminally bad. I could not harmonize Evangelical eschatology with the teaching of the Bible on this point. It was one or the other. The Bible, after all, is the court of last appeal. The doctrine of

an immortal soul, as taught by the Evangelical clergy from the greatest to the least, is not a Bible doctrine, but a doctrine of men, and underlies nearly every error of the present day. Plato the philosopher (429-347 B.C.) formulated it into a system, and this was taught by the instructors of the youth. Later it was subtly insinuated into the creed of the church by the philosophers of the second century, who gained control of the chairs of theology in the schools at Alexandria and other places. Paul in his day contended with it. Even then its votaries endeavored to introduce it into the church. He neither believed it nor in-dorsed it. He taught the resurrection (Acts 17: 17, 18, 32; I Cor. 15: 51-58). The Greeks, who by wisdom knew not God, "mocked at a resurrection of the dead." Why? Because in their system there was no place for resurrection, and no need of judgment. For if a person's doom is settled at the hour of death, and rewards and punishments are given immediately, then why later a resurrection and judgment to determine innocence or guilt? Paul warned against "philosophy and vain deceit," and "science falsely named, which some professing have erred concerning the faith" (Col. 2: 8; I Tim. 6: 20, 21). I am teaching no new doctrine, but the same thing that was believed and taught by God's people in all ages—"none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts 26: 24). These things were abandoned, lost sight of, and forgotten when the church grew popular, wealthy, and powerful; and history records that when this was the case "they ceased to speak of the millennium." They said, "Eureka! It is here." But the truth was never without its faithful witnesses. I do not regard myself as any great one, but as a plain and unpretentious student of the truth.

I have laid aside the modern "ministry" with its popularity, its salary, its life of ease, and its honorary titles, and am supporting myself and those dependent upon me with the labor of my own hands. Besides this I utilize every opportunity I have of presenting to my fellow-men, without money and without price, the glad tidings of life eternal in the future kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. I am only one of a goodly company of like precious faith who are scattered throughout

the different states in this country and in other countries of the world.

These are the Christadelphians (from *Christou*, "of Christ," and *adelphoi*, "brethren," hence, "brethren of Christ.")

Reader! I beseech you, look well to the reason of your hope. Be sure it is founded on the promises of God. To this end acquaint yourself well with His Word. See that you have "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude 3; Eph. 4:4). Then forsake the associations and fellowship of every institution which by its teachings makes of none effect the word of God; put on Christ by being baptized into Him (Rom. 6:1-4; Gal. 3:27), thus changing your relation from the law of sin and death in Adam to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus; and having done this, add to your faith, your virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and love; and so there shall be ministered to you at last an entrance to the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (II Peter 1:1-11). This is my wish and earnest prayer for you. Amen.

## DOES IT MATTER WHAT WE BELIEVE?

It is understood that the foregoing question relates to our salvation. The reason why it receives consideration in these pages is because it is claimed by well-meaning persons that it makes no difference what we hold as a matter of belief; that as long as we are sincere in our belief, one faith is as good as another. Many are perplexed and in doubt on account of the confused state of "Christendom," and seeing no way to harmonize the conflicting views that are held and taught in the religious world, and either not having the disposition to investigate for themselves as to where the truth is, or else no one to guide them, they take what seems to them the easiest way out of the difficulty, and say, "It matters not what we believe, so long as we are sincere."

In contrast with this, the Scriptures teach that "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. 11:6). From this we see that it is possible for men under certain conditions to please God; and that He is pleased with faith. What, then, is faith? Lexically defined, faith is "the assent of the mind to a proposition made by another." It is God who makes the "proposition," and when anyone assents to its truth, this, according to Webster, is faith. The apostle Paul gave this definition of faith: "Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1, A. V.); or, "Faith is the basis of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen" (*Diaglott*). It is clear from this definition that faith deals with "things hoped for," "things not seen"; and that those "things," since "hoped for," have been promised



by One who is truthful and able to fulfil His promises. Such faith not merely believes in the existence of God ("that He is"): it believes God; that is, takes Him at His word.

Attention is here directed to one example, among many contained in the Scriptures, of such faith: the faith of Abraham. It is written that "he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving God the glory, and being fully persuaded that, what He had promised, He was able also to perform" (Rom. 4: 20, 21). Abraham not only believed in God: he believed God, that is, put faith in His word, and was fully persuaded of God's ability to perform every item of His promise. It was this faith which was counted to Abraham for righteousness (Rom. 4: 3, 22). And let it be borne in mind that this was written "not for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. 4: 23, 24). If Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness, and it was written for us also, that it shall be imputed to us, what, in that case, will be our faith? Will it not be the same as Abraham's faith? That such is the case is clear from the language of the apostle when he says in the same chapter that Abraham is "the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised" (vs. 12). What is it to walk in the steps of Abraham's faith? It is to believe what he believed, and to do, at least in principle, what he did. This is evident from the further statement of the apostle Paul that "there is . . . *one faith*" (Eph. 4: 4, 5). Since this is true, and we, in order to please God, must walk in the steps of Abraham's faith, therefore we must believe the same things which Abraham believed.

What is the source of faith? Men say it is the gift of God. But who performs the act of believing? The apostle Paul wrote, "For with the heart *man* believeth unto righteousness" (Rom. 10:10). It is impossible to believe without something in which to believe. Something must be communicated to man in order that he may believe in it; and in order to the



one faith, it is the word of God, as the apostle says: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). Then faith consists of believing what the word of God teaches or promises. God declares His purpose by means of His word. That purpose is the same today as when God made promises to Abraham, and hence in order to please God it is necessary to believe the word of God declaring that purpose. The word of God is "the truth," as Jesus said (John 17:17); "the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation," as Paul said (Eph. 1:13). Since there is but one gospel (Gal. 1:6-8), there can be but one faith, which is "the faith of the gospel" (Phil. 1:27). And since the gospel was preached to Abraham (Gal. 3:8), and to his descendants (Heb. 4:2), therefore to believe the gospel is the same today in substance, as it was in the days of Abraham.

In view of the foregoing array of testimony, and the conclusions arising therefrom, does it matter what we believe? Assuredly it does. For since without faith, it is impossible to please God; and Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness; and faith comes by hearing the word of God; then it is impossible for anyone to please God as long as he either disbelieves what the word of God teaches, or believes what it does not teach. Remember, without faith it is impossible to please God, and faith must rest for its foundation upon the testimony contained in the word of God. It does make a difference what we believe, first of all to God Himself. He can only be pleased where there is a hearty response to His word; where there is a faith that places all confidence in His truthfulness and power, and cheerfully obeys His commands. To disbelieve is in effect to say that God is a liar (I John 5:10), and with such an attitude God is not pleased.

It also matters what we believe as to the results obtained. Since God is pleased with faith as described above, and justified Abraham on account of such faith, no one can be justified in the sight of God without faith.

Having dealt with the question upon general principles, let us now consider the matter in a more concrete form. It is when we call the attention of men and women to the teaching

commands which God has enjoined and placed upon record in His Word.

Then we read the strong and emphatic language of the apostle Paul concerning the covenants of promise (Eph. 2: 11, 12): "Aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." What are these covenants of promise? They are the covenants which God made with Abraham and David respectively. What do these covenants promise to give or do? The covenant with Abraham promises to give to Abraham and his Seed (which Seed is Christ, and those who are Christ's. See Gal. 3:16-29) the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession (Gen. 13: 15; Acts 7: 5; Heb. 11: 8, 9). According to this covenant both Abraham and his Seed, Christ and those belonging to Him, shall live forever, which is virtually a promise of immortality, involving resurrection to those who have died. The covenant with David promises to raise up Christ to sit on David's throne, and that David himself shall be a witness to the establishment of the throne and kingdom of his illustrious Descendant—the Christ (II Sam. 7: 10-16; Ps. 89: 3, 4; Isa. 9: 6; Luke 1: 30-33; Acts 2: 30). And David styled this "all my salvation and all my desire" (II Sam. 23: 1-5). Would this covenant save David? David so understood the matter. Will it save others? It will do as much for them, as they are invited to share the blessings of "the sure mercies of David" (Isa. 55:1-3). The sure mercies of David mean resurrection from the death-state to those of the covenant related who have died, and immortality for all the faithful. That Jesus was raised from the dead and immortalized under the operation of this covenant is evident from the apostle's reference to it in Acts 13: 34 "As concerning that He raised Him (Jesus) up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, He saith on this wise: I will give you the sure mercies of David." Elsewhere it is testified that the Lord Jesus was brought again from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant (Heb. 13: 20); and the blood of His covenant will also bring His prisoners of hope

from the pit wherein is no water (Zech. 9: 11, 12). Men and women are brought into this covenant by faith and obedience; they are sanctified by the blood of the covenant (Heb. 10: 20). when they put on Christ in baptism (Gal. 3: 27). The apostle says that to be strangers from the covenants of promise is to be Christless and Godless and hopeless in the world. Such strangers have not been sanctified by the blood of the covenant, and hence are still in their alienated and unclean state. They have "no hope." Does it make a difference what we believe? It makes just this difference, that while the true believer in Christ Jesus is nigh to the commonwealth of Israel and the covenants of promise, an heir of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love Him (Jas. 2: 5), the alien and stranger is far off from these covenants and the blessings which they promise, and when he dies, he goes down into the grave without hope of resurrection.

Jesus sent His apostles to preach the gospel, saying, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16: 15, 16). From this we see that belief of the gospel, with baptism, is essential to salvation. Whoever, therefore, will be saved must believe the gospel; and whoever does not believe the gospel will not be saved. Will anyone say it matters not whether we believe the gospel or not? To affirm such a thing would be to contradict the plainest teaching of the Lord Jesus. Since "he that believeth (the gospel) shall be saved," it is in order to ask, what is "the gospel" which Jesus commanded the apostles to preach? That the gospel cannot be believed unless it is known and understood is a fact too true to be doubted or denied.

The word "gospel" means glad tidings; hence "tidings" which make glad or joyful the intelligent believer. This gospel, futhermore, is styled "*the* gospel," showing that it is a definite and specific message. If the apostles executed the mission upon which they were sent, they all proclaimed the same message, and all who believed the gospel had the same faith; they all believed the same thing. The faith begotten

by the gospel was "the faith of the gospel" (Phil. 1:27). To execute this mission, the apostles must have been well instructed in the gospel at the time when Jesus gave this command, so that they not only understood the message they were to deliver, but how to proclaim it to others.

Jesus was anointed and sent to preach the gospel (Luke 4:18, 43), and He preached it when "the twelve were with Him" (Luke 8:12), and later sent them to preach the same message (Luke 9:1, 6). And not only this, but He said at a still later period, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world as a witness to all nations" (Matt. 24:14). After His resurrection He gave the command to "preach the gospel to every creature," as referred to above. What was the gospel proclaimed by Jesus and His apostles? It was "the glad tidings of the kingdom of God." That this kingdom was to "come" to the earth is clear from the prayer which Jesus taught His followers to pray, "Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:9, 10). In this kingdom Jesus is to be the King (John 18:36, 37). The apostles shall be given authority over the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:28-30). Power over the nations and over cities will be given to the faithful followers of Jesus (Luke 19:11-19; Rev. 2:26, 27). The saints shall reign with Christ on earth in this kingdom (Rev. 5:10; II Tim. 2:12). The kingdom will come at the appearing of Christ (Matt. 25:31; 24:29-33 with Luke 21:27-31). This kingdom will be the restored kingdom of Israel (Acts 1:5). But someone may ask, "Is it necessary to believe these things in order to be saved?" It is if they constitute an element of the gospel. That they are an integral part of the gospel is too clear to admit of a single doubt. "But suppose someone sincerely believes that the kingdom is in heaven, or in the heart of the believer, or that the church is the kingdom: will he not be saved?" Jesus did not so teach, and therefore such belief will not save anyone even though he sincerely believes it. Sincere belief of an error will not change that error into saving truth. "Must we then believe concerning the king-



dom of God what the references given teach, in order to be saved?" Assuredly you must. "He that believeth (the gospel) and is baptized shall be saved." And the gospel relates to the kingdom of God to be established upon earth at the coming of the Son of Man from heaven. Does it matter whether we believe the gospel or not? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." To believe and be baptized means salvation, while non-belief means damnation. Is there any difference between salvation and damnation? No one would say no to this question. Then this is the difference it makes as to what we believe. From what was the gospel designed to save? It was intended to save from sin and its effects. Faith accepts the message concerning the kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus and His apostles (Luke 19:11; Mark 15:43); the believer prays for it (Matt. 6:10), is an heir of it (Jas. 2:5), and is awaiting an entrance into it (II Pet. 1:10, 11). The "good and honest heart" (Luke 8:15) gladly receives the gospel message, and upon belief of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," such a one is baptized, as were those at Samaria (Acts 8:12), into the name of Jesus the Christ, thus passing from Adam to Christ, putting off the old man and putting on the new man (Gal. 3:27). He is then a "new creature" (II Cor. 5:17), a joint heir with Christ according to the promise made to Abraham (Rom. 8:17; Gal. 3:16, 27-29), and an heir of the kingdom (Jas. 2:5).

The word of God thus believed is a mighty "power" (Rom. 1:16) in bringing about a mental and moral transformation in men and women. The apostle Paul wrote to the Thessalonian brethren, "For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe" (I Thess. 2:13). What evidence have we that such a change had taken place in those persons? The apostle himself furnishes this evidence. "For," says he, "they themselves (their contemporaries in Macedonia and Achaia)



show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for His Son from heaven . . . even Jesus" (I Thess. 1:9, 10). They had turned from their idols to God. What was the cause of this turning? The word of God which they had heard and believed. What was the result? First, to serve the living and true God; and second, to wait for His Son from heaven. Why wait *for* the Son of God *from* heaven, and not rather go *to* His Son *in* heaven? Because the word of God which they believed had instructed them with reference to the coming of Christ and the object of His coming. And their faith was not merely a matter of private opinion, but a fact well known among their contemporaries, as Paul testified. Conversion or turning to God is the result of enlightenment. This is evident from the words of Jesus to Saul of Tarsus, "To open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light" (Acts 26:18). Hence we know that the Thessalonians were first taught, then they believed, and as the result of this they turned to God.

Thus we see that it makes a difference what we believe. We must believe the truth in order to please God and be saved. Error, however sincerely or firmly believed, has no saving qualities, and hence can save no one. It is possible to be sincere in error, but the sincere person will correct the error: that is, he will discard the error, when it becomes known to him as such, and accept the truth in its stead. Sincerity cannot and will not change error into truth, but it will turn the honest and good heart *from* the error *to* the truth.

There is another aspect of this matter to which I must invite attention, namely this: We are asked by well-meaning persons who see the force of the truth: "Can we not believe the truth and remain where we are?" They point to the fact that there are many well-meaning and upright persons in the popular churches, and are loath to separate from their company. What does the truth require? The gospel call is both strong and clear: "Come out, and be ye separate" (II Cor. 6:17). This injunction involves every form of falsehood, whether doctrinal or moral. If corrupt morals will drag the

believer to ruin, then corruption in doctrine will have the same effect. Hence the frequent and repeated scriptural admonitions to believers to preserve soundness in doctrine. The apostle Paul wrote to Titus (chap. 2:7), "In doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned." Likewise the apostle John wrote to the brethren, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, nor bid him Godspeed; for he that biddeth him Godspeed is a partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 9:11). This shows how important it is that we believe and teach "sound doctrine," and how false teaching was viewed by the apostles. If the believers were not to receive the teachers of false doctrine into their ecclesial "house," nor bid them Godspeed, how can anyone who believes the truth as taught by Jesus and the apostles either join a "house" or church in which false doctrine is taught therein or continue after he has learned the truth? In the light of the words just considered it seems to me that he would instinctively feel to withdraw from those who teach things contrary to sound doctrine. To remain with the popular churches after one has come to a knowledge of the truth is equivalent to wishing them Godspeed, for it involves participation in the worship of a false God, the trinitarian God of the apostasy, as well as the financial and moral support of a system which is inimical to the truth.

Reader, are you beginning to see the beauty of the gospel and the meaning of the covenants of promise? Do you believe the glad tidings of the kingdom? Do you wish to be incorporated in the commonwealth of Israel? Would you be sanctified by the blood of the covenant? If so, then you must become obedient to the faith (Acts 6:7; Rom. 1:5)—be baptized into Christ (Rom. 6:1-4), thus putting on, or being clothed with, Christ (Gal. 3:27). By so doing you not only put on Christ, but at the same time you become identified with the one body (I Cor. 12:13; Eph. 4:4). If then by baptism

you are united to Christ and His body, the ecclesia, or called out, why should you wish to retain your membership in a body which not only does not teach the truth of God, but opposes it, and teaches that which is false? Or why should you wish to be joined to *another* body when the belief and obedience of the truth bring you into a vital relation with the true body of which Christ is the Head? You cannot hope to enhance your usefulness by remaining in a body which teaches error. When Saul of Tarsus learned to know the truth he immediately sought the companionship of those who were in the truth. He did not "join" the religious societies, Jew or Gentile, that were represented in the localities which he visited, but persistently and steadfastly adhered to the one body with which he had become identified when he was baptized at Damascus.

Does it matter what we believe? It does. It matters whether we believe the truth or not. The truth will make us free and save us. Error will leave us in sin and death. Believe the truth. Believe it from the heart, and be saved at last.

## WILL ALL MEN BE SAVED?

This question presupposes that man is in a condition from which he needs to be saved. What is this condition? It is not a state into which men will come if they commit sin, but one in which they are already involved, whether they sin or not. They came into it, not by personal transgression, but by the transgression of one man: Adam, the progenitor of the race. The act by which this result was brought about was eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden, which had been placed under the divine interdict in these words: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17). The record shows that Adam did eat of the forbidden tree, and thus he transgressed the divine law under which he had been placed. This act is frequently referred to in the writings of the apostle Paul, and is styled "sin," "Adam's transgression," "the offence of one," "one man's offence," "one man's disobedience" (Rom. 5:12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19). The apostle describes the result of "Adam's transgression" as "death," "judgment upon all men to condemnation," and "many were made sinners" (verses 12, 18, 19). So we see that, whether men sin or not, they are already under condemnation; and this condemnation consigns man to the dust, as the sentence pronounced upon man after the transgression clearly specifies: "*Because* thou hast . . . eaten, cursed is the ground . . . dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen.



3:17-19). This return to dust involved the extinction of Adam's life; and since Adam sinned and incurred the penalty of death before he begat a son, the death sentence being pronounced upon Adam in every fibre of his being, every atom of his substance came under that sentence, and hence every son of whom he was the father, as Eve was the mother (Gen. 3:20), is born with that sentence already resting upon him. Adam himself being subject to the divine wrath, all his descendants are "by nature the children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3). All are under condemnation, not because they have personally sinned, but as the apostle points out, "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (Rom. 5:18). They being but a "multiplication" of Adam (Gen. 1:28), after he had sinned, are justly the subjects of divine displeasure. The question is in order, Why do men die? The common answer is, "Because all are sinners." True; but in what sense are they sinners? Do all die because they have sinned? Do none die who have not sinned? The apostle again informs us, "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 5:14). Thus, whether men sin or not, they are under the dominion of death. This accounts for the death of countless numbers of infants and other irresponsible classes, who have never sinned in the sense of transgressing a known law. In ordinary religious thinking it is held that men die because they have sinned personally, but this does not account for the fact that many die who have never sinned. But when we understand that death is in the world of mankind on account of the sin of one man, and that death "passed upon all men, for that (margin, 'in whom') all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12), all is clear. They sinned "in" Adam upon the same principle upon which Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek in Abraham, that is, federally (Heb. 7:4-10). Once again: "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (Rom. 5:19). Thus we see that they were not made, or placed in the position of, sinners on account of their own sins, but by Adam's disobedience. And since "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23), they are justly condemned to



death, which means extinction of life, and return to the dust. Had no law besides the first Eden law been enacted, and no other rule been brought into operation, both Adam and all his posterity would have returned to the dust without the possibility of redemption. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. 3: 19). This law, which is apostolically styled "the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8: 3), made no provision for the restoration of life to man after death. Once he died and returned to the dust, this law could not bring him from thence. And this legacy "passed" from Adam, the head of the race, upon all men. Thus we have in Adam, sin, condemnation, death, dust.

It is in order here to call attention to a fact that is sadly misunderstood by our religious friends, viz., that the sentence pronounced upon Adam was not consignment to an eternity of torment. The "condemnation" pronounced upon Adam did not involve eternal torment either for Adam himself or his posterity. There is nothing in the language addressed to Adam, either before or after the transgression, that can be fairly construed to mean eternal torment. And since the sentence pronounced upon Adam culminated in his return to the dust of the ground, the same destiny awaited all his descendants. Thus the "condemnation" following the "offence of one" was a condemnation to a death in which there is a return to the dust. It is a "death" which necessitates a "resurrection," or standing again, in order to a resumption of life (I Cor. 15: 18-21).

We see from the foregoing that the condition from which men need to be saved is not a future hell of eternal torment, such as the religious world sees and teaches as the doom of the wicked, but a present state of sin and condemnation, in which men are already legally dead, and it is but a question of time as to how soon the sentence of death will be executed upon them. From this state we need to be saved. And this salvation involves justification instead of condemnation; righteousness instead of sin; life and immortality instead of death.

Whereas the Scriptures clearly teach that "by man came death," they teach with equal clearness that "by Man came

also the resurrection of the dead" (I Cor. 15:21). We have seen who the "man" is by whom death came. But who is the "Man" by whom came the resurrection of the dead? Did this result "come" by or through the same man? Far from it. It is manifest that the man who was condemned on account of his own transgression could not bring about resurrection. And none of his descendants could do this, unless one could be found who, while being of the same nature as Adam, would be sinless as to character. And such an one was actually found in a son of Adam, not an immediate son, but still a descendant of the progenitor of the race (Luke 3:23-38). This was Jesus the Son of God, and at the same time the Son of Man.

Since disobedience brought death upon the race, upon what principle does the resurrection take place? Upon that of obedience. Obedience implies a law, given for the guidance of a being who can either obey or disobey that law. Since resurrection follows obedience, and came by Jesus, "the second Man," we are led to conclude that Jesus was raised from the dead because He obeyed the law of God. We are clearly taught in the Scriptures that He rendered perfect obedience. He Himself frequently taught His followers and others that He always did those things that were pleasing to the Father. It was His meat and drink to do the will of God. His entire life may be summed up in the words of the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered" (5:8). He was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2:8). Thus we see that while Adam died on account of his disobedience, Jesus died on account of His obedience. As to nature, He was a partaker of flesh and blood as the children are partakers of these (Heb. 2:14). His flesh, like that of all the race, was "sin's flesh" (Rom. 8:3), descending as it did from the sinful flesh of Adam. This flesh made it possible for Him to be tempted, and we are informed that He was "in all points tempted like as we are" (Heb. 4:15). He did not yield to the temptation, but overcame it, as He Himself testified (Rev. 3:21), and hence was "without sin." And

in overcoming, what did He overcome? It was that element of His nature to which the suggestion to depart from the path of right and duty appealed—the flesh. And it was this element of His character, namely His holiness, that caused God to raise Him from the dead. “The death of the cross,” referred to by the apostle, was not what may be termed “natural death,” but a violent one, in which His life was violently taken away. God permitted His faithful Son to be thus “put to death,” inflicting death upon His sin-condemned nature inherited from Adam through His mother; but on account of the holiness of His character, manifested amid circumstances of such adversity, God raised Him from the dead “through the blood of the everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20), previously entered into between God and Abraham and David (Ps. 105:6-11; Isa. 55:3), which covenant or promise Jesus “confirmed” (Rom. 15:9) by the shedding of His blood (Matt. 26:28). This having been accomplished, the law of sin and death having taken His life, when the covenant contemplating life and immortality was confirmed or ratified, it became immediately effective, and Jesus was the first to be brought from the dead under its operation (Heb. 13:20; Acts 26:23). In this sense Jesus is “the first fruits” (I Cor. 15:20, 23), “the firstborn from the dead” (Col. 1:18), “the firstborn among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29), and “the firstborn of every creature” (Col. 1:15). Having thus satisfied the demands of the law that deprives man of life, He was “raised from the dead by the glory of the Father” (Rom. 6:4). And since “the sure mercies of David” (Isa. 55:3), which pledged resurrection and endless life to all who enter into covenant relation with Jahwe, had been confirmed by the death of Christ, when He was raised, this was “no more to return to corruption” (Acts 13:34), and hence He was also changed from corruption to incorruption, and henceforth “death hath no more dominion over Him” (Rom. 6:9). He is now “alive forevermore” (Rev. 1:18).

Once more to the words of the apostle, “By man came also the resurrection of the dead” (I Cor. 15:21). To whom did the resurrection come? First of all, to the man by whom

it came; that is, Jesus. Thus while sin ends in death, "righteousness (which Jesus both loved and fulfilled—Heb. 1:9; Matt. 3:15) delivereth from death" (Prov. 10:2; 11:4). In this way was accomplished what is expressed in the words, "Who in the days of His flesh, when He had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared" (Heb. 5:7). The subject of this statement is Jesus. He to whom He offered prayer was the Father. The petition was that He might be saved from death; and He was "heard in that He feared." Hence He was saved. From what was He saved? From dying? No, for He died. But He was saved "from death," after He had died. He was the exemplification of salvation. Would you know what salvation is? Look to Jesus, and see it illustrated and exemplified in Him. Would you know the principle upon which salvation is effected? It is that of obedience to God's will. The obedience of Jesus was perfect; His salvation, which embraced resurrection and immortality, followed.

The question then arises, Upon what principle will others be saved? Let us again hear the Scriptures: "And being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. 5:9). This being true, if we can know how many will thus "obey Him," we shall know how many will be saved. According to this testimony none will be saved except those who render such obedience. If therefore all men will obey the Lord, all will be saved; if a part obey, only a part will be saved. But "all" will be saved who render such obedience.

Have we any evidence that all men will obey, and consequently be saved? Scripture is cited by those who believe in universal salvation to prove that all men will finally be saved. Our attention is directed to the statement of the apostle Paul, that God "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (I Tim. 2:4). It is said that God is so wise as to will only that which is right and good, and that He is able to execute His will. We would not deny that God wills only that which is in every respect good, and



also freely admit that when the accomplishment of His will depends solely upon the exercise of His power, He can do what He undertakes to do. Yet with this concession we are by no means led to believe that all men will finally be saved simply because God will have all men to be saved. If it could be shown that everything that was done in the past was in perfect accord with the will of God, the argument from this passage would have some force. But it is an incontrovertible fact that many things were done in the past which were contrary to the will of God. It will not be disputed that God communicates His will to men by means of commandments. Let us then ask the question, Did God will that Adam should sin, should transgress the divine commandment? Who will say yes? To do so would be to charge God with inconsistency. However, I wish to direct attention to a commandment that was given to the brethren by the Lord Jesus through the apostles. The apostle Paul wrote to the brethren at Thessalonica, "For ye know what commandments we gave you by Jesus Christ. For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honor, not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the gentiles which know not God; that no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter: because that the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we have also forewarned you and testified" (I Thess. 4:2-6). Three things here come prominently to view: (1) that the brethren should abstain from fornication; (2) that no man should defraud his brother in any matter, and (3) that the Lord is the avenger of those who do such things. But here the question arises, Why "avenge" evil if the things prohibited are in accordance with the will of God? Again, did none of the brethren ever commit fornication? I need but mention the case that occurred at Corinth, where one of the brethren had his father's wife (I Cor. 5:1). Now since the will of God was that the brethren should abstain from fornication, when such an act was committed by one of them, it was plainly in contravention of the clearly expressed will of God. The same remark applies



to the interdict against fraud among the brethren. Did none defraud their brethren in Christ? It was the will of God that they should not. What are the facts? The apostle wrote to the brethren, "Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that the brethren" (I Cor. 6:8). Here was another act which was contrary to the will of God as expressed by His "commandment." Thus we see that men not only have the power to do things that are contrary to the will of God, but actually do them; and as long as God is dealing with men by suasion, and not by force, He does not compel them to do His will. This is also true with reference to salvation. Man may be saved upon certain conditions to be fulfilled by himself. Jesus complained of some of His contemporaries, "Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life" (John 5:40). Did the Lord will that they should come? He surely did, for He constantly invited them to "come." And yet many did not come. Why not? Because they opposed their "will" to the will of Him who invited them. Will they finally have life, even though they set their own will in opposition to the will of God as expressed by the Lord Jesus? The Scriptures leave no ground for an affirmative answer to this question. All of which makes clear that men can set themselves in opposition to the will of God, and thus fail to obtain the blessings which God has set before them on condition of faith and obedience. We therefore dismiss the passage under consideration because it affords no proof that all men will be saved.

Someone asked the Lord, "Are there few that be saved?" (Luke 13:23). There was never a better opportunity to show that all men will be saved than the one here presented to the Lord. What was His answer? Hear His words, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able" (vs. 24). What, according to the words of Jesus, will be the number of those who shall find it? "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and *few there be that find it*" (Matt. 7:14). Not all will heed the injunction to "strive," and of those who do strive, "many shall not be able;" and only "few" shall actually find it.

But let us glance at the ages that are past. The antediluvian world ended with "few, that is, eight souls saved" (I Pet. 3: 20). At the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah few were saved, and we have the most solemn warning in the words of the Savior, "Remember Lot's wife" (Luke 17: 32). Of the children of Israel who left Egypt, but few entered into the land of Canaan, and the many "could not enter in because of unbelief" (Heb. 3: 19). We are told that God was "grieved" with them that sinned, "whose carcasses fell in the wilderness" (Heb. 3: 17). Are we grieved when everything is to our liking? No! Why was God grieved? Was it because that generation acted in harmony with His will? Quite the contrary. When the Lord Jesus appeared and "came to His own, His own received Him not" (John 1: 11). As they had done with John when they "rejected the counsel of God against themselves" in not being baptized of Him (Luke 7: 30), so they rejected the Lord, and finally crucified Him, the only name in which men can be saved. If the results of past ages be taken as an indication, the number of the finally saved will be comparatively small.

Another aspect of this question presents itself in the claim put forward by many well-meaning, though we believe misguided persons, that while only a few of those of past generations entered the way of salvation, those who did not will be raised from the dead and be given an opportunity in another lifetime to be saved. Where is the Scripture evidence in favor of such a view? It does not exist. There is not one passage which, when fairly considered, indisputably proves that any one who has not become covenant related with the Deity through belief of the truth and obedience thereto, will be raised from the dead, to say nothing of a future opportunity to be saved. The law of the resurrection is that of obedience. Jesus the first fruit was raised from death because of His obedience unto death, even the death of the cross. And not only was He Himself brought again from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant, as the inspired penman pointed out (Heb. 13: 20), but others will be brought from the pit through the blood of His covenant (Zech. 9: 11). In

Isa. 55: 1-3 the thirsty are invited to "come to the waters," and the promise is made to those who come, "And I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." That this covenant involves resurrection and immortality is evident from the application of it made by the apostle Paul (Acts 13: 34). Jesus Himself entered that covenant by sacrifice (Ps. 50: 5), "the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9: 26). Hence He was brought from the dead through the operation of that covenant. And He is "the first-fruits of them that slept" (I Cor. 15: 20). How then can he be raised from the dead who has never heeded the invitation to come into the everlasting covenant? who has never become related to the sacrifice of Christ by baptism (Rom. 6: 1-4)? who never "put off the old man" or "put on the new" (Col. 3: 10), which is Christ (Gal. 3: 27) who never became a "new creature in Christ Jesus" (2 Cor. 5: 17)? who was never freed from condemnation in Adam (Rom. 8: 1-3)? upon whom the wrath of God abideth (John 3: 36)? He not being in Christ, who is "the Resurrection and the Life" (John 11: 25), has no right or title to either resurrection or life. The apostles "taught the people and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4: 1, 2). Resurrection is not "through" Adam because it is not in him; it is "through Jesus" because it is "in Jesus." Resurrection pertains to those who are "Christ's" (I Cor. 15: 20). "The dead in Christ" shall rise at Christ's coming (I Thess. 4: 16). These will fall into two classes: "the just and unjust" (Acts 24: 15); the just being those who sow to the Spirit, who shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting; and the unjust those who sow to the flesh, who shall of the flesh reap corruption (Gal. 6: 8).

Comparatively few of the human race enter the everlasting covenant; and not all who enter are faithful to the obligations which they thus assume. Some of these become "enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil. 3: 18). They trample under foot the Son of God and count the blood of the covenant, where-with they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace (Heb. 10: 29). What shall be the end of such? Will they be saved? The apostle says, "Whose end is

destruction." Since it is impossible for anyone to go beyond the "end," when they reach that end, "the second death" (Rev. 2:11; 26:14; 21:8), from which there is no resurrection, they forever disappear.

Again our attention is directed to a statement which is thought to encourage the hope that finally all men will be saved. The passage reads, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John 1:9). Does this teach that "every man" will ultimately be saved? It is admitted by those who refer to it in order to prove universal salvation, that the passage does not directly teach that doctrine; but since it speaks of the Lord Jesus as "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," therefore all men will at last be enlightened, and possibly be saved. The inference is that since some men have died without being thus enlightened, they will be raised from the dead, and given an opportunity in a future lifetime to be enlightened. Is this the teaching of this passage? First, of what "world" was the writer speaking? It was a "world" that "knew Him not." Was it the world of mankind? It was the Israelitish world, to which John the Baptist had been "sent of God" (John 1:6), to prepare the way of the Lord. And when Jesus came, He preached peace to the children of Israel (Acts 10:36). Being sent to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24), He came enlightening every man in that "world," cosmos, or order. It was said by some belonging to this world, "Perceive ye not how ye prevail nothing? Behold the world is gone after Him" (John 12:19). What world was this? It was the Jewish world. Notwithstanding Jesus was shedding His light upon every man in this world, there were those who "loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil" (John 3:19). They closed their eyes against the light, and remained in darkness. However, there is another matter in connection with this passage (John 1:9) that is deserving of attention. The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders the passage thus: "The true Light was that which, coming into the world, enlightens every man." The Revised Version gives this reading in the text, "There was the true Light, even the Light



which lighteth every man, coming into the world." This makes the Light "come into the world," instead of every man, and in coming it was lighting every man. The marginal reading is as follows: "The true Light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world." The Elberfeld Bible (German) gives this reading: "That was the true Light, which, coming into the world, lightens every man." Thus the lighting was done while the true Light was coming into the world. In what sense was the Light lighting? It was shining upon the men of that world, so that if they chose to walk in the light, they might enjoy its benefits. But where is the hint or intimation in this passage that all men will be saved? As we have seen, it does not exist. Again, our attention is directed to the words of Jesus, "And I, if I be lifted from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (John 12:32). It is confidently believed that this passage teaches universal salvation, and the phrase "all men" is supposed to favor that view. We shall see. Jesus says, "I will draw all men unto Me." How does He "draw" men to Himself? By teaching. He said elsewhere, "No man can come to Me, except the Father which sent Me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:44). We are led to ask, How is this drawing affected? It is neither by the exercise of arbitrary power, nor by talismanic influence, but by teaching. Jesus further said in the same connection, "It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God." What is the conclusion which He draws from this statement? Hear Him: "Every man, *therefore*, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me" (vs. 45). Thus He will attract men to Himself by His teaching. But it says, "They shall *all* be taught of God." Will all be saved who have been taught in the past? Many had obtained the knowledge of the truth who "sinned wilfully, for whom there is no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries" (Heb. 10:26, 27). Will the adversaries nevertheless be saved? Does devour mean salvation? To affirm such a thing would be to deprive words of all meaning. If these adversaries are devoured, they will not be saved,

and hence the doctrine that all men will be saved is contrary to the truth.

But while considering the phrase "all men," I wish to direct attention to the mission of John the Baptist. The object of this mission was "that all men through him might believe" (John 1:7). And mark you, John was "sent of God" for this purpose (vs. 6). Did "all men" include every human being, past, present, and future? It is evident that it meant those who came within the sphere of John's influence. Did "all men" believe through John's preaching? We know that not all believed, for it is said that "the Pharisees and lawyers rejected (margin, 'frustrated') the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him" (Luke 7:30). Thus while it was the will of God that they should be baptized, they willed to do otherwise, and hence were not baptized. Upon a certain occasion the priests, the scribes, and the elders questioned Jesus as to His authority for teaching, to which He replied, "I will also ask of you one question, and answer Me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men? Answer Me." What did they say? "They reasoned with themselves, saying, If we say From heaven, He will say, Why then did ye not believe? But if we shall say, Of men; they feared the people; for all men counted John, that he was a prophet indeed. And they answered and said unto Jesus, We cannot tell," whereupon Jesus declined to tell them upon what authority He was doing those things (Mark 11:27-33). From the "reasoning" of those men we see that confessedly they put no faith in either John's preaching or his baptism. And this in spite of the fact that John had been sent of God that all men through him might believe. Some did not believe. They "rejected the counsel of God," which shows that it is not impossible for men to make the purpose of God with reference to themselves of none effect. This is simply illustrated in many instances that are brought to view in the Scriptures. Stephen charged his Jewish contemporaries with resistance against the Holy Spirit: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit; as your fathers did, so do

ye" (Acts 7:51). As their fathers had resisted the Holy Spirit in opposing and persecuting the prophets (who were moved by the Holy Spirit) (Neh. 9:30), so they had rejected the Lord Jesus, and became His betrayers and murderers. The apostle Paul spoke of those in his day who "resisted the truth," not men who had never known the truth, but men who had become "reprobate concerning the truth" (II Tim. 3:8), men who were "trucebreakers," or covenant breakers. It is possible for men to "refuse Him that speaketh" (Heb. 12:25); to be "stubborn and rebellious," like "a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not steadfast with God" (Ps. 78:8). It is possible to have "an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God" (Heb. 3:2), against which the apostle solemnly warned the brethren to "take heed."

Much stress is laid on passages in which the word "all" is found. We are referred to I Tim. 4:10, which reads, "We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe." And it is said, "How can God be the Savior of all men as long as any are unsaved?" In what sense is God "the Savior of all men"? The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders the passage thus: "We hope in a living God, who is a Preserver of all men, especially of believers." That the sense of this passage is represented by the word "Preserver" is evident from the context. The apostle informed Timothy that "bodily exercise profiteth little (margin, 'for a little time'), but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance. For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God who is the Savior (or Preserver) of all men, especially of those that believe." We notice the apostle's exhortation to godliness because it has promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. While this is true of the godly, the ungodly, who has never entered into covenant with the Deity, exists merely by sufferance, and while he possesses the life that now is, has no promise of the life which is to come. When the life that now is ends, which it may do at any

time, he sinks into oblivion because he has no promise, and hence no prospect, of a future life. God is the Giver and Preserver of the present life, "giving to all life and breath and all things" (Acts 17: 25). While God in this sense is the Savior of all men, He is the Savior "specially of them that believe." In this special sense He is the Savior of believers only. And what is this salvation? It is the salvation of which Jesus will be the Author to all them that obey Him: "Eternal salvation" (Heb. 5: 9). Thus while all men, both believers and others, are the objects of God's benevolence, and enjoy the blessings of the present life, the believer alone has the prospect of a future life, that which is life indeed. So this passage, too, fails to furnish proof in favor of universal salvation.

But another passage is appealed to, viz., "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. 16: 22). Again the word "all" is made to do service. But let us inquire, Who are the two "alls"? One all are "in Adam." The other all, "in Christ." Not all who have descended from Adam are "in Christ." Does the believer die "in Adam"? The apostle Paul wrote to the Corinthian brethren, "Therefore if any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new" (II Cor. 5: 17). Hence when a believer dies, he dies "in the Lord," and not "in Adam." When a man dies who has not become "a new creature in Christ Jesus," he dies "in Adam," and not in Christ. Does the Lord restore men to life regardless of whether they have passed from death unto life or not (Rom. 8: 2)? As has been shown above, resurrection and life are in Christ Jesus. Then how can they be made alive in Christ who were never in Christ? This is impossible! Does death bring persons into relation with Christ? Not the death of the sinner, for in that case Christ would not need to have died. It is by being baptized into Christ and His death (Rom. 6: 1-4), preceded and accompanied by intelligent faith (Acts 8: 12), that men are inducted into Christ. They who are thus transferred from the old creation to the new, and afterward die, will be "made alive in Christ," while those with whom this transfer has not been made, still belong to the old



creation, with its "old things," and hence they cannot be "made alive in Christ." The wrath of God abideth upon all who do not, in the divinely appointed way, believe into the Son of God (John 3:36). Not having been freed from the law of sin and death by the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, nothing can bring them from the death state. The former cannot, because it can only take, but not give, life; and the latter cannot because they never came within the scope of its operation.

We do not deny that men will have an opportunity to be saved in the age to come. Believing the gospel of the kingdom which promises the establishment of the kingdom of God at the coming of Christ, the gathering of Israel into the land of promise, the blessing of the nations in fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, "In thee and thy Seed shall all families be blessed" (Gen. 12:3; Gal. 3:8; Gen. 22:18; Acts 3:25), we believe that men will be blessed in Christ in the age to come. But we do not believe that the fulfilment of these promises involves the resurrection of any from the dead to an opportunity of salvation in another lifetime. This opportunity will pertain to men and women then living upon the earth, and will not involve those of past ages and generations.

Again, we are referred to the statement of the apostle Paul that "all Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11:26). It is said that if all Israel is saved, it is by the grace of God; and if Israel is saved by grace, why should not the rest of mankind be saved upon the same principle? And we are given to understand that "all Israel" means every Israelite that ever lived or will live. In the first place, let me remark that this application of the word "all" is unwarrantably broad. It was not so used by any Bible writer, as the following examples, out of many, clearly show: "And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel" (Deut. 5:1). "And all Israel stoned him (Achan) with stones" (Josh. 7:25). "Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did to all Israel" (I Sam. 2:22). Does "all Israel" in these passages mean every descendant of Jacob who had lived up to the time then mentioned, including all then living? This is impossible. There is

no case in the Bible where "all Israel" includes every Israelite that ever lived. Then why should this phrase have such a wide application in Rom. 11:26? All Israel in this passage means the entire nation of Israel, that is the twelve tribes descended from Jacob. And this does not involve the resurrection of those who have died in past ages. True, Israel will be saved by grace, but on this condition: "If they abide not still in unbelief" (Rom. 11:23). Salvation is by grace, as the Scriptures abundantly testify. But it is not without faith; and while faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), it is *man* that believeth (vs. 10). God does not believe for him, nor compel him to believe the testimony if he does not believe. "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar" (I John 5:10).

In conclusion, let me direct the reader's attention to some Scripture testimony that plainly asserts that some who have died shall not rise from the dead. I know full well that this is not a popular doctrine. But what of that? The question after all is, Is it true? Men may be startled at the thought that some, yea many, who have died shall never see light, i. e., shall remain in the death state. But let us not stagger at the things set forth in the word of God. What then do the Scriptures teach? We have a notable instance of this doctrine in Isaiah, chap. 26. It is said, "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah" (vs. 1). What "day" is this? It is the day when God will "swallow up death in victory" (25:8), which will be in connection with the resurrection at the coming of Christ (I Cor. 15:51-58). This, then, is the time when the song above referred to shall be sung in the land of Judah. Why Judah? Because "the Lord shall inherit Judah His portion in the Holy Land, and shall choose Jerusalem again" (Zech. 2:12). Thus the Jews, regathered into their own land, and established in their inheritance, will sing with joy to the Most High. Among other things this song gives expression to this thought: "Lord, Thou wilt ordain peace for us; for Thou also hast wrought all our works in (margin 'for') us" (26:12). How quiet and peaceful will be the rest, when they, according to the covenant which

God made with David, "shall move no more," when the sons of iniquity shall afflict them no more (II Sam. 7: 10). What more shall they say? "O Lord, our God, other lords besides Thee have had dominion over us; but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy name. They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish" (vss. 13, 14). Here certain lords who had had dominion over Judah in times past are said to be "dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise." Who are these lords? It was not merely one lord, but "lords" who had oppressed Judah, and they are all in the same condition. Among these lords were the Babylonians, and Jahwe thus predicted the overthrow of Babylon: "The daughter of Babylon is like a threshing floor; it is time to thresh her; yet a little while, and the time of her harvest shall come . . . And Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling-place for dragons, an astonishment and a hissing, without an inhabitant. They shall roar together like lions, they shall yell as lion's whelps. In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord" (Jer. 51: 33, 37-39). Here is one of those "other lords" who, as Isaiah said, "shall not live, shall not rise." In contrast with those who shall not rise, the song refers to "*Thy* dead men" (Jahwe's dead men), who "shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise." And in view of this it says, "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead" (vs. 19). Thus while some dead shall not live, others shall live, arise, and sing. A similar contrast is found in Ps. 49. The psalmist speaks of the perishing of the foolish and the brutish persons and their leaving their wealth to others, and continues, "Their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever, and their dwelling places to all generations; they call their lands after their own names. Nevertheless man being in honor abideth not; he is like the beasts that perish . . . Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have

dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling" (vss. 10-14). Shall "the beasts that perish" rise? Shall the sheep that are laid in *sheol* live again? "The man that is in honor and understandeth not" (vs. 20) is "like" them. Then there is no resurrection for such. In striking contrast with these is the righteous. The psalmist says of him, "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for He shall receive me" (vs. 15). The reason why one shall be "redeemed from the power of the grave," and the other shall "never see light," is because the one has, through faith and obedience, become related to "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24), while the other remained in his sinful and condemned state, and when death overtook him, he died under the law of sin and death, which, as we have seen, cannot redeem anyone.

The apostle Paul calls attention to the same condition when he says, "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law" (Rom. 2:12). Whatever they do is sinful, for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23), but "sin is not imputed where there is no law" (Rom. 5:13). Not having come "under law to Christ" (I Cor. 9:21), that is, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:2), when they die, they perish, that is, die without hope of resurrection (see I Cor. 15:18). They are the "others" whom the apostle Paul had in mind when he said, "Even as *others which have no hope*" (I Thess. 4:13). They are "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, *having no hope*, and without God in the world" (Eph. 2:11,12). Thus both Old and New Testaments teach that there is hope only for those who are in Christ Jesus, while those who are not in Christ are without hope, and perish.

Reader, let me appeal to you. Do not be deceived by the delusive hope that if you do not embrace the present opportunity of being saved, you will have an opportunity in another life. The Scriptures clearly and emphatically teach that "now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation" (II Cor. 6:2). Do not put off until tomorrow what needs to be done today; and by all means do not put off for another life-



time what must be done "now," in the present lifetime. If you neglect to "lay hold of the hope set before us," you will die without hope. Jesus is "the resurrection and the life," and He assures him that believeth into Him that, "though he die, yet shall he live" (John 11:25). But there is no assurance, and therefore no hope, of life after death to those who remain "without Christ." Believe the gospel; be baptized into Christ; then continue faithful in Him; if you live, live unto the Lord, and if you die, you die unto the Lord (Rom. 14:8). Then when the Lord comes, you will be awakened from the sleep of death, and clothed with the garment of incorruption; and you shall say, with other redeemed ones, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

## BAPTISM DOTH NOW SAVE US (I PET. 3:21)

In dealing with the subject of baptism it will be necessary to consider what baptism is, who shall be baptized, and the object of baptism.

What, then, is baptism? Omitting for the present all reference to the Greek words *bapto* and *baptizo*, and their meaning, we turn to the pages of the Bible as given to us by King James' translators in 1611. We observe, first, that the act of baptism, whatever it may be, requires the element of water. Thus John the Baptist (or, rather, the Baptizer) baptized those who came to him, with water (Matt. 3:11, 16), The Ethiopian eunuch, who on his homeward journey from Jerusalem heard Philip preaching Jesus, was baptized in water (Acts 8:35, 36, 38). In like manner, those who heard the preaching of the apostle Peter at the house of Cornelius were baptized with water (Acts 10:47, 48). From these examples it is clear that baptism requires water, and hence that act, as far as the baptism which Jesus commanded is concerned, cannot be performed without this element.

Another fact to be noticed is that when persons were baptized in the days of John or the apostles they went down into the water and came up out of it (see Matt. 3:16; Acts 8:38, 39). In the case of the eunuch we are informed that both Philip, the baptizer, and the eunuch, the candidate for baptism, went down into and came up out of the water. Since this is the case, we conclude that it was necessary for them to go into the water in order to perform this rite; and since necessary, it could only be done by such descent into the water.

Here the question arises, In what way was the water applied to the candidate? Was it sprinkled or poured upon him, or was he immersed in it? If the application of the water to the candidate, whether by pouring or sprinkling, constituted baptism, it was not only unnecessary but useless for them to go into the water. In that case it would have been easier and more convenient to have some water brought to them than for them to go down into it. The Scriptures record instances where baptism was performed at certain places because of the fact that there was water there in abundance. John was preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and as the result of his preaching the people of Judea and Jerusalem repaired to the river Jordan, in which they were baptized of John (Mark 1:1-5). A little later John was baptizing at Aenon near Salim "because there was much water there" (John 3:23). Those baptisms took place in the localities named because of the abundance of water there, which fact would not need to be so specifically mentioned had not water in larger quantities than for the purpose of pouring or sprinkling been necessary, and therefore we conclude that baptism consisted of the immersion of persons in water.

Again, we have a doctrinal argument by the apostle Paul in Romans, chap. 6. The apostle wrote to the brethren: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: 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 (Rom. 6:1-4). "Buried with Him (Christ) in baptism." This language shows that in the apostle's mind there was a similarity between the burial of Christ and the believer's baptism. What is there about baptism that caused the apostle to make this observation? Is it pouring or sprinkling water upon a person? Did the apostle mean to say, "Buried with Him by pouring or sprinkling"? Would such an act in any way resemble a burial? The only possible answer to these questions is a negative. But immersion

in water, where the candidate is for the moment hidden from view, and cut off from the atmosphere, very properly represents a burial; and his rising again and emergence from the water likewise fitly represent resurrection. The same thought finds expression in a passage in Paul's letter to the Colossians, "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead" (Col. 2: 12). Thus had those persons both been "buried with Him" and "risen with Him" in baptism. Their baptism, in its visible aspect, contained features which led the apostle to designate it as a burial and rising with Christ. And since this can only be said of immersion, therefore immersion is the scriptural form of baptism.

There is another fact which leads to the same result, viz, each of the words, "baptize," "pour," and "sprinkle," has a different meaning, and these words cannot be used interchangeably without bringing confusion into the Scriptures. No one would venture to make the apostle Paul say, "Buried with Him by baptism, pouring, or sprinkling, wherein also ye are risen with Him." And it would be equally inconsistent to make him say, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized, poured, or sprinkled into Jesus Christ, were baptized, poured, or sprinkled into His death." And yet this is exactly what we should not only be doing, but be compelled to do, were we to use the words "baptize," "pour," and "sprinkle" interchangeably. Since each of these words has a meaning of its own, therefore baptize has a different meaning than either pour or sprinkle; and since only one other meaning is possible, and that is to immerse, therefore immersion is the meaning of baptize.

We now come to consider the origin of the word "baptize." Baptize was originally a Greek word, and was, in a modified form, introduced into the English Bible and the English language. It comes from the Greek word *baptizo*, having its root in the verb *bapto*, and was translated into English by the words "baptize" and "wash." It was never translated either "pour" or "sprinkle." This is a fact which is significant. If the translators had given a uniform translation of the Greek verb, we should read in Matt. 26: 23, "He that baptizeth (*embapto*) his



hand with Me in the dish, the same shall betray Me"; and in Rev. 19: 13 we should read, "And He was clothed with a garment baptized (*bapto*) in blood." If the Greek verb in these passages means "dip" in English, we should read in other places that John dipped in Jordan or at Aenon near Salim, and that persons were dipped in water. What good reason is there for translating words coming from the same Greek root by two or three different English words, as King James' translators have done? Whatever may have been the motive underlying the action of the translators, their translation of the word is, to say the least, confusing to the mere English reader. The foregoing are facts which no scholar or person of information will gainsay.

We have thus far considered only the scriptural use of the word "baptize," and brief attention has been called to the Greek word *baptizo* as used by Bible writers. We shall now consider the meaning of the word itself. It is in order to remark that whatever was the meaning attached to, or derived from, *baptizo* in the days of the Savior and the apostles, that must be its meaning to us. How is this meaning to be determined? We are told by those who oppose immersion as the only scriptural way to baptize, that the word baptize does not of itself determine whether the action expressed by that word is sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. If this be the case, we are forced to the conclusion that when the Savior gave the command to His followers to proclaim the gospel and to baptize such who should believe, His command was couched in terms of such doubtful meaning that those who were to execute that command were obliged to find an interpretation for the terms the Savior used. Such an imputation is equivalent to the charge of a lamentable lack of wisdom on the part of the Savior, if not wilful deception. We cannot for a moment entertain such a thought. What, then, did the word *baptizo* mean at the time when the Savior issued His command to the apostles? Did it mean to "sprinkle" or "pour"? The translators have not once so translated it. They did translate its root, *bapto*, into English by the word "dip." They knew better than to attach the meaning of sprinkling or pouring to this word; in other words, the word

is not susceptible of being translated either "sprinkle" or "pour." But since they rendered it "dip," this proves that "dip" is the proper meaning of "baptize."

There is an instance in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, where all the words—"pour," "dip," and "sprinkle"—are used. The passage is Lev. 14: 15, 16, and reads: "And the priest shall take of the log of oil, and *pour* it into the palm of his own left hand; and the priest shall *dip* his right finger into the oil that is in his left hand, and shall *sprinkle* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Three actions are here designated, and each is indicated by a different Greek word. What are these words? The word for "pour" is *cheo*; that for "dip" is *baptein*, and that for "sprinkle" is *rhantizo*. These Greek words are but translations from Hebrew words having a similar meaning. And what are these? They are *yatsaq*, *tabal*, and *nazah*, respectively. What did they mean? They meant to "pour," "dip," and "sprinkle." The second, *tabal*, when translated into English, means to dip; in Greek it means *baptein*. What, then, does *baptein* mean? In the language of another: "Since things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other, it follows that *baptizo* in Greek and *dip* in English and *tabal* in Hebrew are equal to each other; therefore 'dip' is the proper translation of *baptizo*."

There is another fact to which I must direct the reader's attention. The Authorized Version has John the Baptist saying, "I indeed baptize you *with* water. . . . He shall baptize you *with* the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 3: 11). But in the Greek the preposition is *en*, "in water, . . . in Holy Spirit." The English translation of this passage is capable of being interpreted to mean that in the act of baptism the water is applied to the person, while the Greek conveys the idea that it is the person who undergoes the act of being baptized. When the Hebrew priest dipped his finger in the oil, the oil was not applied to the finger, but the finger was sunk or dipped in the oil. So in baptism it is the person who is baptized, or dipped in the water, and not the water applied to the person.

What was the form of baptism employed by the apostles? It is admitted by all informed persons that immersion was the

apostolic form of baptism. While human opinion, considered apart from facts, is of no value, we have some very significant admissions from men of high ecclesiastical standing with reference to baptism in the apostolic church, and of the great number of testimonies that might be given I subjoin the following:

John Calvin: "The word *baptizo* signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was observed in the ancient church."

Rosenmuller: "The rite of immersion ought to have been retained in the Christian church."

Tholuck: "In order to understand the figurative use of baptism, we must bear in mind the well-known fact that the candidate in the primitive church was immersed in water and raised out of it again."

Bretschneider: "The apostolic church baptized only by immersion."

Dean Stanley: "The practice of immersion" was primitive and apostolic."

Philip Schaff: "As to the outward mode of administering baptism, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form."

How came these men to make such admissions? The facts known to them forced them to do so. The earliest baptisms on record outside of the Bible were by immersion. "Baptism" by pouring was not introduced until a long time after the death of the apostles.

While I do not wish to weary the reader with extracts from lexicons, I must ask him to consider the fact that there is not a standard lexicon of the Greek language that does not give "dip" or "immerse" as the meaning of the word *baptizo*.

The next question is, *Who shall be baptized?* Jesus gave command to His apostles: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (rather, 'into') the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28: 19). This command is clear and explicit. It contemplates, first, that the nations were to be taught; and second, that those so taught were to be baptized. It is understood, of course, that baptism was only to be administered where the teaching was received and accepted. This principle is illustrated in the state-

ment that "without faith it is impossible to please" God (Heb. 11:6). Any act, therefore, which is not the result of faith, is not pleasing to God; and hence, if anyone be immersed in the absence of such faith, that act would not please God, because it is not prompted by faith.

It is clear from numerous instances in the Acts of the Apostles that in those days faith always preceded baptism. When the apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, commanded the inquiring Jews to "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38), then "they that gladly received his word were baptized" (vs. 41). At Samaria, Philip preached Christ to the people, and "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:5, 12). The Ethiopian eunuch was baptized when he gave evidence of faith in the things which Philip preached to him (Acts 8:35-39). Other cases of a similar kind are upon record in the following passages: Acts 9:6, 18; 22:16; 10:24, 27, 33, 47; 16:14, 15; 16:33, 34; 18:8; 19:5.

It is in order to ask, What did those persons believe? The substance of their faith is indicated in the words, "But when they (the Samaritans) believed the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12). The "things" believed by those Samaritans at the time of their baptism consisted of two items, which constitute the substance of the gospel.

Let it be borne in mind that those persons first believed, then they were baptized. This shows that any baptism that may take place in the absence of such faith is invalid; and it very effectually sets aside the "baptism" of infants and others who either cannot or do not believe the things above referred to. And I may say at this point that there is not a single case of the baptism of small children on record in the New Testament. Jesus neither commanded nor authorized the baptism of small children; the apostles did not practice it.

But let us once more revert to the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. These "things"



are, first, "concerning the kingdom of God." These may be summarized as follows:

1. The kingdom of God will be a divine political dominion established upon the earth (Dan. 2:44, 7:27; Rev. 5:10; Matt. 5:5).

2. Jesus the Christ is to be the King in this kingdom (II Sam. 7:10-16; Isa. 9:6; Luke 1:30-33).

3. The twelve tribes of Israel, regathered into the land of Canaan, will be the immediate subjects of this kingdom (Ezek. 37:21-28; Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:28-30).

4. The twelve apostles are to sit on thrones in this kingdom judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:28-30).

5. The saints, the believers of all ages, will reign with Christ in this kingdom (Matt. 8:11; Luke 13:29; Heb. 11:39, 40; II Tim. 2:12; Rev. 2:26-28; 3:21; 5:5; 20:4, 6).

6. The land of Canaan will be the future territory of this kingdom (Ezek. 37:21-28; Gen. 13:15; Gal. 3:16, 27-29; Heb. 11:8, 9).

7. Jerusalem, rebuilt and adorned, will be the seat of this government upon the earth (Jer. 3:17; Zech. 2:12; Isa. 2:14; Matt. 5:35).

8. This kingdom will be established at the return of Christ to the earth (Matt. 25:31; II Tim. 4:1).

9. All dominions shall finally serve and obey the divinely appointed ruler (Dan. 7:27), all human rule and authority and power will be abolished, and God will be all in all (I Cor. 15:23-28).

"The things concerning the name of Jesus Christ" are the things pertaining to His birth of a virgin descendant of Adam; His participation in the same flesh and blood nature with those whom He came to redeem (Luke 1:30-35; Heb. 2:14, 17); that He was a "Man," not God (John 8:40; Acts 2:22; I Tim. 2:5); His work of destroying the devil, or putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (Heb. 2:14; Rom. 8:3; Heb. 9:26); the oneness of God (I Cor. 8:6; Eph. 4:4); the mortality of man (Job 4:17; 14:1); his unconsciousness in death (Eccles. 9:5, 10); the resurrection at Christ's coming (I Cor.

15:23); the judgment of those who are responsible (Rom. 14: 10-12; II Cor. 5: 10); the immortalization and exaltation to kingship of the worthy, and the rejection and consignment to the second death of the unworthy (Matt. 25: 31-46; Rev. 20: 11-15).

The design of the gospel is to take out of the nations a people for the name of Jahwe (Acts 15: 7, 14). Those who hear and believe the gospel, and are thereupon baptized into the name of the Lord, thereby become united to the name of salvation. Having thus put on that worthy name, they are in the name of the Lord, and whatever they do, they are commanded to do it in the name of the Lord Jesus (Col. 3: 17).

What is the object of baptism? In the command of Jesus, already considered (Matt. 28: 19), we have the words, "Baptizing them in (Greek *eis*, 'into') the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The baptism is "into" the name. Hence no one is in the name by natural birth, and baptism accompanied by faith is the means of inducting persons into it. Jesus is the Representative of that name to men. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4: 12). Whoever therefore in the days of the apostles was baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, was considered as being in that name (Acts 2: 38; 8: 16; 10: 48; 19: 5). The apostles regarded baptism as the means of inducting persons into Christ. Thus Paul wrote to the Galatians, "As many of you as have been *baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*" (Gal. 3: 27). To put on a garment is to be clothed with it; and clothing is for a covering. The object of a covering is twofold: first, for protection; and second, for hiding nakedness. Adam was in a state of nakedness after he had sinned (Gen. 3: 10, 11). Nakedness represents a state of sin. When Aaron made the golden calf, causing Israel to sin, he made them "naked to their shame" (Exod. 32: 21, 25). King Ahab, by transgression, "made Judah naked" (II Chron. 28: 19). As man is born naked, he is also born in a state of sin. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51: 5). For this sin man needs a covering to hide his nakedness, and the psalmist

(Greek, *kleros*) or "heritage" in those days consisted of the entire "flock of God" (I Pet. 5: 1, 2), and not of a favored few. Doubtless all the apostles baptized persons, as we know Paul baptized a few (I Cor. 1: 13-17). We know of a number of baptisms which took place in the absence of the apostles, and others in their presence which were performed by others than themselves. Philip, who was not an apostle, baptized the Samaritans and the eunuch (Acts 8: 12, 36-38); Ananias, not an apostle but a disciple, baptized Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9: 10, 17, 18; 22: 12); Peter "commanded" or ordered the believers at the house of Cornelius to be baptized (Acts 10: 48), which shows that he himself did not baptize those persons, but this was probably done by the "brethren" who had accompanied him (Acts 10: 23, 11: 12); Paul baptized only a few at Corinth, while the rest of the Corinthian brethren who were baptized upon the occasion of the first visit of Paul to Corinth, were probably baptized by Silas and Timothy (Acts 18: 8; I Cor. 1: 14-17). Since "disciples" and "brethren" in those days were authorized to perform baptism, the brethren of Christ today, though not belonging to the modern "clergy," are authorized to do the same. And such baptism is just as valid as that which took place in the days, or even in the presence, of the apostles. The commission does not say, "He that believeth and is baptized by an apostle or a clergyman, shall be saved," but "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" Therefore whoever fulfils these conditions, even though baptized by one of the least of the brethren, is in the way of salvation.

There is one other matter to which I must direct a moment's attention. That is the question of re-immersion after one was once immersed. The reader may never have thought along this line. But there is a case of re-immersion upon record in the Acts of the Apostles. The apostle Paul on his third journey found twelve men at Ephesus who had been baptized with the baptism of John, who, upon hearing the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 19: 1-5). They, like their teacher, Apollos, knew only the baptism of John, that is, they had

been baptized in the faith of the things concerning the kingdom of God only. As the record shows, they were partly instructed in "the way of the Lord" (Acts 18: 25); but, like their teacher, they required to be "more perfectly" instructed in that way (vs. 26). This more perfect instruction consisted of the things pertaining to the Lord Jesus, and when their faith was thus amplified by the proclamation of the apostle Paul so that it embraced all the items of the gospel, their baptism under the sanction of the apostle followed. Since the faith of the gospel in all its items was of such importance in those days that an immersion which took place in the absence of some of those items was invalid, and required another immersion, it is equally necessary in our days that men and women believe all that is embraced in "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 8: 12, 28: 31). Baptism, in order to be valid, must follow, and not precede, belief of the gospel. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 16). Not, "he that is baptized and afterward believeth shall be saved." The baptism of John was "from heaven" in the days when it was in force (Luke 20: 4). But when "the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ" were embodied in the gospel, and men and women were required to believe them in conjunction with those of the kingdom, and thereupon be baptized, then belief in the things of the kingdom alone was not sufficient, and when an immersion took place which was deficient in one of those things, a new immersion became necessary. What is the case when one has been immersed in the belief of the immortality of the soul; going to heaven or hell at death; kingdom in the heart, the church, or heaven; and other errors which are subversive of the truth as it is in Jesus? Is an immersion which is based upon such belief a scriptural and valid baptism? In the nature of the case, it cannot be. Then when one holding such views learns the truth, shall he content himself with the fact that he was once immersed, and afterward came to believe the truth? If he really loves the truth, he will not risk his salvation to an immersion based upon a belief which is foreign to the gospel.



## THE GOSPEL: ITS SUBJECT-MATTER AND DESIGN

The subject selected for this lecture is "The Gospel," and not only is it an appropriate one but it is one of supreme importance, for our very salvation depends upon it. In dealing with this subject it will be my duty, first, to offer a few remarks explanatory of the term "the gospel"; then to point out its subject-matter; and, lastly, to call attention to its design.

The word "gospel," as found in our English Bible, is a translation of the Greek word *euangelion*, which occurs 102 times in the Greek New Testament. It is also rendered "good tidings" (Luke 2:10), and "glad tidings" (Rom. 10:15). The word "gospel" signifies "good tidings," and these are calculated to make the believer "glad." In one of the passages referred to it is "good tidings of great joy," and in the other "glad tidings of good things." Thus we see that the gospel places before men and women the promise of "good things," and these things are "good" because they tend to satisfy man's deepest needs.

Soon after His baptism of John in the river Jordan and His temptation in the wilderness, Jesus went into the synagogue at Nazareth and when the book of the prophet Isaiah was given to Him, He began to read the passage: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord" (Luke 4:16-19). When He was about to leave Galilee, in pursuance

of His great mission, "the people stayed Him that He should not depart from them. And He said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God in other cities also, for therefore am I sent" (vs. 43). In the original we have the words, "I must *evangelize* the kingdom of God." Thus we see that Jesus was not only divinely anointed and sent to proclaim the gospel, but He also had a keen appreciation of the mission upon which He was thus sent.

I may further remark that, according to the apostolic testimony, there is but one gospel. The apostle Paul said, in writing to the brethren in Galatia, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another, but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:6-8). If such language were used by anyone in our day he would be considered a very narrow and intolerant person, and almost the entire religious world would condemn him and shun him as one unfit for association with enlightened men and women. Yet the apostle boldly pronounced an anathema upon anyone who should attempt to preach any other gospel than that proclaimed by himself. What was the reason for this unbounded confidence upon the part of Paul? He said concerning the gospel which he preached that it was "not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (vss. 11, 12). If he thus received it "by revelation of Jesus Christ" it was in perfect agreement with the gospel as preached by the Lord Himself—in fact, it was the same, and hence any modification of it was a corruption of it which would make it of no effect as the means of salvation. The apostle was therefore not only authorized but compelled to pronounce an anathema upon anyone who should presume to "preach any other gospel." As there is but one gospel, so there can be, in the nature of the case, but "one

faith" (Eph. 4:4, 5), and this is styled by the apostle "the faith of the gospel" (Phil. 1:27), for it is the faith that comes by hearing the gospel.

The apostle not only had the confidence that he had received the gospel from the Lord Jesus, but he was equally certain that it was able to effect the end for which it was designed. With this thought before him he said, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16). Since it would save both Jews and Greeks upon the exercise of faith on their part, they were both in a condition requiring salvation. The power to save is in God. The means of transmitting this power from God, the Source of power, to those who are to be saved, is the gospel. Faith upon the part of those who hear is the switch that turns the divine power into the thought and life of the individual with a view to his salvation. The apostle was very emphatic in his statement concerning the function of the gospel. He said, "For it is *the* power of God unto salvation." From which it is evident that it is the only means extant for the salvation of those who believe. Having made these necessary introductory remarks, let us now consider

*The Subject-Matter of the Gospel* as proclaimed by Jesus and His apostles. This is composed of three items or elements, each of which is of equal importance with the others, and the absence of one is as fatal as the absence of the others. These elements are:

1. The kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven, which are the same.
2. The circumstances connected with the putting-away of sin by the death of Christ.
3. The judgment, in the epoch of the resurrection, of the household of faith, whether faithful or unfaithful.

Each of these elements occupies a place of its own; each is important, and of equal importance with the others. The gospel, in its entirety, is "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." If one element is omitted, this constitutes a change—a modification of the gospel, and hence, in

that case, it ceases to be "the power of God unto salvation."

Let us, then, consider the above-named elements of the gospel in their order. We mentioned, *first*, "*the kingdom of God*," and stated that the terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" are the same. In proof of this statement attention is directed to two passages of Scripture in which these terms are found, and the same things are affirmed of both. I refer to the comparison of the kingdom to leaven. One of the passages reads thus: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened" (Matt. 13:33). The other reads: "Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like unto the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened" (Luke 13:20, 21). What is styled "the kingdom of heaven" in Matthew, is called "the kingdom of God" in Luke, which proves that both terms refer to the same kingdom. This kingdom of God is one of the elements of the gospel which Jesus was sent to preach, for it is said in the account of what Jesus began both to do and teach, that "He went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, and the Twelve were with Him" (Luke 8:1). And when "the Twelve," whom He had chosen "to be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach" (Mark 3:14), accompanied Him and heard the message that came from His lips, they learned both the message and how to proclaim it. There is therefore a fitness of things in the fact that Jesus afterward "called His twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils (demons), and to cure diseases. And He sent them to *preach the kingdom of God*, and to heal the sick" (Luke 9:1, 2). Did "the Twelve" carry out the instructions given them? "They departed, and went through the towns, *preaching the gospel*, and healing everywhere" (vs. 6). Thus in preaching the gospel they preached the kingdom of God, for the gospel relates to the kingdom. Nor was "this gospel of the kingdom" to be preached to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" only (Matt. 10:6), for Jesus announced to His disciples that "this gospel of the king-



dom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations" (Matt. 24: 14). Hence it was to cross the bounds of Palestine and be proclaimed to the "nations" or gentiles beyond. This is in accord with the statement of the apostle Paul, that "the gospel is . . . to the Jew first, and also to the Greek," or other than the Jew (Rom. 1: 16). The elements of a kingdom consist of the following: (1) A King; (2) Joint Rulers; (3) Subjects; (4) A Territory; (5) A Capital City or seat of government; (6) Laws. Hence there must be these or similar elements in "the kingdom of God," or of heaven. Did Jesus proclaim the kingdom of God as a fact or as a matter of belief and hope? Let us notice the attitude of those who heard Him preach, and we shall be able to judge. It is recorded that "He was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come" (Luke 17: 20). From this we see that the kingdom had not come at the time when this question was asked. Upon another occasion Jesus spoke a parable "because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear" (Luke 19: 11). It had not then appeared, and hence the expectation that it would appear. It is recorded in the narrative of the crucifixion of Jesus that "Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counsellor, . . . also waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15: 43). Hence the kingdom of God had not appeared at that time; and since Joseph "also waited for the kingdom" it is clear that Joseph was only one of a number who were in this waiting attitude. Why did they expect it and wait for it? Because the preaching of Jesus had awakened these expectations. And not only this, but when Jesus was in Galilee, and had performed a miracle, some attempted to "take Him by force and make Him a King" (John 6: 15); from which we see that they not only understood that the kingdom of God was to be established, but also the relation of Jesus to that kingdom.

After the resurrection of Jesus, when the Lord conversed with His disciples on "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," and He commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, "they asked Him, saying, Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1: 3-6). From

this we know that Israel had had a kingdom; that this kingdom was not then in the condition in which it once had been; that its restoration was in prospect, and that the Lord Jesus was the one to effect this restoration. The question of the disciples related solely to the time of this restoration, which is borne out by the Lord's reply, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power" (vs. 7).

After the apostles had entered upon their mission of "preaching the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16: 16), and gathered many disciples, who were subject to much persecution from their contemporaries, they "confirmed the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts 14: 22). Those persons were disciples, because they were "in the faith," and hence the propriety of the apostle's exhortation to "*continue* in the faith." But they were not yet in the kingdom; they were to enter that after they had passed "*through* much tribulation." The apostle Paul said to Timothy, and through him to "believing men" (II Tim. 2: 2), "If *we* suffer, we shall also reign with Him" (vs. 12). Thus Paul, and Timothy, and faithful men shall reign with Christ, upon condition that they suffer. The sufferings belong to "the present time" (Rom. 8: 18). The reign is future.

There is one other passage, among many, to which I would call special attention, viz., II Peter, chap. 1, where the apostle, writing to the "brethren" who had "obtained the like precious faith" with himself and the other apostles, exhorted the brethren to "add to their faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity," assuring them that if they did these things, they should never fall; "for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (vss. 5-11). They had been "called by the gospel" (II Thess. 2: 14) for God's kingdom and glory (I Thess. 2: 12), and having been thus called, they were to "make their calling and election sure" by walking worthy of their calling; and upon due fulfilment of these conditions they should be permitted to

enter the kingdom of Christ. Had they already been in the kingdom the apostle would have congratulated them upon their successful entrance into it; and in that case there would have been no need to exhort them to "do" certain things in order to secure such an entrance. Since those brethren were not yet in the kingdom the question arises, When shall the kingdom come, and when shall they enter into it? Here, too, we have a definite and conclusive answer in the words of Jesus and the apostles. Jesus had told the apostles that they who had followed Him, in the regeneration when the Son of Man should sit upon the throne of His glory, they should sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28). Let us notice particularly the time when they should thus sit upon thrones. It is to be "in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of His glory." When shall He sit upon this throne? Before or after His coming? Hear His own words: "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory" (Matt. 25:31). Thus we see that before He will occupy that throne of glory He must first come in His glory, and "then (and not until then) shall He sit upon the throne of His glory." And since this shall be "in the regeneration," we know that the apostles will not sit upon thrones until He Himself shall come. Not only did the Lord assure the original apostles of this fact, but Paul, the apostle of the gentiles, likewise informs us that the appearing and kingdom are inseparately united. In writing to Timothy, his "dearly beloved son," he said, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom, preach the word" (II Tim. 4:1). Hence there will be no judgment before the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. The parable of the nobleman (Luke, chap. 19) likewise proves very clearly that the faithful shall reign with Christ after His return; and that He Himself will not assume the reins of government until His return from heaven. From the foregoing testimonies we see:

1. That Jesus will be the King in the kingdom of God.

2. That the apostles and faithful brethren shall be associated with Him in this kingdom.

3. That the twelve tribes of Israel will be the immediate subjects of this kingdom. Other Scripture testimony goes to show that while the land of Canaan will be the immediate territory of this kingdom, its dominion will extend to the uttermost parts of the earth, and that it will embrace the entire population of the earth.

4. That this kingdom will be established at the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, and the approved will then enter into it, that is, have eternal life bestowed upon them and their respective positions in the kingdom assigned to them. In short, the gospel promises to men and women who believe, joint heirship with Jesus in the kingdom of God in the age to come, which will be ushered in by the coming of Christ.

The *second* item of the gospel relates to the circumstances connected with the putting-away of sin by the sacrificial death of Christ. The apostle Paul had occasion to correct a doctrinal error with reference to the resurrection which had gained some currency in the ecclesia at Corinth, and in introducing the matter he said to the brethren, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (I Cor. 15: 1-4). It is evident from this language that the apostle included the death of Christ as a sin-offering, his burial, and His resurrection, in the term "the gospel." Our Authorized Version of the Bible makes the apostle say that he had preached these matters "first of all." But the force of the original is that he preached these matters "among first things," or among the first principles. Though they do not constitute the entire gospel as preached by Paul, they form an essential part of it. And he who would be saved must believe this item as an integral element of the gospel.



The language of the apostle relative to the death of Christ is very clear and definite "that *Christ died* for our sins." If "Christ died" He was related to the law of sin and death, as the entire race is related to that law (Rom. 8:2). For it would be unjust for one who is not related to the law of sin to die; and we know that God does not demand that which is contrary to His justice. He could neither have been God nor the possessor of the divine nature. God is neither mortal nor can He die. He says, "I live forever" (Deut. 32:40). He is "immortal" (I Tim. 1:17); yea, He "alone hath immortality" (I Tim. 6:16). If, therefore, Jesus had been God—a third part of the "trinity"—He could not die, neither ought He to have died; and since He died He was a partaker of the same nature with those for whom He died. We are fortunately not left to inference in deciding this important point; for we are told in the Scriptures: "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" (Heb. 2:14). Let us consider, first, the "flesh and blood" of which Jesus took part. He Himself taught that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh" (John 3:6). And the apostle Paul bore testimony to the nature of the flesh when he said, "For I know that in me (that is in my flesh) there dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:20). What was it that was dwelling in him? Hear his own words: "Sin dwelleth in me" (vss. 17, 20). How came sin to dwell in him? By being "born of the flesh." Is sin in the flesh? It is, for the apostle says, "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*" (Rom. 8:3). How came sin to be in the flesh? Was man created with "no good thing," with "evil," with "sin in the flesh"? By no means. What God created was "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Hence the "evil" came into man's flesh subsequent to his creation. If sin was in Paul's flesh we are led to inquire, When did it enter the flesh? It was not in man when he came from the hands of the Creator, and hence it came in later. When did this come about?

It was when Adam transgressed God's law, and thus became a sinner, when sin became an element of the flesh. And inasmuch as all flesh (of mankind) was in Adam when he sinned, therefore, as the apostle says, "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (Rom. 5:19). And because the "many" were in Adam when he sinned, therefore it may very properly be said "in whom all sinned" (Rom. 5:12, marg.). Hence when a son was born to Adam that son was but a multiplication of Adam himself, and sin was in his flesh. And the same is true of every "son of Adam" (Deut. 32:8), whether he was born in Adam's days or thousands of years since then. It was with this thought in view that the Psalmist said, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51:5). Now the question arises Did Jesus partake of the same flesh of which these things are affirmed? Truly, "He also Himself likewise *took part of the same*" (Heb. 2:14). How? By being "made of a woman" (Gal. 4:4). Why? "That through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." According to this statement the devil had the power of death, and Jesus, through death, destroyed him. All of which was possible because Jesus took part of flesh and blood as the children are partakers of these. Did Jesus, through death, destroy the devil of theology? Not so, for he is believed to be deathless, and therefore indestructible. Had the Lord destroyed such a devil it would have been useless for the apostles afterward to call upon the brethren to "resist the devil, and he will flee from you" (Jas. 4:7). A devil who is destroyed in the proper sense of the word can offer no opposition, and hence requires no resistance. But who had "the power of death"? Had this power been delegated to a personal wicked angel? This cannot be, for we have no record in the Scriptures of any such transaction. But we do know, from the explicit testimony of the apostle Paul, that "the sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15:56). The power of death is concentrated in the sting, and since this sting is sin, we see clearly that that which had the power of death was not a personal devil, but sin. Since Jesus partook of flesh and blood, He likewise took part of

specific statements of the apostles. The apostle Paul wrote a letter to the brethren at Rome and said, among other things, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world (Rom. 1:8). In chap. 2 he speaks of "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God," in which God "will render to every man according to his deeds" (vss. 5-7). The apostle knew from the reports he had heard concerning their faith, that they had been duly instructed with reference to the judgment, and hence his allusion to the "day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" as a matter understood and believed by these brethren. The apostle said, in the further development of this thought, that in this judgment "there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall perish without law; and as many as have sinned within law shall be judged by law. . . . [When?] In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ *according to my gospel*" (vss. 12, 16). Thus the judgment is an integral element of the gospel as preached by Paul. The same remark applies to the teaching of the apostle Peter. When the council of brethren was called at Jerusalem to consider the relation of the believers from among the gentiles to the law of Moses, the apostle Peter, referring to his visit at the house of Cornelius, and his work while there, said, "Men and brethren, ye know how that God a good while ago made choice among us that the gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe" (Acts 15:7). What Peter here styles "the word of the gospel" the Lord Himself calls "words whereby thou (Cornelius) and all thy house shall be saved" (Acts 11:14). Did Peter, upon that occasion, speak any words which were superfluous—words which were not essential to salvation? Not one. They were all a part of the gospel, and hence necessary to salvation. What, then, were those "words"?

1. "The word (of the kingdom) which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ" (Acts 10:36).

2. The death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus (vss. 39-41).

3. That He was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead (vs. 42).

4. Remission of sins through belief in His name (43).

These are the words by belief of which Cornelius and his house were to be saved, and Peter styles them "the word of the gospel." The apostle James said, referring to the statement of Peter just mentioned, "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts 15: 14). Since these four items constitute "the word of the gospel" which men must believe in order to be saved; and since this is "*how* God at the first did visit the gentiles to take out of them a people for His name," no one can be saved who does not believe those items. Since this division of our subject deals with the judgment of the household of faith in its relation to the gospel, let us notice especially the third item presented by Peter at the house of Cornelius, viz., that Jesus "commanded the apostles to preach unto the people and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead" (Acts 10: 42). The apostles were commanded to "preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16: 16). Since the apostles, in the execution of that command, preached the judgment of quick and dead by the Lord Jesus Christ in the day of judgment, therefore the judgment is an essential part of the gospel.

That Jesus is to be the Judge of quick and dead is plainly stated in the third item presented by Peter at Cæsarea; and it is a truth which Jesus Himself plainly taught when He said, "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son. . . . And hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man" (John 5: 22, 27). The apostles heard this when they were with the Lord; and later on, when the promised "Spirit of truth" came upon them, these things were brought to their remembrance (John 14: 26). Hence this truth concerning the position of Jesus in the judgment was thus refreshed and made vivid in their memory. In like manner the apostle Paul bore testimony to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ shall "judge the quick



and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom" (II Tim. 4:1); and we see unanimity and harmony in the teaching of the apostles upon this point of the truth, as well as upon all other points.

Since Jesus has been appointed Judge, He must perform the functions of a judge over those who come under His jurisdiction. Both apostles declare that this authority extends to "quick and dead," and Paul testifies that "to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord of both dead and living" (Rom. 14:9). Who are these dead and living over whom Jesus is Lord, and whom He is to judge? Since, as we have seen, the judgment is a vital element of the gospel, we have not been left in the dark upon this point, for the apostle Paul continues, "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God" (Rom. 14:10-12). Those "dead and living," therefore, of whom Christ is Lord, shall all stand or be presented before the judgment-seat of Christ, and give account of themselves to God. Who, then, are the subjects of this passage? That they are "brethren" is clear from the language, "Why dost thou judge *thy brother?* . . . *we* shall stand . . . every one of *us* shall give account of himself." This language was not written to the world, or those who are without, and hence it can only apply to those who have entered into covenant relation with God. This truth is made still more emphatic in Paul's reference to the judgment in his second epistle to the Corinthians: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II Cor. 5:10). Omitting the words in italics, we have the following points:

1. There will be a judgment-seat of Christ.
2. We, the saints (II Cor. 1:1), must all appear before that tribunal.
3. The object of this appearing is, that everyone may receive certain things.

4. These things will accord with what was previously done, whether good or bad.

5. The medium through which those things shall be received is in or through the body.

Thus it is evident that not all who appear at the judgment-seat of Christ have done good, but some have done bad. Will they all appear at the same time? There is nothing in this language to indicate that they shall appear at two different times. Moreover, all the parables of Jesus relating to the period of the resurrection and judgment show that both classes will appear at the same time: The wheat and the tares; the good and the bad fish; the faithful and the unfaithful servants; the wise and the foolish virgins; the sheep and the goats—all showing that both classes are dealt with at the same time.

We may remark with reference to the object of the judgment, that it is twofold. First, that everyone may give account of himself to God (Rom. 14: 10-12). If everyone, whether he has done good or bad, must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and give an account of himself to the Judge, we see at once how important it is that everyone who has become related to God should walk worthy of the vocation wherewith he has been called, that he may have "boldness in the day of judgment" (I John 4: 17), and not be ashamed before the Lord at His coming (I John 2: 28). Will he be bold who has been untrue to his Lord and Master? who has trampled under foot the Son of God? Nothing remains for him but a fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries (Heb. 10: 26-29). Solemn questions, these, but a thousand times more solemn will be the realities of the judgment scene, the decrees that shall be declared by the righteous Judge, and the destinies that shall be entered upon by those who come within its scope.

The testimonies considered make it clear that everyone appearing before the tribunal of Christ shall there "receive the things in body according to that he hath done, whether good or bad" (II Cor. 5: 10). What are those "things" to be received? "Eternal life" is one of the things to be "rendered"

in the "day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" to those who "by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality" (Rom. 2: 5-7). And since an entrance into the kingdom is to be ministered to the faithful (II Pet. 1: 10, 11), when the "righteous judgment of God" shall have declared them "worthy" of it (II Thess. 1: 5), therefore eternal life and an entrance into the kingdom are "the things" to be received by the faithful. And since "*the things*," without exception, shall be received "before the judgment-seat of Christ," neither of these things has been received prior to the appearance of those who are amenable to the judgment-seat of Christ.

That the question of worthiness for both the kingdom and eternal life is to be determined before the judgment-seat of Christ is further proven from our Lord's parable of the sheep and the goats (Matt. 25: 31-46). We have in this parable the following points:

1. The coming of the Son of Man in His glory and all the holy angels with Him.

2. He shall then sit upon the throne of His glory.

3. The gathering before Him of all the gentiles or nations (who have become related to Him through the gospel—Matt. 24: 14; 28: 19, 20).

4. Their separation to His right hand and His left.

5. The invitation to those at His right hand, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

6. The command to those on His left hand, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

7. Both classes then enter upon their respective destinies:

- (a) "These [the 'cursed,' upon the left hand of the King] go away into everlasting punishment."

- (b) "The righteous into life eternal." It will be observed that neither class has received according to their deeds prior to their gathering before the King. Those upon the left hand do not bring their punishment with them into the presence of the King, but "go away into" it after their separation from the

righteous and the pronouncement of the sentence, "Depart from Me, ye cursed." In like manner, "the righteous" have not been endowed with "life eternal" before their appearing in the presence of the King, their separation from the goats, and the verdict, "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom." They "go into life eternal."

The same truth is taught in the address of Jesus at Jerusalem, as recorded in the gospel according to John (John 5:28, 29). "Marvel not at this (that is, the fact that the power to execute judgment has been committed to 'the Son of Man'—vs. 27): for the hour is coming in 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." Here we see:

1. That those that are in the graves shall "come forth" in the same "hour" (which is the epoch of the resurrection).

2. These "all" are divided into two classes who have previously done either "good" or "evil."

3. Both come forth from the graves "unto" a "resurrection," from which it is clear that the coming-forth precedes "the resurrection." This resurrection, therefore, is not the act of coming out of the graves, but the state following the coming forth.

4. "Life" and "damnation" are closely related to "good" and "evil" which were "done" previously. If "they that have done evil" do not come forth *with* but "unto the resurrection of damnation," that is, if the damnation follows the coming-forth, neither do those who have done good come forth *with* but "unto the resurrection of life." Faithful followers of Jesus are the "sheep" (John 10:27, 28), to whom He will give eternal life in the day of judgment (Rom. 2:5-7), in the presence of the judgment-seat of Christ (Matt. 25:31-46). These testimonies set aside, once and for all, the doctrine that some shall emerge from the graves in the possession of eternal life; in other words, that they bring eternal life or immortality with them out of the earth. If this were the case, then the judgment as taught in the gospel would be reduced to a mean-



ingless formality. If the judgment has a practical function to perform, the act of emergence from the grave cannot be the line of separation between the approval and the rejected, the worthy and the unworthy, any more than death is the dividing line. The separation, as the parable of the sheep and the goats clearly shows, takes place in the presence of the judgment-seat of Christ, and it is the function of the Judge to decide the destinies of those who appear before Him.

"The gospel," then, embraces "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 8: 12). These items were not only preached by Philip at Samaria, but also by the apostle Paul, for it is said that at Rome he was "preaching the kingdom of God, and those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence" (Acts 28: 30, 31). The things concerning the kingdom of God are the truths concerning the kingdom: Its King, subjects, territory, joint rulers, seat of government, the time of its establishment, and the conditions, intellectual, legal, moral, and physical, of entrance into it; and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ relate to the sacrifice of Christ in its bearing upon sin, the ratification of the new covenant, baptism into the name of Jesus Christ for a change of relationship from sin and condemnation in Adam to righteousness in Christ. These items being clearly and definitely taught by Christ and His apostles as essential elements of the gospel, whoever would be saved must believe them, as did those who heard the apostles and gladly received their word" (Acts 2: 41).

Lastly, what is the design of the gospel? This was fitly set forth in the words of the apostle James in his comments upon the proclamation of the gospel to the gentiles by Peter. "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts 15: 14). As to the "how," we know that the first thing was the proclamation of the gospel; thereupon persons believed, and lastly, as the result of such belief, they were baptized in conformity with the command which had been given by Christ to the apostles. This is "how God *at the first* did visit the gentiles," etc. Has He changed the order since then, or is it still the

same? We have no record of such a change, and none was authorized by the Lord; hence the order is still the same as it was when Peter preached the gospel at the house of Cornelius; and the gospel in all its elements is still as it was then, "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (Rom. 1:16). Its "power" to save has not been diminished with the lapse of centuries since its first proclamation. Behind it is still the God who "is of power" to save (Rom. 16:25).

The gospel takes out of the gentiles or nations a people for the name of God. This being the case, the gentiles are not by nature in that name. They have "no hope" and are "without God in the world" (Eph. 10:11, 12), until they believe the gospel and are thereupon baptized into the name of salvation. Jesus the Christ is the Representative of that name, for "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). This name was conferred upon Him by the Father through the Holy Spirit, on account of his perfect obedience to the Father's will, and hence it is "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:9).

Believers of the gospel are inducted into this saving name by being immersed in water. It is said that when the Samaritans, to whom Philip "preached Christ" (Acts 8:5), "believed the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12). And it is stated in the same connection that they were "baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus" (vs. 16). First they believed the things preached; then they were baptized into the name of the Lord. And this is the order in every case upon record. Hence an immersion which takes place in the absence of faith in the truths taught in the gospel is not a scriptural baptism. For instance, if someone should believe in the kingdom, and either disbelieve or be ignorant of the other elements of the gospel to which attention has been directed, his immersion would not unite him with the name of salvation. A scriptural baptism follows belief in "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ."

Through union with the One Name the believer is baptized into the death of Christ; in fact, he is said to be "*buried with Him* in baptism" (Rom. 6: 1-4). Thus he becomes related to the sacrificial death of Christ, so that he is legally justified from the "condemnation" that came upon all men on account of the offense of Adam (Rom. 5: 18, 19); through Christ he becomes "a new creature" (II Cor. 5: 21), and obtains a title to resurrection and everlasting life. Baptism not only inducts the believer into Christ, but also into the "one body" (I Cor. 12: 13), of which Christ is the Head (Col. 1: 18). He thereby becomes one of the "many brethren" of whom Christ is the first born (Rom. 8: 29). Being "in Christ Jesus," he is commanded to do "all things in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3: 17). Being now in the name of the Lord Jesus, whatsoever he asks of the Father in the name of Jesus, being governed in his petitions by the "words" of Jesus, is given to him (John 15: 7, 16). It is his constant endeavor to "walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2: 14), and to run with patience the race set before the saints working out his own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in God's saints (Rom. 8: 18), and that if he suffers with Christ, the judgment of God will count him worthy of the kingdom of God (II Tim. 2: 12; II Thess. 1: 5). At last he shall be one of the company that shall be associated with the Lamb in Mount Zion, who have the name of the Lamb written upon their foreheads (Rev. 14: 1; 22: 3, 4). That worthy name of Jahwe (*He who shall be*) was first impressed upon their mentality by means of the gospel, which brings life and immortality to light (II Tim. 1: 10), and by baptism they become *legally* incorporated into that name. Finally, having successfully passed their probation, and the judgment-seat of Christ having declared them "worthy" of both the resurrection from dead ones and the kingdom of God (Luke 20: 35; II Thess. 1: 5), they are then *physically* incorporated into the One Name of which the prophet Zechariah wrote, "And Jahwe shall be King over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Jahwe and

His name one" (Zech. 14:9). Their mortal body shall be quickened by the power of the Spirit of God (Rom. 8:11), and in its changed condition will be like the glorious body of Christ (Phil. 3:20); hence they are then in a condition to "reign with Christ upon the earth a thousand years" (Rev. 5:10; 20:4, 6). Then they shall be able to sing the new song, "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen" (Rev. 1:5, 6). Reader, it is my heart's desire and my prayer that by the mercy of God we may be exalted to such an honorable and glorious position.



## THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF THE SCRIPTURES AND HISTORY

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as well as every other doctrine, has its history. It had a beginning somewhere, and can be historically traced to its source. That source is either the word of God or the thinking of unenlightened man. The Bible being the revelation of the will of God concerning man, and dealing with the origin, and destiny of man, is the only authoritative standard by which we can judge this matter. If the Bible teaches this doctrine, we are bound to believe and accept it; if not, then it becomes our duty to reject it. In order that we may bring this matter intelligently before our readers, we shall first state the doctrine as it is almost universally held. According to this doctrine it is believed:

1. That man, *every* man, has within him a soul "which enables him to think and reason" (Webster).
2. That this soul is immortal, deathless.
3. That it is capable of conscious existence after death, and independent of the body
4. That the souls of the righteous go to heaven, and those of the wicked to a hell of torment, at death.

The American Tract Society has issued a publication entitled, *Scripture Lessons*, in which it is said, "Man has a soul. The body dies. The soul never dies. The souls of the good

will be happy in heaven; the souls of the wicked will be miserable in hell." This may be taken as a fair statement of the doctrine as it is popularly held.

That the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is considered by its advocates to be of the utmost importance, appears from the frequent references to it in the religious systems of our times. Webster styles it "a fundamental article of the Christian system." Professor Max Muller says, "Without a belief in personal immortality religion is surely like an arch resting on a pillar, like a bridge ending in an abyss." The "Rev." Robert South, an English clergyman and author, said, "The soul is immortal. This is a foundation truth, upon the removal of which religion falls to the ground." But let no one be disturbed by the alternative which these extracts set before us. They derive their truth or falsehood from a correct answer to the question, Does the Bible teach that man is possessed of an immortal soul? If the Bible teaches the doctrine, and the "religion" of the Bible assumes the natural, inherent immortality of all souls, then the removal of this doctrine means the removal of the "foundation" stone of religion; but if the doctrine is the result of the thinking of man unenlightened by divine revelation, then this doctrine is fundamental only to error, and the sooner we dismiss this basic error from our minds, the better it will be for us.

We now come to consider the history of this doctrine; and the reader must not be surprised when we say that the doctrine is not to be found within the lids of the Bible. The Hebrew and Greek words translated "soul" in the English Bible are found over eight hundred times, and are applied to a great variety of objects, ranging all the way from microscopic forms to man; and yet not once is the term "immortal" applied to the soul. Nor are we alone in reaching this conclusion. We have the testimony of men of learning and depth of thought in different persuasions holding the popular belief, who have made the same discovery. The "Rev." George Dana Boardman, an American Baptist clergyman, said, "I must add that not a single passage from Genesis to Revelation teaches, so far as I am aware, the doctrine of man's immortality." The following testimony from

*Ruin and Recovery of Mankind*, by Isaac Watts, is to the same point, "There is not one place of Scripture that occurs to me where the word 'death' occurs, as it was first threatened in the law of innocency, that necessarily signifies a miserable immortality of the soul either to Adam, the actual sinner, or to his posterity." These admissions are important, coming as they do from men who either were believers in the immortality of the soul, or members of bodies holding this doctrine. We wish to draw special attention to the testimony of Mr. W. E. Gladstone upon this matter, which is as follows: "When arguments are offered for the immortality of the soul, they are rarely derived from Scripture. The indications there afforded, when properly co-ordinated one with another, bear no marks of the idea of natural immortality, either as directly revealed or as prevalent among mankind at large. The disquisitions of the rabbis, the speculations of the philosophers, were quietly passed by. They remained whatever they had been in their original impotence or power. Passing by them all as naught, He [Christ] proclaimed the establishment of His own rule. On the head and front of this new teaching stood the great doctrine of the resurrection."

On this point we also quote from the lectures of John Nelson Darby, an English theologian: "I cannot show from Scripture that man is naturally immortal. I can only deduce it. The idea of the immortality of the soul has no source in the gospel; it comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists, and it is just when the coming [of Christ] was denied or lost sight of that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul *came in* to replace that of the resurrection" (*Lectures*, Vol. IV, 2d ed.)

This witness admits that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not originally taught in the church, but "came in" later.

We next call attention to the statement of Archbishop Whately, of Dublin, a man of deep learning and undoubted scholarship: "To the Christian, indeed, all this doubt would be instantly removed if he found that the immortality of the soul, as a disembodied spirit, were revealed in the Word of God. . . . In fact, however, no such doctrine is revealed to us;

the Christian's hope, as founded on the promises contained in the gospel, is the resurrection."

Inasmuch, then, as the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not to be found in the Bible, as the foregoing testimonies frankly admit, it must be sought elsewhere. What is its true source? It had its origin in the reasoning of men unenlightened by the light of divine truth; and we give the following testimony from the writings of Herodotus, the Greek historian and "father of history," who lived about B. C. 450, to show that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as a dogmatic proposition, originated with the Egyptians: "The Egyptians were also the first that asserted the doctrine that the soul of man is immortal, that when the body perishes it enters into some other animal, constantly springing into existence. . . . This opinion some among the Greeks have at different periods of time adopted as their own" (*Euterpe*, chap. 123).

This statement of Herodotus is referred to by Bunsen in his work entitled *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, from which we quote the following: "The Egyptians were the first who taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, a fact mentioned by all Greek writers from Herodotus to Aristotle, and one brilliantly confirmed by the monuments."

We also give a statement from Bishop Warburton's work, *The Divine Legality of Moses Demonstrated*, Vol. II, p. 230: "The Egyptians, as we are assured, were among the first who taught the soul survived the body and was immortal."

Now the question arises, were these Egyptians, who invented this now popular doctrine, divinely enlightened men? Are they the sources of divine knowledge of the mediums through which we can obtain light upon this important question? We wish to call attention to the testimony of Scripture concerning the religious condition of Egypt about the time of the prophet Isaiah, about B. C. 700: "This is the burden of Egypt. Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt, and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it. And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians, and they shall fight every man against his brother, and every man against



his neighbor; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom. And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof, and I will destroy the counsel thereof, and they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards" (Isa. 19: 1-3). The last verse of this extract shows that at this time at least the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was believed and taught by the Egyptians, as is shown by the terms "familiar spirits" and "wizards." These familiar spirits and wizards, however, were the last resort of the Egyptians in their confusion at the visitations of God. Jehovah reproves the children of Israel for their wayward and rebellious disposition when He says to them through the prophet Isaiah, "Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel but not of Me, and that cover with a covering but not of My spirit, that they may add sin to sin; they walk down into Egypt and have not asked at My mouth; to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt" (Isa. 30: 1, 2). And again he says, "Woe unto them that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord! Yet He also is wise, and will bring evil, and will not call back His words; but will arise against the house of the evildoers, and against the help of them that work iniquity. Now *the Egyptians are men and not God*; and their horses are flesh, and not spirit. When the Lord shall stretch out His hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together" (Isa. 31: 1-3). Thus we see that woe was pronounced upon those who went to the Egyptians who were men of flesh, and not God, to whom God had neither revealed His will, nor given information concerning the condition of man. Therefore, according to these testimonies of Scripture, the Egyptians, who were the first to teach the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, were not authorized to teach anything concerning the condition of man either in life or in death. From Egypt this doctrine was carried into Greece by the philosophers who went thither to consult the Egyptian

sages. Among these was Socrates, who brought this doctrine more nearly into its present form than it had been before. We quote the following from the writings of Plato, the pupil of Socrates, as they are given in one of his works. the *Phaedo*: "Death is not an evil. And reason shows that death is either a long untroubled sleep, or removal to a better world, where are no unjust judges. . . . Our souls must have existed before birth, and will have continued existence after death. . . . Does the soul follow as an effect of the body? Has it not been proved that the soul existed before birth, and that all our knowledge is but recollection of what we experienced before the soul entered the body? . . . The soul plainly appears to be immortal. . . . The soul, whose inseparable attribute is life, will never admit of life's opposite, death. Thus the soul is shown to be immortal, and since immortal, indestructible. . . . Do we believe there is such a thing as death? To be sure. And is this anything but the separation of the soul and body? And being dead is the attainment of this separation, when the soul exists in herself and separate from the body, and the body is parted from the soul. That is death. Look at the matter in this way: How inconsistent of men to have always been enemies of the body, and wanting to have the soul alone, and when this is granted to them, to be trembling and repining; instead of rejoicing at their departing to that place where they hoped to gain that life they loved? Surely he will (depart with joy) if he be a true philosopher. . . . Death is merely the separation of soul and body. And this is the very consummation at which philosophy aims. The body hinders thought. The philosopher should welcome the release of the soul."

Since this doctrine is confessedly not a Bible doctrine, it was not originally believed or taught in the church, but came in later, through the influence of the philosophers of the second and third centuries, who, with the profession of Christianity, wished to retain the habit of philosophers; and, being the educated of the time and having control of the seats of theology in the schools, they soon wielded a mighty influence which firmly established the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in the teaching of the church, almost without the knowledge

of those who were being taught by them. Upon this point we give the following testimonies from the *Ecclcsiastical History* of Dr. Mosheim, pp. 39, 42, 43, 65, and 66:

“Toward the close of this [2d] century a new sect of philosophers rose of a sudden, spread with amazing rapidity throughout the greatest part of the Roman Empire, swallowed up almost all other sects, and was extremely detrimental to the cause of Christianity. Alexandria in Egypt gave birth to this new philosophy. Its votaries chose to be called Platonists, because they preferred the sublime Plato to all other sages, and approved of the most of his opinions of the Deity, the universe, and the human soul. This new species of Platonism was embraced by such of the Alexandrian Christians as were desirous to retain, with the profession of the gospel, the title, dignity, and habit of philosophers. It is also said to have had the particular approbation of Athenagoras, Pantoenus, Clement of Alexandria, and all those who in this century were charged with the care of the school which the Christians had at Alexandria. . . . The venerable simplicity was not of long duration; its beauty was gradually effaced by the laborious efforts of human learning and the dark subtleties of imaginary science. . . . Many examples might be alleged which verify the observations which we have now been making, and if the reader is desirous of a striking one, he has only to take a view of the doctrine which began to be taught in this century concerning the state of the human soul after the dissolution of the body. . . .

“Its first promoters [in the church] argued from the known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was also adopted by Origen and his disciples, that the divine nature was diffused through all human souls, or in other words, that the faculty of reason, from which proceed the health and vigor of the mind, was an emanation from God into the human soul, and comprehended in it elements and principles of all truth, human and divine.”

The influence that was wielded by this doctrine during the period can be estimated from the following testimony of Tertullian, who flourished at the end of the second century:

“For some things are known, even by nature: the immortality of the soul, for instance, is held by many. The knowledge of our God is possessed by all. I may use, therefore, the opinion of a Plato, when he declares: ‘Every soul is immortal.’” (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III, p. 547).

And we further give the testimony of Origen, another of the “Fathers”:

“Souls are immortal, as God Himself is eternal and immortal. . . . As if we were to say to the Platonist, who believes in the immortality of the soul, etc.” (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IV, pp. 314, 402).

Thus it is seen that while the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not originally taught as an article of faith in the early church, it crept in and displaced the doctrine which had been taught by Christ and the apostles. We also adduce the following testimonies to show the truth of this statement. We quote from the apology of Justin who lived approximately A. D. 100 to 166:

“But if the soldiers enrolled by you, and who have taken the military oath, prefer their allegiance to their own life, and parents, and country, and all kindred, though you can offer them nothing incorruptible, it were very ridiculous if we, who earnestly long for incorruption, should not endure all things, in order to obtain what we desire from Him who is able to grant it. . . . But our Jesus Christ, being crucified, and dead, and having ascended to heaven, reigned; and by those things which were published in His name among all nations by the apostles, there is joy offered to those who expect the immortality promised by Him.” (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, p. 176).

This is further corroborated by the writings of Arnobias, who lived in the third and fourth centuries. He speaks of men who are “carried away with an extravagant opinion of themselves that souls are immortal, next in point of rank to the God and Ruler of the world, descended from that parent and sire. divine, wise, learned, and not within reach of the body by contact. . . . Will you lay aside your habitual arrogance, O men, who claim God as your Father, and maintain that you



are immortal just as He is?" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VI, p. 440).

The reader will see from the foregoing testimonies that there were those in the days immediately following the apostles, and for some time afterward, who raised strong objections against the then current doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

Leaving this period, when the doctrine *began* to be taught in the church, we pass to the fifth century, and again quote from the testimony of Dr. Mosheim, p. 117:

"If, before this time, the lustre of religion was clouded, and its divine precepts were adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, instead of decreasing, increased daily. The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers, while none stood up to censure or oppose this preposterous worship. . . . The famous pagan doctrine concerning the purification of departed souls made by means of a certain kind of fire, was now more amply explained and established than it formerly had been."

In addition to this we also give the testimony of Augustine in his *City of God*, Vol. II, p. 1:

"But I see I must open this kind of death a little plainer. For man's soul, though it be immortal, dies a kind of death. It is called immortal, because it can never fail to be living and sensitive; and the body mortal, because it may be destitute of life, and left quite dead in itself."

These testimonies show that the conditions, instead of improving, grew constantly worse from century to century, and that not merely the abstract doctrine of the immortality of the soul was taught, but many other equally erroneous doctrines were evolved therefrom.

Passing on to the seventh century, we have the testimony of an able writer to this effect, that Pope Gregory with the aid of this doctrine constructed, established, and gave working efficiency to the dogmatic scheme of purgatory, ever since firmly held and defended by the papal adherents as an integral part of the Roman Catholic system. Accordingly, from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries no doctrine was so central and effective

in the common teaching and practice of the church, no fear so widely and vividly felt in the bosom of Christendom, as the doctrine and fear of purgatory. (W. R. Alger, *Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life*, pp. 411, 412.)

Coming down to the tenth century, we have still another testimony from Dr. Mosheim, relative to the effect and influence of the belief of this Egyptian doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Speaking of the fears of purgatory, he says:

“The fears of purgatory, of the fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities from departed souls, were now carried to their greatest heights, and far exceeded the terrifying apprehensions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched by the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints, while from the pains of purgatory they thought there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitions admirably adapted to increase their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they labored to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.”

We now come to the sixteenth century, in which this doctrine received the stamp of approval from the highest ecclesiastical authority in the world, the pope himself, who, in conjunction with the Lateran Council, A. D. 1513, declared and decreed:

“Whereas some have dared to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul that it is mortal, we, with the approbation of the sacred council, do condemn and reprobate all those who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal, seeing, according to the canon of Pope Clement V, that the soul is not only truly and of itself and essentially the form of the human body. . . . but likewise immortal; and we strictly inhibit all from dogmatizing otherwise; and we decree that all who adhere to like erroneous assertions shall be shunned and punished as heretics.”

We also give an extract from the proceedings of the Council of Trent, A. D. 1545-62:

“Since the Catholic church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, by the writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers, both taught in holy councils, and lastly by this œcumenical council, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the most acceptable sacrifice of the mass, this holy council commands all bishops to have a diligent care that the sound doctrine of purgatory delivered to us by venerable fathers and sacred councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere preached.” (*Brit. Enc.*, Vol. XX, p. 114).

However, there were in this period those of sufficient courage and conviction to speak out against this pagan-papal doctrine, among whom were Luther and Tyndale, and their testimony follows.

Luther said: “I permit the pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as the soul is the substantial form of the human body, the soul is immortal, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals; that such as his faith is, such may be his gospel, such his disciples, such his church, that the mouth may have meat suitable for it, and the dish a cover worthy of it.”

These are the words of William Tyndale, the English reformer: “In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, or purgatory you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection, which we be warned to look for every hour. The true faith putteth the resurrection; the heathen philosophers, denying that, did put that souls did ever live. And the pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ and the fleshly doctrine of the philosophers together—things so contrary that they cannot agree. . . . And because the fleshly-minded pope consenteth to heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupteth the Scripture to establish it. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then what cause is there for the resurrection?”

Thus we see that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which first assumed a doctrinal form among the pagans of Egypt, was thence carried into Greece, further developed by the Grecian philosophers, insinuated into the doctrine and creed

of the church in the second century, and subsequently still more amplified and carried to its logical conclusion in the doctrines of purgatory and eternal torment. Though it may be said this is the doctrine of Catholicism, with which Protestants have nothing in common, this is a mistake. Although the doctrine is not formally stated in many of the creeds of Protestants, yet it is implied therein, taught and defended by the clergy and believed by its members. Thus, covering the entire ground over which we have gone, Professor Alfred Wiedemann says, "This Osirian doctrine influenced the doctrine of the Greek philosophers, made itself felt in the teaching of the Gnostics; we find traces of it in the writings of the Christian apologists and of the older [but not the oldest—A. H. Z.] fathers of the church, and through their agency it has affected the thoughts and opinions of our own time." Is it any wonder that with the philosophers, the scholars, the ecclesiastical authorities, on the side of this doctrine, it should be almost universally believed and held as an essential part of the pure doctrine of God?

We now come to consider the relation of this doctrine to some of the current errors of our day. First, it is the foundation of spiritualism, as the following extract from *The Banner of Light* shows: "The first, the greatest, and the grandest truth coming through modern spiritualism is the immortality of the soul." And we also give an extract from the proceedings of a spiritualist convention held at Rockford, Ill., a few years ago: "Resolved that spiritualism, according to the modern acceptation of the term, embraces all those who believe in the immortality of the soul." Whoever, therefore, believes in the immortality of the soul is a spiritualist, since it is impossible to be a spiritualist without a belief of this doctrine. We give an extract from a sermon by a leading divine of recent years, now dead, which goes to show that this doctrine of spiritualism is held not only by those styled spiritualists, but in a modified form by many in the Protestant denominations of our day:

"What are the departed doing now? Their hand has forgotten its cunning, but their spirit has faculties as far superior to four fingers and a thumb as the supernatural is superior to the human. The reason that God took away their hand and



their eyes and their brain, was that He might give them something more limber, more wieldy, more skilful, more multipliant. Have you any idea that that affluence of faculty at death collapsed and perished? Why so when there is more for them to look at, and they have a keener appreciation of the beautiful, and the sunsets and the rainbows and the spring mornings are interwoven? Are you so obtuse as to suppose that because the painter drops his easel, and the sculptor his chisel, and the engraver his knife, that therefore the taste which he has been enlarging or intensifying for forty or fifty years is entirely obliterated?

“The artists or friends of art on earth worked in coarse material and with imperfect brain and with frail hand. Now they have carried their art into larger liberties and into wider circumferences. They are at their old business yet, but without the fatigues, without the limitations, without the hindrances of the terrestrial studio.

“No sickness in heaven, but plenty of sickness on earth, plenty of wounds in different parts of God's dominion to be healed and to be medicated. Those glorious souls are coming down, not in lazy doctor's gig, but with lightning locomotion. You cannot understand why that patient got well after all the doctors had said he must die. Perhaps Abercrombie had touched him. I should not wonder if he had been back again to see some of his old patients. Those who had their joy in healing the sickness and woe of earth, gone up to heaven, are come forth again for benign medicament. John Howard visiting dungeons; the dead women of Northern and Southern battlefields still abroad looking for the wounded. George Peabody still watching for the poor; Thomas Clarkson looking for the enslaved—all of those who did good on earth, busier since death than before. The tomb is not the terminus, but the starting-point. To show you that your departed friends are more alive than they ever were; to make you homesick for heaven; to give you an enlarged view of the glories to be revealed, I have preached this sermon.” The above quotation is from a sermon preached by T. DeWitt Talmage on December 6, 1896.

Second, this doctrine also forms the basis of Mormonism. We give the following from the *History of the Mormons*, by Samuel M. Smucker :

“While we [Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery] were thus employed [in the work of translation] praying and calling upon the Lord, a messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon us, he ordained us, saying unto us, ‘Upon you, my fellow-servants, I confer the priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness.’ He said this Aaronic priesthood had not the power of laying-on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us hereafter; and he commanded us to go and be baptized, and gave us directions that I should baptize Oliver Cowdery, and afterwards he should baptize me. Accordingly we went and were baptized. I baptized him first, and afterwards he baptized me. After which I laid my hands on his head, and ordained him to the Aaronic priesthood; afterwards he laid his hands on me, and ordained me to the same priesthood, for so we were commanded. *The messenger* who visited us on this occasion, and conferred this priesthood upon us, *said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament, and that he acted under the direction of Peter, James and John, who held the keys of the priesthood of Melchizedek, which priesthood, he said, should in due time be conferred upon us, and that I should be the first elder, and he the second. It was on the 15th day of May, 1829, that we were baptized and ordained under the hand of the messenger”* (*History of the Mormons*, pp. 35, 36).

Now, if John the Baptist and the apostles Peter, James, and John continued in a condition of consciousness after they died, it may be true that they appeared to Joseph Smith and others in 1829 and afterward, and ordained them to the priesthoods of Aaron and Melchisedec. But if the teaching of the Bible is true “that the dead know not anything, neither they that go

down into silence" (Eccles. 9: 5), it cannot be that the persons named could appear to Joseph Smith, or any others for any purpose whatever prior to the resurrection.

Third, we have seen in the extracts already given that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is at the root of purgatory. If man at death continues in a conscious condition, and there be some not quite good enough for heaven and not quite bad enough for hell, it may be that they are sent to a place called purgatory to remove remaining impurities of their natures, and afterward admitted to the bliss of heaven; but if it is true that "there is no work, nor knowledge, nor device, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest" (Eccles. 9: 5, 10), then the doctrine of purgatory as based on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul cannot be true.

Fourth, this doctrine is also the basis of saint-worship, and the worship of Mary, as practiced by Roman Catholicism; but as truly as "the dead know not anything," those dead persons to whom the devotees of the Catholic religion offer their petitions, know nothing of those prayers, and therefore cannot intercede with God in behalf of the petitioners.

Fifth, the doctrine of eternal torment also stands or falls with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. If souls are immortal, and yet subject to punishment, and this punishment continues while they have existence, they will be punished and tormented forever, because, being indestructible, they will exist forever. Will the reader bear with me while I give the following extracts from the writings of Emmons, a Catholic, and Benson, a Methodist:

"The happiness of the elect in heaven will in part consist in witnessing the torments of the damned in hell. And among these, it may be their own children, parents, husbands, wives, and friends upon earth. One part of the business of the blest is to celebrate the doctrine of reprobation. While the decree of reprobation is eternally executing upon the vessels of wrath, the smoke of their torment will be eternally ascending in view of the vessels of mercy who, instead of taking the part of those miserable objects, will say, 'Amen, hallelujah, praise the Lord'" (Emmons, *Sermon 16*).

“God is present in hell, in His infinite justice and almighty wrath, as an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture. The presence of God in His vengeance scatters darkness and woe through the weary regions of misery. It is the presence and agency of God which gives everything virtue and efficacy, without which there can be no life, no sensibility, no power. God is, therefore, Himself present in hell to see the punishment of those rebels, that it is adequate to the infinity of their guilt. His fiery indignation kindles, and His incensed fury feeds, the flames of their torment. While His powerful presence and operation maintain their being, and render all their powers most acutely sensible; thus setting the keenest edge upon their pain and making it cut most intolerably deep; He will exert His divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacities of their minds will admit” (Richard Benson).

Awful as the above picture is, yet, if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true, there is but one alternative between an eternal, burning hell, where countless millions will undergo an eternity of torment, and the doctrine of universal salvation. Whoever believes in the immortality of the soul must either believe in eternal torment or in universal salvation. The Bible doctrine of the destruction of the finally wicked obviates both these erroneous views.

Lastly, let us consider the Bible doctrine of immortality, for be it known, the Bible also contains a doctrine of immortality. But the mere quotation of this doctrine from the pages of the Bible will at once show the striking contrast between the heathen doctrine and the doctrine of God. The doctrine of the Bible is, first, that God “only hath immortality” as an inherent quality of His being (I Tim. 6: 16). He alone can impart this quality to other beings who shall be worthy of it. He is the “King of kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light which no man can approach unto, whom no man has seen, nor can see,” and the “King eternal, invisible, immortal, the only wise God, to whom be honor and glory forever and ever” (I Tim. 1: 17). If God only has immortality in Himself as an attribute of His being, then no



other being has immortality until God shall bestow it. He further says in His testimony through Moses, "I lift up My hand to heaven, and say, I live forever" (Deut. 32:40). What does "live forever" mean except that to His life there shall be no end? Does man thus live forever? *Can* he live forever unless God bestows this quality upon him? Never! We are told by Him who spake as never man spake, that "the Father hath life in Himself" and that He has likewise "given to the Son to have life in Himself" (John 5:24). As to man, we are told that, after he had eaten of the forbidden tree in the Garden, God said, "Behold, the man is become as one of us [the Elohim], to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken. So He drove out the man, and He placed at the east of the Garden of Eden cherubims and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen. 3:22-24). The very thing which God affirms concerning Himself, "I live forever," He denies to man because he is a sinner, lest as such he live forever. The Scriptures further testify that man is mortal. "Shall *mortal man* be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" And let me say that this term from which "mortal man" is rendered in Job 4:17 (*enosh*) is found 522 times in the Old Testament. God is immortal, man is mortal. "Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he [the man]?" (Job. 14:10).

The Bible doctrine of immortality is that Jesus Christ, through the gospel, brought life and immortality to light (II Tim. 1:10). This being true neither the Egyptians, nor Plato, nor the dogmatists of the second and third centuries, either understood or brought life and immortality to light. To those of the philosophic Greeks who were contemporary with the apostles, the teaching of Paul was foolishness (I Cor. 1:23); but if Paul was a believer in the Egyptian and Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul, or his doctrine agreed with theirs, why should his preaching be foolishness to them? It

must have appeared foolish because of its radical disagreement with their own doctrine. Again, we find Paul preaching at Athens, and among other things which he set forth was the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ. Athens, be it remembered, was the seat of one of the leading schools of Greece, which had been founded by Thales about B. C. 600. What effect had the preaching of resurrection (*anastasis*) upon the minds of these Athenians who did nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing? They mocked at the apostolic doctrine of the resurrection (Acts 17:32); but if Paul's preaching had anything in common with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, why mock? Their doctrine contemplated the departure of the soul at death to the Elysian fields where they expected to enjoy the felicity of the presence of the gods, while the doctrine of Paul contemplated the resurrection, or standing again, of the body which died. Resurrection pertains to *the dead*, while the soul believed in by the pagans is deathless, and cannot die. In this fact we see ample explanation of the mocking of those Athenian philosophers at the preaching of Paul.

Again, the doctrine of the Bible is that believers of the gospel which was proclaimed by Jesus and the apostles, are to seek for glory, honor, and immortality, and this by means of patient continuance in well-doing (Rom. 2:5-7). If man were already immortal, why seek for immortality? We seek only that which we do not possess. Therefore those seekers were not possessed of a present immortality, and could not obtain the object of their seeking unless, by patient continuance in well-doing, they should demonstrate their desire for the coveted blessing. We have abundant information in the Word of Truth as to the time when this immortality shall be obtained. The doctrine of the Bible is that they who are Christ's shall put on immortality in connection with Christ's coming, the resurrection and the judgment (I Cor. 15:23, 51-55; II Cor. 5:4, 10).

We now proceed to the last point of this subject: The antagonism of this doctrine to the Bible doctrine of immortality. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul affirms im-

mortality of all men whether they are fit for perpetuity of being or not, thus setting itself against the Bible doctrine of sin, death, resurrection, and immortalization of the worthy (Rom. 5:12, 2:5-7; Luke 20:34-36).

Again, it assigns immortality to all men, thus setting aside the Bible doctrine that God only hath immortality. It makes men immortal whether they seek for immortality or not. And lastly, it sends good men to heaven and the wicked to hell at death, thus neutralizing the Bible doctrine of the resurrection and the judgment, both events taking place in connection with Christ's coming, and not at death. If man is immortal, God has made him so; if he is subject to death, it is because of sin. Man ate of the forbidden tree, thus bringing upon himself the sentence, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." The man who saw the fruit of the forbidden tree and coveted and ate the same, is the man who was told, "Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return." Would such language be spoken to one who is understood to be immortal? Surely not. It is utterly incompatible with the thought that man was by nature immortal. We are told that all the days of Adam's life were nine hundred and thirty years, with the additional statement, "and he died" (Gen. 5:5). Nine hundred and thirty years comprehended *all* his days. He was no more alive after their termination than he had been before their beginning. Why was this? Because he had sinned and brought death upon himself; and from him death passed through to all men, because in him all have sinned. They who obtain immortality obtain it as the precious gift of God after patient continuance in well-doing and seeking for glory, honor, and immortality, and this will be in the presence of the judgment-seat of Christ, who shall render to every man according to his deeds. Thus, then, the destiny of man is in the hands of God. If he lives forever it will be because God wills that he shall; because he is worthy; if not, because he is not worthy and God wills that his existence shall be terminated. If the wicked live forever and God wills that they shall live forever, then God wills that wickedness shall be perpetuated; and this is entirely incompatible with the revelation that God has made, as well as with His own char-

acter. Thus God will not be obliged to confess in the end that the creation of the earth was a failure, and that He created an order of beings, which, though it might fall to the greatest depth of degradation or rise to the greatest height of assumption, would necessarily be deathless because incorruptible. "The wages of sin," as the Scriptures uniformly testify, "is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 6:23). Let us then admonish the reader to study this subject carefully, to weigh the testimonies that have been given from Scripture and the writings of men who have made this matter the subject of study, and to follow the Scriptural injunction to "seek for glory, honor, and immortality"; and in God's own time that inestimable blessing shall be bestowed upon him if found worthy.



## THE OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD, PAST AND PRESENT

A great deal of confusion prevails in the religious world with reference to the operation of the Spirit of God in the time in which we are living. Men say with apparent sincerity that they are the subjects of the operation of the Spirit of God in the same manner as men were operated upon in apostolic times.

It will be necessary for us to consider, first, the relation of the Spirit to its source or origin, which is God. The apostle Paul wrote to the brethren at Ephesus: "There is . . . one God" (Eph. 4:6). And lest there be any misunderstanding with reference to the question who this one God is, he says, in writing to the brethren at Corinth, "We know that there is none other God but one. To us there is but one God, the Father" (I Cor. 8:4-6). Likewise he wrote to Timothy, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2:5). Nor was Paul the only one in New Testament times who recognized and taught this great truth. Jesus, the Son of God, taught it to His contemporaries. When one of the scribes came to Him with the question, "Which is the first commandment?" He replied by saying to him, "The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." And the scribe said to Him, "Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God, and there is none other but He." And "Jesus saw that he answered Him discreetly" (Mark 12:28-34).

The One God who had revealed Himself as such to Israel (Deut. 6: 5) is the God and Father of Jesus Christ, as is evident from such statements as the following: Jesus said to Mary after His resurrection, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father; but go unto My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to My Father, and your Father; and to *My God, and your God*" (John 20: 17). After His ascension to Heaven He sent word to the churches, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *My God*, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *My God*, and the name of the city of *My God*, new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *My God*, and I will write upon him My new name" (Rev. 3: 12). Both the apostles Paul and Peter say, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Eph. 1: 3; I Pet. 1: 4). From the foregoing we see that the One God is the God and Father of both the Lord Jesus Christ and His brethren. Jesus acknowledged God as His God both before and since His glorification. He Himself disavowed being God. When "one came and said unto Him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" He said to him, "Why callest thou *Me* good? there is none good but one, that is God" (Matt. 19: 16, 17). And not only this, but He said that the father is "*the only true God*" (John 17: 3), which would make anyone besides the Father claiming or acknowledged to be God, a false god. Thus we see perfect agreement between the Old and New Testaments upon the great truth of the sole Godhead of the Father.

As there is but one God, so there is also but "one Spirit" (Eph. 4: 4). This Spirit is the Spirit of God; that is, the Spirit belonging to and emanating from God. It is the Spirit which God "sendeth forth" from His personal presence (Ps. 104: 30) to perform His will. This Spirit radiates from His person, penetrating and permeating every part of His creation. By this Spirit He is everywhere present. As the Psalmist said, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?" (Ps. 139: 7). It fills all space, and by it God is in touch with every creature of His, giving and

sustaining life. It was this same Spirit of God that was moving upon the face of the waters at the creation (Gen. 1:2).

While there is one Spirit, there are "diversities of operations" of the Spirit of God. Of this Spirit, which is in universal diffusion and sustains every form of created being in life, Job said, "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils, my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit" (Job 27:3, 4). What was this Spirit of God in Job's nostrils but that free Spirit of God of which the apostle Paul said, "He giveth unto all life, and breath, and all things" (Acts 17:25). How came Job, who was only one of the race of mankind, to have the Spirit of God in his nostrils? It is the same as the "breath of life" which was breathed into the nostrils of Adam when he was created (Gen. 2:7); the same "breath of the spirit of life" which was in the nostrils of all flesh, both of fowl and of cattle and of beast and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man" (Gen 6:17; 7:21, 22); the same spirit of which Solomon says, "They [man and beast] have all one breath [Heb., *ruach*, spirit]" (Eccl. 3:19). It is the spirit and breath which God gathers unto Himself, as the result of which all flesh perishes together, and man turns again to dust (Job 34:13, 14). It is the same spirit of which the Psalmist said, "Thou hidest Thy face, they [the beasts] are troubled, thou takest away their breath [*ruach*, spirit], they die, and return to their dust" (Ps. 104:29). "His [man's] breath [*ruach*, spirit] goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4). This is the Spirit of God which is in man's nostrils, by which he is sustained in life; and when God gathers it to Himself, when it returns to God who gave it (Eccl. 12:7), man returns to dust from which he came. We would direct especial attention to the fact that man himself was made of dust, and not of spirit. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7). "The first man is of the earth" (I Cor. 15:45). Abraham said he was "but dust and ashes" (Gen. 18:27). God Himself, having created man, "remembereth that we are dust" (Ps. 103:14). The spirit is not man, nor any part of him, but that

which causes him to live, which sustains him in life. This is the Spirit of God in its manifestation in the material world. Without it all would be lifeless; with it there is vitality and consciousness and activity.

Attention is directed to the statement of Jesus that "God is a Spirit" (John 4:24); and yet also God *has* Spirit. What, then, is the difference between God who *is* Spirit, and the Spirit of God? God is Spirit in focus; the Spirit of God is Spirit radiating from His person. As light and heat emanate and radiate from the sun, and are but an extension of the sun itself, so the Spirit of God is that power emanating from God which fills all space, and is the medium of life from God to His creatures. By His Spirit, which surrounds and envelops the earth, God is in communication with every part of His created work. Hence it is impossible to withdraw from the presence of God by His Spirit. God Himself is personally present in a place which the Scriptures designate "heaven." Solomon said, "God is *in heaven*, thou *upon earth*" (Eccl. 5:2). And since "the earth," where man has his being and abode, is a place, heaven where "God is," being placed in contrast with the earth, is also a locality. Jesus taught His followers to pray, "Our Father *which art in heaven*" (Matt. 6:9). Jesus Himself was taken up into heaven (Acts 1:11), and is now "in the presence of God" (Heb. 9:24). He is seated "on the right hand of God" (Mark 16:10). That God personally dwells in a place is further evident from the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. "When they shall pray toward this place, hear thou in *heaven Thy dwelling place*" (I Kings 8:30). This is the place to which Jesus went when He ascended to heaven, and this place, even "heaven must receive Him until the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets which have been since the world began." Then "God shall send Him" (Acts 3:20, 21), and "the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven" (I Thess. 4:16; II Thess. 1:7; Phil. 3:20). God dwells in a place, "in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see" (I Tim. 6:16).



Is the Spirit of God a person? Theology says it is. What saith the Scripture? It is affirmed that the Spirit of God is a person because the personal pronoun "He" is used in speaking of the Spirit. If this fact, which is admitted, proves personality for the Spirit of God, it proves the same for other objects to which personal pronouns are applied. Thus, for instance, wisdom is personified. "Wisdom hath builded *her* house; *she* hath hewn out *her* seven pillars; *she* hath killed *her* beasts; *she* hath also furnished *her* table. *She* hath sent forth *her* maidens; *she* crieth upon the highest places of the city." "She" is also represented as saying, "Come, eat *my* bread, and drink of the wine which *I have mingled*" (Prov. 9: 1-5). Is wisdom a person of the female sex because such language is employed with reference to her? No one would affirm such a thing. Another example: Paul wrote to the brethren at Rome, "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, *his* servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" (Rom. 6: 16). The masculine pronoun "his" is applied to both "sin" and "obedience." Are these, therefore, persons of the male sex? By no means. Moreover, the impersonal pronouns "itself" and "it" are also used in the Bible in speaking of the Spirit of God. Paul wrote to the Roman brethren, "The Spirit *itself* beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8: 16). And the apostle Peter said, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired . . . searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when *it* testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow" (I Pet. 1: 10, 11). Remembering the statement of the apostle Paul that "there is *one Spirit*" (Eph. 4: 4), let us ask a few questions. When the Spirit of God was moving upon the face of the waters, before their division, was that Spirit a person? When Job said, "The spirit of God is in my nostrils," did he mean to say there was a person in his nostrils? When the Lord God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, did He breathe a person into him? When it is said that "the breath of the spirit of life" was in the nostrils of "every liv-

ing thing" (Gen. 7: 21, 22), does that mean that there was a person in their nostrils? When Solomon said, "They [man and beast] have all one breath [*ruach*, spirit]" (Eccl. 3: 19), did he mean to say they have all one person? When it is said, "The spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (Eccl. 12: 7), is that which is represented by the pronoun "it" a person that was given? If not, why should it be considered as a person when "it" returns? Can a person be breathed into the nostrils of man and beast? Does God take away a person from man when "He gathereth unto Himself His spirit and His breath" (Job 34: 14)? When "He taketh away their breath [*ruach*, spirit]" (Ps. 103: 29), does He take away a person from the animals? It is perfectly evident from the foregoing passages, and many others of similar import, that the Spirit is not a person, but an emanation from the one God who is a person. Another thought along the same line presents itself in connection with the anointing of Jesus with Holy Spirit at His baptism. The apostle Peter said at the house of Cornelius, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with Holy Spirit and power, who went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the devil" (Acts 10: 38). Here three subjects are introduced to our notice: God, Jesus of Nazareth, and Holy Spirit. God is the One anointing; Jesus is the One being anointed; that with which the anointing is done is Holy Spirit. The very suggestion that Jesus was anointed with a person would seem blasphemous; and yet this is the logical upshot of the doctrine that the Spirit is a person. What is it to anoint? To pour oil upon someone or something. In this case, instead of applying oil to Jesus, God anointed Him with Holy Spirit. In the Mosaic establishment, which was a pattern or shadow of things to come (Heb. 8: 5; 10: 1), there was a "holy anointing oil" (Exod. 30: 22-33), with which persons were anointed or consecrated for the priesthood (Exod. 28: 41; 29: 7), and for the kingly office (I Sam. 9: 27; 10: 1). The oil was poured upon the head of the person to be thus anointed. This was a type of the Holy Spirit. Jesus was anointed with Holy Spirit (Luke 4: 18) and this communicated "power" to Him. Can a person be poured out upon another person? We read

of water being poured out (Ps. 77:17); of money (John 2:15); of ointment (Matt. 26:12), and other substances being poured out, but all these are impersonal substances. The Spirit of God is everywhere present. God by means of this Spirit carries out His will in relation to the earth, hence we know that the Spirit is an impersonal power emanating from His person and feel justified in using the impersonal pronoun "it" when speaking of the Spirit.

We do not employ the term "Holy Ghost" as it is frequently used in the Authorized Version of our Bible. Why not? Because when the Greek word *pneuma*, commonly translated "spirit," is used without the adjective "holy," it is translated "spirit;" but often when the adjective "holy" precedes the word *pneuma*, the latter is translated "ghost." We have an example of this in Acts 2:4, which reads, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost [*pneuma*], and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit [*pneuma*] gave them utterance." Now it is difficult to see why this term should be rendered "ghost" in one place and "spirit" in another in the same verse. If the translation of the word had been uniform we should either have read, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak, as the Ghost gave them utterance"; or "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and spake as the Spirit gave them utterance." There are only two instances in the New Testament where the Greek word *pneuma*, when used without the adjective holy, was translated "ghost," namely, Matt. 27:50; John 19:30. "Ghost," from the ancient Saxon *Gast*, means "breath." "Spirit" is from the Latin *spirare*, and means "to breathe, to blow"; and the noun *spiritus*, being so closely related to the verb "to breathe," has the meaning of "breath." Therefore when Job said, "The Spirit of God is in my nostrils" (Job 27:3), he manifestly referred to that which God breathed into man's nostrils at the creation. Since the breath or spirit emanates from God, and returns to Him when the man dies, it is very appropriately styled "the Spirit of God." Since the term "the Ghost of God" lacks euphony, and was not used by the translators, we use only the terms "Spirit of God" and "Holy Spirit."

The Spirit of God and the Holy Spirit are the same; but when the Spirit of God is used for a holy purpose, such as revealing divine truths, moving men to utter those truths for the good of others, or performing miracles, it is Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God, thus employed, was striving with the antediluvians (Gen. 6:3). How? With or without human instrumentality? Not without such means, surely. Noah was "a preacher of righteousness" (II Pet. 2:5). The Spirit of God through Noah was reproofing the unrighteous. The Jews of apostolic times were accused of resisting the Holy Spirit, as their fathers had done before them (Acts 7:51, 52). How had their fathers resisted the Holy Spirit? By persecuting the prophets, in whom the Spirit of God dwelt, through whom God testified against them (Neh. 9:30). Their children resisted the Holy Spirit by refusing to heed, and afterward murdering, the Just One, to whom God had given the Spirit without measure (John 3:34). In ancient times holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (II Pet. 1:21). The spirit of the Lord spoke through David, and the word of God was in his mouth (II Sam. 23:2). "The Holy Scriptures," which the apostle Paul so warmly recommended to his son Timothy, were "given by inspiration of God," they were God-breathed (II Tim. 3:15-17). They are the result of God's speaking to the fathers "at sundry times and in divers manners" (Heb. 1:1). God sometimes sent His angels, who are His ministering spirits (Heb. 1:14); sometimes He spoke by vision, sometimes by dreams; but all these "divers manners" were the diversities of the operation of the Spirit of God upon the mental powers of men whom God had chosen to convey His truth to others.

Does the Holy Spirit operate upon persons today as it did in the days of the apostles? In order to give a satisfactory answer to this question, it will be necessary to consider the operation of the Holy Spirit in the days of the apostles, and then make a comparison. We are told that Jesus gave commandments to the apostles He had chosen; and He "commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of Me. For



John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in Holy Spirit not many days hence. . . . Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts 1: 1-8). Having received such commandment, they tarried at Jerusalem; and when the day of Pentecost (or fifty days—Deut 16: 9) was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place (Acts 2: 1), quietly, thoughtfully, and devoutly waiting for the promised comforter, who was to guide them into all truth, bring the words of Jesus to their remembrance, and show them things to come (John 15: 26; 16: 13; 14. 26). While the chosen apostles and witnesses (Acts 10: 41) were thus "sitting" and waiting, "suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the house where they were sitting" (Acts 2: 2). The sound did not proceed from the apostles, but it came from heaven, to which Jesus had been taken before (Acts 1: 11). The next phenomenon which is mentioned consisted of "cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them" (vs. 3). While the rushing mighty wind could be *heard* the tongues as of fire could be *seen*. Since "it filled the house where they were sitting," they were completely enveloped in Spirit, or immersed in it as the Greek preposition ("baptized *en* [or in] Holy Spirit" vs. 5) clearly indicates. And not only were they surrounded by Holy Spirit they were filled with it, the result of which was a mental effect: "They began to speak," not merely in the language in which they had hitherto conversed, but "in *other* tongues"; and "the Spirit gave them utterance," not only to say things which they could not otherwise know and express, but one in this language or tongue, and another in that, so that the representatives of a large number of widely separated localities could understand them. And let it be carefully observed that the Spirit was given only to the "witnesses chosen before of God," and not to the multitude. The multitude came together when the rumor of the circumstance of the apostles' speaking with tongues was "noised abroad" among the "devout Jews" who had assembled at Jerusalem. The Spirit had been promised to the apostles,

and was given to them upon the day of Pentecost. The multitude "were amazed and marveled, . . . and in doubt, saying one to another, What meaneth this?" (vs. 7, 12). The speakers were "Galileans" (vs. 7), "men of Galilee" (Acts 1: 11), "Peter with the eleven" apostles (vs. 14), "Peter and the rest of the apostles" (vs. 37). The apostles were "ignorant and unlearned men" (Acts 4: 13), or untaught and private persons; and since they were to "begin at Jerusalem" (Luke 24: 47; Acts 1: 8) and not being able to speak in foreign languages, the Spirit gave them utterance in the tongues of those assembled at Jerusalem upon this occasion. This was the "Feast of Weeks, which was the second of the three great national feast days upon which all the males in Israel were commanded to appear before the Lord at Jerusalem (Deut. 16: 9, 16). That the tongues were a gift of the Spirit is further evident from the language of the apostle Paul. "To another is given . . . kinds of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will" (I Cor. 12: 8-11). Tongues are one of "the signs that should follow" believers in the apostolic age (Mark 16: 17, 18). They were intended "for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not" (I Cor. 14: 22). We also have a number of instances upon record where the Holy Spirit was imparted to persons through the laying-on of the apostles' hands. When the apostles Peter and John laid their hands upon the believers at Samaria, they received the Holy Spirit (Acts 8: 14-18), and while it is not stated what the manifestation of the Spirit was, it is quite evident that some gift was imparted to the Samaritans. At Ephesus Paul laid his hands upon those who had been baptized at his direction, and "the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts 19: 1-6). This was done by the hands of the apostles. Timothy likewise received a "gift" by the laying-on of Paul's hands (II Tim. 1: 6). The apostles were "ministers" through whom the Spirit was ministered in those days (II Cor. 3: 6; Gal. 3: 2-5); and whenever the Spirit was ministered to persons, there was some "gift," as Paul clearly pointed out (I Cor. 12: 4-11). Thus the Spirit proceeds from

the Father (John 15:26); was given by Him to Jesus without measure (John 3:34); by Him shed forth upon the apostles (Acts 2:33); and by them was ministered to believers. There are no cases upon record in the New Testament where the Holy Spirit was ministered or shed forth upon persons in the absence of an apostle. To the apostles was committed the ministry of the word (Acts 6:4); the ministration of the Spirit (II Cor. 3:3-8), and the ministry of reconciliation (II Cor. 5:18). They were the stewards of the mysteries of God (I Cor. 4:1). Since their days no one has had such a commission as they had.

An apostle is one sent by another (*apostello*, I send); and since Jesus chose His apostles (Acts 1:2; 10:41), who were to be His "witnesses" (Acts 13:31), He also equipped them with the "signs of their apostleship (II Cor. 12:12), by which they could be recognized as the sent ones of Jesus Christ. These signs had for their object the confirmation of the word preached by the apostles. "And they went forth preaching everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following" (Mark 16:17-20). The "great salvation which began to be spoken by the Lord . . . was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him: God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit according to His will" (Heb. 2:3). These "mighty signs and wonders" were wrought "by the power of the Spirit of God" in the apostles (Rom. 15:19). Thus the apostles were duly authenticated as the sent ones of the Lord; and when they laid their hands upon persons, these likewise received some gift of the Spirit. When the elders, who were appointed under apostolic authority and sanction (Titus 1:5-11) were called to the bedsides of the sick, and prayed over them, anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord, the prayer of faith saved the sick (James 5:14, 15). Evangelists, or proclaimers of the gospel, had "gifts," as Timothy (II Tim. 1:6; 4:5), and could perform miracles, as "Philip the evangelist" (Acts 21:8; 8:13). Thus, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, the "gifts" which Christ "gave to men" (Eph. 4:11), constituting the official body of the early church, were equipped with the gifts of the

Spirit, which they could demonstrate as occasion required. Does the Spirit operate upon persons in this manner today? Have we, "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers" today? If so, have they the gifts of the Spirit? Do they who claim to be sent to preach, speak with tongues? Do they prophesy? Do they heal the sick? Men are "ordained" to what is styled "the ministry" with all due ceremony and pomp by the laying-on of hands, but no gift is imparted by that ceremony, and there is no casting-out of demons, no speaking with tongues, no healing of the sick as the result of such laying-on of hands. Nothing of this kind is "ministered" by those claiming to be "ministers." We see those who are styled "evangelists," but they are no more able to perform miracles than the "laity," as the "clergy" please to style those who are not of their class. There are men who claim to be "pastors and teachers," but they cannot heal the sick, as the elders of the apostolic church could do. There is the ceremony, the outward form, in our days, but no power, no gifts. When the presbytery or eldership of apostolic times, in conjunction with an apostle, laid hands upon anyone, there was a "gift" (I Tim. 4: 14; II Tim. 1: 6); but no amount of laying-on of hands by the eldership of our days is followed by any gift of the Spirit. The apostolic eldership imparted what it possessed—gifts; the modern eldership imparts what it possesses—nothing. Men punctiliously observe the "form" of laying-on of hands, when they cannot show one fragment of evidence of "power" (II Tim. 3: 5). This is a matter upon which the world should be enlightened. When the apostles, the sent ones of Jesus Christ, preached the word, their preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (I Cor. 2: 4). This is the "power" which Jesus had promised to give them as His "witnesses" (Acts 1: 8); and "the mighty signs and wonders" were alone done "by the power of the Spirit of God" (Rom. 15: 18). The apostles, the able ministers . . . of the "Spirit" (II Cor. 3: 6-8) have passed away; and the Spirit no longer operates through them. The prophecies have "failed" or been withdrawn; and we have no more prophets. The tongues have ceased, because the Spirit no longer operates in this manner;



the knowledge which was given by the Spirit (I Cor. 12:8) has vanished away (I Cor. 13:8). The evangelists with "gifts" received by the laying-on of apostolic hands have ceased and we have none who can "do the work of an evangelist," as Timothy could by the power imparted to him. There are no elders who can heal the sick, as in the days when the apostles were present.

How does the Spirit operate upon persons today? We hear men praying for a "pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit" upon a promiscuous assembly of people. We doubt not their sincerity; but we are convinced that they are sadly wanting in knowledge concerning this matter. The Holy Spirit was not poured out upon the multitude on the day of Pentecost, neither did the apostles pray that this might be done; but it was given to those to whom the promise of the Spirit had been made; and forthwith they began to speak to the people of "the wonderful works of God."

The address of the apostle Peter (Acts 2: 15-36) is but an indication of the character of the "many words" with which he exhorted and testified (vs. 40). And when the apostle pointed out to those Jews that that which they could "see and hear" had been shed forth by the same Jesus whom they had crucified, and that God had made Him both Lord and Christ, "they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (vs. 37). Thus tongues were truly "for a sign," not to believers, but to those who were not believers. But the "sign" made believers of about three thousand of them that day; for when Peter said, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins everyone of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (vs. 38), "then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Now they were believers (see vs. 44), having believed through the word of the apostles (John 17: 20), which word was confirmed with signs following (Mark 16: 19).

Where is the similarity between the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost and our modern revivalistic methods? The

revival affects an outpouring of the Spirit upon a mixed multitude of persons, whether believers or unbelievers, while Jesus distinctly stated that "the world cannot receive" the Spirit of truth (John 14: 17). The Spirit was to be given only to those who believe on Jesus and obey God (John 7: 37; Acts 5: 32). In keeping with this the apostle Paul asked the partly instructed disciples at Ephesus, "Have ye received the Holy Spirit *since* ye believed?" (Acts 19: 2). The Holy Spirit was not given to men to make believers of them; for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God" (Rom. 10: 17). Men were to believe through the word of the apostles (John 17: 20), and the record of what Jesus did and taught was written that men might believe that He is the Christ, and that believing they might have life through His name (John 20: 30, 31). I repeat: The Holy Spirit was not given to men to make them believe, but was given to men after they did believe. It was not poured out upon a company of unbelieving people on the Day of Pentecost, but upon the apostles who were already believers, to enable them to bear witness to those who were to believe through their testimony.

What is it that moves persons in the modern revival if it is not the outpouring of the Holy Spirit? No "successful revival" can be "conducted" without an animating speaker, a great supply of pathetic anecdotes, consisting largely of death-bed scenes, and much so-called "personal work." The speaker brings the people under the influence of the revival by his magnetism; he appeals to their sentiment by the death-bed stories which he sandwiches into his exhortations, and the personal workers go into the audience, and lead those who are susceptible to a front seat where they give their hands to the speaker, and are prayed for; and the secular press reports that hundreds of converts were "swept into the kingdom of heaven," when neither the hundreds nor their leaders have even the remotest idea of what the kingdom of heaven is. This is styled a "pentecostal outpouring" when it does not bear one mark of resemblance to the scene witnessed on the Day of Pentecost. Great is the delusion of those who are overcome by the spell thus thrown over them.

“Knowledge” of divine things was given to men “by the same Spirit” of God in apostolic days (I Cor. 12:8; 13:2), but the apostle Paul instructed the Corinthian brethren, “Whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away” (I Cor. 13:8). This knowledge vanished away when the Spirit ceased to operate upon persons by imparting knowledge in a supernatural way. We learn from the Scriptures that knowledge is a very essential element in the matter of salvation. The wise man said, “The soul without knowledge, it is not good” (Prov. 19:2). Isaiah wrote of Christ, “By His knowledge shall My Righteous Servant justify many” (Isa. 53:11). “Grace and peace” are to be multiplied to believers “through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord” (I Pet. 1:2). Men “escape the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus-Christ” (II Pet. 2:20). And Jesus says, “This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent” (John 17:3). From the foregoing we see that the knowledge of the truth is indispensable to the obtainment of eternal life; in other words, that without such knowledge it is impossible to be saved. If knowledge was to “vanish away,” as Paul said, how are men to be saved? Let us hear the apostles upon this matter. Paul wrote to the Ephesians, “If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which was given me to you-ward,” that is, the Gentiles, “how that by revelation He made known to me the mystery, as I wrote afore in few words, whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ” (Eph. 3:1-4). The apostle Peter, in like manner, put forth his earnest “endeavor” that the brethren might be able after his decease “to have these things in remembrance” (II Pet. 1:12-15). When the apostles were with Jesus they heard His “words of everlasting life,” which words “are spirit and are life” (John 6:63, 68). These words were brought to their “remembrance” by the Holy Spirit which was afterward given to them. What was thus refreshed in their memories, or was revealed to them by the Spirit, was for the instruction of those who should be saved. The apostle Peter was sent to the house of Cornelius with “words” whereby he

and his house were to be "saved" (Acts 11: 13, 14). "Their word" is the means by which men are to believe on the Anointed (John 17: 20). Since the apostles have died, and it is no longer possible to hear "their words" from their lips, these words have been written, and are, like the things written aforetime, "for our learning" (Rom. 15: 4). And whoever believes the saving truth, believes it through the written word. The writings of the apostles are "Scriptures" quite as much as those of the ancient prophets of Israel (II Pet. 3: 15, 16). They are the result of the revelations that were made to the "holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph. 3: 5). Having the word of prophecy more confirmed, we should give heed to it as a light that shines in a dark place (II Pet. 1: 19). The word of God, when received in a good and honest heart, is not a dead letter, but is "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing 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). It is not only "quick" or living (I Pet. 1: 23), but is able to "quicken" the mind in which it finds lodgment. Jesus said, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." The means by which this quickening is brought about are the words of Jesus, of which He said, "The words which I speak unto you are spirit and are life" (John 6: 63). The Psalmist also said, "Thy word hath quickened me" (Ps. 119: 25, 50).

Thus we see that although the prophets and apostles have died, and their voices are heard no more, yet by those words, indited by the Spirit of God, they are still speaking. Their words are still the words of the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul wrote these words, "Wherefore as the Holy Spirit saith (not merely *said*, in the past tense, but *saith*, in the present tense), today, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts" (Heb. 3: 7). What was spoken by Jesus and the apostles, the Holy Spirit "saith" today, as far as the language is applicable today, as the thoughts expressed are still the thoughts of God. He, therefore, who obeys the commandments of the apostles and follows their instructions, is "led by the Spirit of God" (Rom. 8: 14).



Jesus said the Comforter should "reprove (or convince) the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment" (John 16:8). How was this to be done? By an outpouring of the Spirit upon an assembly of sinners? Not so, but by the presentation of the inspired words of God to them. How are men to be convinced? Let the apostle Paul answer: "By sound doctrine to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (Titus 1:9). And what is the source of sound doctrine? "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof (conviction), for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (II Tim. 3:16). This was the uniform method of the apostles, and it must be ours to bring about the desired result. The methods in vogue in modern revivals, such as vociferous public prayers for a "pentecostal outpouring" of Spirit upon an assemblage of worldly people, rising or raising the hand, and going to the anxious seat, are not founded upon apostolic precept or example; and besides, they tend to do great harm. The public prayers for the "conversion" of entire audiences and localities are not fulfilled, and thoughtful persons cannot but take notice of this fact. It gives men occasion to say that God does not answer prayer. Why the multitude of *public* prayers for the "conversion" of persons and an "outpouring" of the Spirit for the "conviction" of sinners, when there is neither warrant nor authority for such a procedure? How utterly unlike Jesus, who said, "I pray not for the world" (John 17:9). If they who make those public prayers are in covenant relation with God, why would not those same prayers, if offered up in the seclusion of the closet, be as acceptable to God, and as sure to be heard, as if made in public? (Matt. 6:6). Why the number and variety of affecting anecdotes that are related at every "revival," instead of being content to proclaim the word of which God said, "It shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" (Isa. 55:11)? The only scriptural way to convert sinners is by teaching them God's ways (Ps. 51:13). And whoever is not converted in this way is not built upon the foundation which God has laid. Look at the converts of apostolic days. Instead of following the inventions

of uninspired men, they believed the gospel preached by Christ and the apostles, and when they gave evidence of intelligent faith in this message, they were forthwith baptized (Acts 2: 38, 41; 8: 12, 36-38; 9: 18; 10: 47, 48; 16: 15, 33; 18: 8; 19: 5). Let the reader carefully peruse the foregoing references, and then let him judge whether "it matters not whether persons are baptized or not, just so they are saved," as some modern "evangelists" tell their hearers in their "revivals."

That "sound doctrine" is an essential element in the salvation of persons is clear from the language of the apostle Paul to Timothy, "Take heed unto thyself, and the doctrine; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and those that hear thee" (I Tim. 4: 16). Doctrine is teaching. It is God's teaching concerning Himself and His purpose in relation to man and the earth. And this "doctrine" will "save" both the speaker and the hearer, if they "take heed" to it. "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son" (II John, vs. 9). It is needful not only to *believe* the doctrine, but to abide in it. The apostle Paul, by the Spirit which was to "show things to come" (John 16: 13), said to Timothy, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. 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 shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (II Tim. 4: 2-4).

That men have turned their ears from the truth to fables is evident from the fact that the clergy seldom preach what are styled "doctrinal sermons." In fact, many of them say, "It matters not what men believe, if they are sincere." A writer in one of the leading Sunday-school magazines recently said in effect that there is a mine of spiritual wealth in the heathen mind, and that even the heathen are worshiping God acceptably. If this were true, why send missionaries to the heathen with a view to converting them? Truly, such teaching is an indication of how far men have followed fables.

The thoughtful reader has doubtless noticed that there is no record of any *public* prayers in connection with the preaching of Jesus and the apostles. When these divinely commissioned and Spirit-filled proclaimers of God's truth came before the people, they had a positive message to deliver, and this they did faithfully whenever and wherever the opportunity presented itself. They performed with vigor the duty devolving upon them, without engaging in repetitious public prayers or calling upon uninstructed and unreconciled men to "join" them in singing and prayer, as modern "evangelists" do without the slightest show of authority. Singing and prayer are acts of worship which pertain only to those who are in covenant relation with God. "We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshiper of God, him He heareth" (John 9: 31). The true worshipers are they who have from the heart obeyed that form of doctrine which was apostolically delivered (Rom. 6: 17); who have become reconciled to God; who by baptism into Christ have put on Christ (Rom. 6: 1-4; Gal. 3: 26-29). These have a "Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2: 5), "an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (I John 2: 1). They are in the name of the Lord, having fled into it as a strong tower in which there is safety (Prov. 18: 1). They are in a position to ask the Father for needed blessings in Jesus' name (John 14: 13, 14). The apostle Paul requested the prayers of the brethren; but he did not ask them to pray, and least of all in public, in the presence of the world, for the conversion of sinners, but for himself, "that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds; that therein I may speak boldly as I ought to speak" (Eph. 6: 19, 20.) Thus he spoke "not as pleasing men, but God which trieth the hearts" (I Thess. 2: 4): and as a result of his preaching, men and women "turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven" (I Thess. 1: 9).

What is our position with reference to this matter? Having believed "through their word," it devolves upon us to invite the

attention of men and women to that same word, that they may "hear, believe, and be baptized" (Acts 18:8).

If God no longer calls and by the power of the Spirit equips men to preach the gospel, what right, what authority, has anyone at this day to proclaim the gospel? The apostle Paul wrote to his "son" Timothy, "The things that thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (II Tim. 2:2). The things which Timothy had heard from Paul were "the form of sound words" (1:13), his "doctrine" (3:10). These things Timothy was told to "hold fast," and commit to faithful men; and these in turn should be able to teach others also. We can at best be of those "others" who were to be taught by faithful men; and it behooves us at this time to follow the example of the noble Bereans who "searched the Scriptures daily whether these things (that were presented by the apostle Paul) were so" (Acts 17:11). We cannot afford to trust the matter of our salvation to an "educated clergy"; for the clergy not only disagree among themselves, so that one teaches this, and another that; but they perpetuate the conflicting dogmas and the confusion arising therefrom. Hence it is not only the right of everyone to test their teaching by the Word of God, but it is his duty to do so. The fact that men claim to have a divine call to preach weighs much with the masses who are none too well instructed in the teaching of the Scriptures, and they are all too ready to receive without question or investigation what they are taught by their leaders. Education is another strong lever with which the clergy move the masses, who almost consider it an act of sacrilege to question the teaching of the pulpit. Not so with the Bereans. They listened to a man whose call to the apostleship could not be questioned; for he had the "signs" of a sent one of Jesus Christ (II Cor. 1:12), and his preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (I Cor. 2:4). Besides this, he had the advantage of a splendid education, for he had been educated at the feet of Gamaliel, an eminent teacher of the law (Acts 5:34; 22:3). And yet those hearers of Paul at Berea "searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so."



How much more necessary is it to subject the teaching of men of this day to a searching investigation and test of the Scriptures! Had this been done since the days of the apostles, we should have less of the confusion that prevails in the religious world today.

Were the clergy of the various names of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, led by the one Spirit of the one God, as they claim to be, there would be no divisions among them, they would speak the same thing, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment (I Cor. 1:10). They would "speak as the oracles of God" speak (I Pet. 4:13); and they who are taught by them, instead of being confused and bewildered, would be instructed with wholesome words of sound doctrine, and filled with the knowledge of God.

Men and women who read these lines, let me say, these words come from one who has been a clergyman, and is therefore in a position to know where the clergy stand. He well remembers the time when he was in almost total darkness with reference to the divine plan of redemption, notwithstanding he was in full connection with the ministry; and in this connection he could neither walk in the way of salvation, nor was he able to instruct others to walk therein. Having had his attention directed to the truth as it is in Jesus, he was obliged to begin with the "first principles of the oracles of God" (Heb. 5:12), namely, "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 8:12), and it became necessary to confess that in spite of his position and his claims he was an alien who needed to be adopted into the family of God, by being baptized into Christ, thus putting on Christ, and becoming an heir according to the promise made to Abraham (Gal. 3:16-29). Having rendered obedience to the gospel in the way appointed, he now rejoices in the prospect of "the great salvation," and lives in hope of the glory of God, and it is his heart's desire that others may learn and know the truth as it is in Jesus. With this in view he has written this article.

In conclusion let me recommend to the reader the earnest, persistent, and systematic study of the Scriptures. Let him

study the Bible by subjects, such as God, life, soul, death, resurrection, baptism, and many others. Cruden's *Concordance*, while it has many defects in doctrine, is quite good as a help to find subjects. Young's *Analytical Hebrew and Greek Concordance* is the best concordance known to the writer. Then the *Emphatic Diaglott*, with its interlinear English translation of the Greek text, is a great help in looking up Greek words. Remember, we have now no one with revelations and apostolic authority, but fortunately we have the Scriptures in various translations in our own language, besides many useful helps by means of which we can study the Scriptures for ourselves. Take a little time each day for the study of Bible truth, and you will lay up a fund of Bible knowledge in the course of one year that will surprise you.

## WILL THE WICKED BE ETERNALLY CONSCIOUS OF THEIR PUNISHMENT?

The question relative to the final destiny and state of the wicked has for ages engaged the minds of men; and many and varied are the theories that have been advanced with reference to this important subject. Thus we have theories ranging all the way from the doctrine of eternal torment for the incorrigibly wicked to the final salvation of all men. It is clear to the thinking mind that not all these theories can be correct. Thus, for instance, if all men will finally be saved, the doctrine of eternal torment cannot be true; and if the latter view be correct, not all men will be saved. The truth lies somewhere between these two extremes. Our question implies that there is a class of persons in the world who may be styled the wicked; that they will be punished on account of their wickedness; and that this punishment will be eternal. We use the word "eternal" in the sense of having no end. Will the wicked be eternally conscious of their punishment? The word "conscious" is here used in the sense of having knowledge of their own existence, condition, sensations, actions and mental operations. Whatever is conscious is alive—it lives. The Bible says, in the plainest possible words, "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9: 5): Thus consciousness is a condition of life, and not of death. If, therefore, the wicked are eternally conscious, they must live forever or be eternally alive. I believe this will be admitted by all who give this matter a moment's serious thought. The question, therefore, to be determined first of all is, Will the wicked live forever? We are informed in the Scriptures that "the soul of

every living thing" is in Jehovah's hand (Job 12: 10). He having given life to everything, if He chooses to withdraw that life, it is in His power to do so. It is His life, given to serve His purpose, and it is but His own to take away when He sees fit. Therefore, if the wicked live forever, it is because He wills that they shall so live. He is "able to save and to destroy" (Jas. 4: 12). If the wicked do not live forever, and hence are not eternally conscious of themselves or their own condition, it will be because He, in whose hand is their life, wills that they shall not live forever. But if the wicked *do* live forever, then wickedness (which is the state or condition of being wicked) will be perpetuated. Now, if the wicked cannot live forever without the will of God, and the wicked as such cannot live forever without wickedness; then, if they do live forever, God wills to perpetuate wickedness. This conclusion is inevitable from the premise that God wills the perpetuation of the wicked.

Now, what are the facts? The first man who did that which is wicked, sinful, or immoral, was Adam. Did he live forever? We have the decree of the Deity upon record in the words: "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat *and live forever*; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken" (Gen. 3: 23). Thus we see that God took a very effective way to prevent Adam, the first sinner from living forever. What is the punishment which God inflicted upon Adam? Not to live forever; death; return to the dust of the ground from which he was taken (vs. 19). What does "live forever" mean? To live as long as God lives, who says, "I lift up My hand to heaven, and say, I live forever" (Deut. 32: 40). It is to live without end. If Adam was not to live forever, and to live forever means to live without end, then the life of Adam was terminated or brought to an end when he died. How long did he live? "*All* the days which Adam lived were 930 years; and he died" (Gen 5: 5) When did he *begin* to live? When God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (Gen.



2:7). Thus there was a definite beginning of Adam's life. He did not live before he became a living soul—before the breath of life was breathed into his nostrils. From that time until he died there were 930 years, and this period, as the record informs us, comprehended “all the days that Adam lived.” Thus he lived neither before the 930 years began, nor after they ended; and since, as has been shown, consciousness is a condition of life, therefore, when Adam died he became unconscious. What was his punishment? Death. What did the words “shalt die” mean to Adam? Did they *mean* eternal torment and suffering to him? Is it reasonable to suppose that Adam understood the sentence, “Unto dust shalt thou return,” as meaning an eternity of suffering? If Adam was liable to eternal torment, it was not announced to him, as far as the record which we have is concerned. And if eternal torment was inflicted upon him without previous warning, he was most cruelly and unjustly dealt with; and in that case God was guilty of an act which was infinitely more sinful than Adam's act of eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. We must not charge God with an act so atrocious. Hence we are driven back to the only conclusion which is open from the premises before us, namely, that Adam died, lost his life and consciousness, and returned to the dust of the ground on account of his disobedience against God's command.

We are informed by the apostle Paul that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that (margin, in whom) all have sinned” (Rom. 5:12). Man was in the world before sin, and sin entered by one man (Adam); and as man preceded sin, so sin preceded death. “And so death passed upon all men.” What death is this? The death which followed the “condemnation” (vs. 18). And what was this? Was it eternal torment? Not a word of the kind. But “unto dust shalt thou return.” This is the “condemnation” which came “upon all men” who descended from the first man. Since all have descended from one who was condemned, therefore the judgment came upon all his descendants with the same result that came to Adam; for “death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that

had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (vs. 14). The condemnation that came upon all being the same that came upon Adam, therefore the "death" that "passed upon all men" passed from Adam to all; and this being the cessation of life, and not a whisper or hint about eternal torment, therefore death is to "all men" the cessation of life and consciousness, and return to the dust. And, since death to the wicked will be eternal, therefore they will be eternally in a condition of unconsciousness, and not the subjects of eternal torture.

But there are various passages of Scripture which, with the popular notion of eternal torment firmly fixed in the mind, appear to teach eternal conscious suffering for the wicked. We shall, therefore, proceed to examine these; and if we find them upon the side of eternal torment, we shall confess that the Bible contradicts itself. However, the reader need entertain no fears upon this score, for the Bible no more teaches eternal torment in one place than it does in another. We are reminded of Scripture passages which contain such expressions as "eternal fire," "unquenchable fire," and "the fire which shall never be quenched;" and many well-meaning religious people point to them as positive proof of eternal torment for the wicked. Again we ask, What are the facts? Let us begin with a statement of John the Baptist. Speaking of Jesus, he said, "Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather the wheat into His garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3: 12). It is plain that this is a figure of speech illustrating something. What does it illustrate? The wheat and the chaff represent two classes of people; the righteous and the wicked. The garner and the unquenchable fire represent the destinies of these two classes. As the wheat is preserved in the garner, and the chaff is burned up in the fire, this passage teaches the preservation of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked. But the fire is said to be "unquenchable." True. And what is the effect of unquenchable fire upon chaff? Is it eternal preservation? The Scriptures explicitly state that "the fire *devoureth* the stubble, and the flame *consumeth* the chaff (Isa. 5: 24).

When the stubble is devoured and the chaff consumed, what is left of them? Simply ashes. Now let us apply the same reasoning to those who are represented by the chaff. The action of the fire upon the chaff is an ocular demonstration of what shall befall the wicked. What will be left when they are "burned up"? Ashes (see Mal. 4:1, 3). Since the fire with which the wicked shall be burned up is said to be "unquenchable," and no man can quench it, it will do its work most effectively. This is in harmony with the language of David when he said, "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away" (Ps. 37:20). Smoke is composed of the particles that arise from a burning body, and as the wicked shall be thus consumed into smoke, they shall finally cease to be. As the psalmist said, in the same connection, "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be" (Ps. 37:10). What do the words "shall not be," when applied to the wicked and his place, mean? Evidently that both the wicked and his place shall cease to be, and something else shall take their place. Further comment upon this point is unnecessary.

Our attention is next directed to the passage which says, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41). It is supposed that everlasting fire implies endless suffering. We have an "example" of "eternal (or everlasting) fire" in the case of the Sodomites who are "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" (Jude, vs. 7). The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders the passage thus: "Enduring the retributive justice of eternal fire." If the subjects of this "example" of "eternal fire" are enduring eternal conscious suffering, so will others to whom they are an example; if they were destroyed, then destruction awaits the ungodly. What are the facts? Our only source of information upon this subject is the record in the Word of God. The apostle Peter says that God "turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, and condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after

should live ungodly" (II Pet. 2:6). There is not the remotest hint or intimation in this language that the Sodomites are the subjects of endless suffering. To overthrow anything and reduce it to ashes, as was done with those cities and their inhabitants, is surely not to preserve it in exquisite torment, but to destroy it. One would not employ such language as that employed by the apostle in this passage to describe an eternity of suffering; but it is appropriate to describe destruction, cessation of being. We have confirmation of this thought in the language of Jesus when speaking of the fate of Sodom. "But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone out of heaven and destroyed them all" (Luke 17:29). Does "destroyed" in this case mean preservation in life and consciousness and torment? If so, what language would one be obliged to use to describe cessation of being? But seeing this is an "example" of "eternal fire," we follow the case still farther. We turn to the original record of the "overthrow" of Sodom, and are informed that "the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; and He overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground" (Gen. 19:24, 25). Does this example of the retributive justice of eternal fire contain anything that in the remotest way suggests eternal torment? That Abraham, from whom God would not hide His purpose to destroy Sodom, understood that destruction awaited them, is clear from his words when he interceded for them: "Wilt Thou *destroy* the righteous with the wicked?" (See Gen. 18:17, 23, 24, 31, 33.) Thus Abraham understood that the Sodomites were to be destroyed; Jesus said they were destroyed; Peter said they were turned into ashes; Jude said they are set forth for an example. And this is an example of "eternal fire." Not one word, not a suggestion of any kind, about eternal consciousness and unending suffering. Hence we see that when the King shall say to those upon His left hand, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:41), He will consign them to a fire which will have the same effect as the "eternal fire"



which "destroyed" the Sodomites. That the people of Israel understood that Sodom was destroyed (and not preserved in torment) - is evident from the language employed by Israelitish writers when speaking of the punishment that was visited upon Sodom. Please read with care Isa. 1:9; 13:19; Jer. 49:18; 50:40; Lam. 4:6. Isaiah described Israel as being "a very small remnant," else they should have been as Sodom and like unto Gomorrah. There was no "remnant" left in Sodom and Gomorrah: they were "all destroyed." Babylon shall be "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." What was to befall Babylon? Listen: "For I will rise up against them, saith the Lord of hosts, and cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew, saith the Lord. I will make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will *sweep it with the besom of destruction*, saith the Lord of hosts." (Isa. 14:22, 23). "And Jeremiah said to Seraiah, When thou comest to Babylon and shalt see, and shalt read all these words, then shalt thou say, O Lord, Thou hast spoken against this place, to cut it off, and none shall remain in it, neither man nor beast, but that it shall be desolate forever" (Jer. 51:61, 62). This was ancient Babylon. Was it made as Sodom and Gomorrah when Jehovah's "besom of destruction" passed over it? It was. The desolation of Edom is predicted by Jeremiah, and he said it should be "as in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbor cities thereof, saith the Lord, and no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it" (Jer. 49:18). Of modern ecclesiastico-political Babylon it is said, "And a mighty angel took up a stone as a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, *and shall be found no more at all*" (Rev. 18:21).

In the same connection she is represented as saying, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, *and she shall be utterly burned with fire*; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her" (vs. 8). To burn anything utterly is to burn it absolutely, entirely, totally. Thus

Babylon shall be destroyed, and hence "shall be found no more at all." We are safe in saying that no one in Bible times who was informed upon the subject, from Abraham to the apostles, understood or believed that the Sodomites were the subjects of eternal conscious suffering.

It is in order to direct attention in this place to the "everlasting burnings" mentioned by the prophet Isaiah (33:14). The question is asked, "Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" But let us not overlook the preceding sentence. "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire?" Note carefully the kind of fire: "*Devouring* fire." What is this fire to "devour"? *Something* in connection with "the sinners in Zion," either sin or the sinners themselves. If it is sin, there will be no more sin; and if the sinners, then they shall cease to be. But hear the prophet further: "The people shall be as the burnings of lime: as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire" (vs. 12). There is no eternal torment for the wicked in this passage, but destruction. But "*who* shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Who shall pass this ordeal? Listen: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from the holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; he shall dwell on high; his place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks; bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure. Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off" (Isa. 33:14-17). Thus as the thorns are burned and cease to be, so the sinners shall disappear; they cannot pass the ordeal of the "devouring fire," while the upright shall dwell in God's kingdom and see the King, which is Christ.

We now come to the passage which says, "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mark 9:43-47). First, let us notice that "*their* worm" is not they themselves, and likewise "*the* fire" is not they. Then let us consider that Jesus is comparing two entirely different things, and He points out which of the two is the "better." "It is better to *enter*

into life than to be cast into hell" (*Gehenna*). This is the Greek word for the valley of Hinnom. See Jer. 7:31-33: "And they have built the high-places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into My heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter, for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away." I give the following quotation from Robinson's *Greek Lexicon* upon this subject: "The name *Gehenna* properly signifies the valley of Hinnom, a valley south of Jerusalem, running westward from the valley of Kedron. Here idolatrous Israelites offered their children to Molech. After the captivity the Jews regarded this spot with abhorrence, on account of the abominations which had been practiced there. They threw into it every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals and the dead bodies of malefactors, etc. To prevent pestilence, constant fires were maintained in the valley, and hence the place received the appellation of 'Gehenna of fire.'" Thus the fire of *Gehenna* was not kindled for the purpose of tormenting living persons, but to consume dead bodies. And the passage in Jeremiah (7:33) associates carcasses with the valley of Hinnom. It was a familiar figure with the Jews, who would readily understand its meaning from the associations which were connected with it in the writings of the prophets. Whatever was cast into *Gehenna* was placed there to be destroyed, either by beasts, birds, fire, or worms. The passage further states, "And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth: *and none shall fray them away*" (that is the fowls and the beasts). Are those fowls and beasts still preying upon those carcasses because no one frayed them away? By no means. But not being driven away, they devoured those carcasses, and the devourers themselves have long ago died. There is as good

reason for seeing eternal torment in this passage as there is in those which speak of fire that shall never be quenched.

Returning to the passage in the ninth chapter of Mark: The "life" in question is manifestly eternal life, which Jesus will give to those who are worthy of it "in the world to come" (Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30), which will be after His coming (Matt. 25:31-46). He who removes the offending member has the promise of entering into life and into the kingdom of God, while he who retains it shall be cast into Gehenna. Is Gehenna a place of life and consciousness and suffering? And are these maintained eternally? Listen to Jesus: "Fear Him which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell (*Gehenna*). Yea, I say unto you, fear Him" (Luke 12:5). What is it to kill? To deprive of life. Since the wicked shall not see eternal life, the life which shall be taken from them when they are "killed" is natural life, soul life, derived from Adam, the first man. Hence it is dead persons who are to be cast into hell fire; and since the fire that shall prey upon them shall "never be quenched," it will consume them. Jesus said, "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell" (*Gehenna*—Matt. 5:30). Thus, according to the words of Jesus, if the offending member is removed, it perishes. What did He mean by the word "perish"? Was it preservation in torment? In case the offending member is not removed the whole body will be cast into Gehenna. What will become of that body in Gehenna? Will it be preserved in life and torment? What is there in the language of Jesus to convey such a thought? Absolutely nothing. They who adduce this passage to prove an eternity of torment for the wicked, arbitrarily force that notion into the words of Jesus, contrary to the meaning of words, and contrary to the associations connected with the valley of Hinnom or Gehenna in the writings of the prophets. Let the reader note with care that fire is never employed in the Bible as an agency of preservation of the wicked, but always as one of destruction. I also invite attention to the fact that



this is by no means the first place in the Bible where unquenchable fire is introduced. Turn with me to the book of the prophet Isaiah, and let us read, "And they (who go to Jerusalem to worship) shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against Me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh" (Isa. 66:24). Here we have the same language which Jesus employed, and from its use by the prophet, and others to whom we shall direct attention, we see that it was a familiar term among the Jews. No one in Old Testament times who used or heard it had any idea of eternal torment in connection with it. Do the worms and the fire torment a carcass? It almost seems foolish to ask such a question. And yet this seems necessary because men have forced language to teach what is totally foreign to it. When the worms prey upon a carcass, they consume it; and when a carcass is placed in the fire, the combustible parts are burned; they go up into smoke, and the ashes remain. The Savior employed this familiar figure, not to teach eternal torment, but the utter destruction of the wicked. We have unquenchable fire mentioned in connection with inanimate objects. God sent word to the children of Israel through the prophet Jeremiah: "But if ye will not hearken unto Me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched" (Jer. 17:25). Was this fire kindled in the gates of Jerusalem? It was. What did it do? It devoured the palaces of the city. Why? Because it was not quenched. If it had been quenched it would have ceased and the city would have been saved from destruction (II Chron. 36:17-21). The fire was not quenched. Is it, therefore, still burning? And is it tormenting that in which it was kindled? There can be but one answer to these questions: No. Then since the fire that could not be quenched "devoured" that in which it was kindled, it will have the same effect upon the wicked when they are cast into it. The same words are found in the fol-

lowing references, which the reader is requested to consult: Isa. 34: 9, 10; 42: 3; Jer. 4: 4; 7: 20; 21: 12; Ezek. 20: 45-49; Amos 5: 6. In all these places it denotes destruction, and in none of them endless torment.

We are referred to Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians, where the apostle speaks of "them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power" (II Thess. 2: 28, 29). Again the question suggests itself, Does this language teach eternal torment for the wicked? If so, in what way? Does "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord" mean everlasting preservation and torment? If this be the case, what language should one employ to convey the idea of destruction? Before this language could teach the eternal preservation and torture of the wicked, the meaning of words must be changed. This destruction will be inflicted upon the wicked "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels" (vs. 7), "when He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day" (vs. 10). The Lord will then be personally present upon the earth, having descended from heaven (I Thess. 4: 16), to which He previously ascended. From this "presence" the wicked shall be destroyed; and it will be "everlasting destruction." There will be no end to this destruction. The apostle Paul wrote of the same class elsewhere in these words: "For many walk of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, *whose end is destruction*, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame. who mind earthly things" (Phil. 3: 18, 19). If their "end is destruction," they go to the end and stop; they do not go on after they reach the end. They are "as though they had not been" (Obad., vs. 16). They shall consume away into smoke (Ps. 37: 20). The apostle Peter likewise wrote of this class, "The Lord knoweth how to . . . reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. . . . But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak

evil of things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption" (II Pet. 2:9-12). Notice in this passage; beasts are "destroyed" and men are to "perish." If men are indestructible, so are beasts; if beasts can be destroyed, men likewise. The same Greek word *phthora* is applied to both. Common-sense says that if a beast perishes it ceases to live. Then why should the same word, when applied to man, mean that he continues in life and consciousness and is kept in endless torture? We therefore dismiss this passage as another which not only fails to prove eternal torment for the wicked, but utterly disproves it.

The apostle Paul wrote, "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23); and, "The end of these things is death" (vs. 21). We have proven from the record of Adam's transgression, and the apostolic references to it, that death to Adam meant cessation of life and consciousness, and not eternal torment. It means the same today that it meant to Adam. If death, therefore, means eternal torment, the apostle should have said, "The end of these things is eternal torment." In another place he said, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom. 8:13). Had he meant, "ye shall be eternally tormented," he could just as easily have said so. Let us take the language as it reads, and not read into it what it neither says nor means.

We have not been left in the dark with reference to the state of the dead. And we need not consult heathen philosophers upon the matter. The Bible speaks for itself, and is its own interpreter. Solomon said, "For the living know that they shall die but the dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5). We know who "the living" are, and we also know that they have knowledge. Now, these living who know something shall die; and when they are "dead," they know not anything. There is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave (*sheol*, the unseen) whither thou goest" (vs. 10). Job says concerning the dead man, "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them" (Job 14:21). Thus the dead have no knowledge of the things pertaining

to this life and its interests. Neither have they any remembrance of God. David said, "For in death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave (*sheol*), who will give Thee thanks?" (Ps. 6: 5). The grave, or hell, where Christ's soul was not left (Ps. 16: 10; Acts 2: 27, 31), is represented as "the land of forgetfulness" (Ps. 88: 10-12). Again, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence" (Ps. 115: 17). "For the grave cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for Thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise Thee, as I do this day: the father to the children shall make known Thy truth" (Isa. 38: 18, 19).

Thus if "*the dead know not anything,*" they have no knowledge of any kind, either of themselves, their condition or their surroundings; they have no recollection of the past; they are in silence and forgetfulness. When death has been visited upon the wicked they will be "as though they had not been"; they "shall not be." Then there will be neither wicked nor wickedness, for both shall cease to be. Then the wicked are "cut off from the earth, and the transgressors rooted out of it" (Prov. 2: 21, 22). What a glorious earth this will be when "there shall be no more curse," but all will be like God, possessing not only His moral attributes, but also His nature. And yet there are men who imagine that eternal torment is a necessity in the development of God's plan in relation to the earth and man. Men tell us that if they did not believe in eternal hell torment, they would "do as they please." In other words, but for the fear of hell torment they would follow the desires of the flesh without restraint. To avoid eternal torment, they "join church," and live a religious life. A service that is rendered from fear of hell torment is not acceptable to God. Besides, it arises from a fear for which there is no scriptural ground. Why frighten men into religion (whatever form it may assume) with that which is not true, but a falsehood of the worst kind? Is not the truth sufficiently strong and inviting to induce men to yield loving obedience to Almighty God? The all-wise God knew perfectly upon what plan to conduct the world in respect to morals. It has



been shown above that no hell torment was preached to Adam to deter him from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. There is not a word in the Old Testament which can, with any show of reason, be interpreted to mean eternal torment for the wicked. Will anyone say that the world could not be run without eternal torment during those four thousand years? The laws in Israel were enforced with the death penalty. Every command of the decalogue but two had the death penalty attached to it. "Every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward" (Heb. 2:2). Whatever the reward was, it was "just." Was it eternal torment? It was death, extinction of life, cessation of being. The transgressors were "cut off" (Lev. 17-10). And that the words "cut off" meant death is evident from Lev. 20:1-3, where he who gave his children to Molech was to be "*put to death*: the people of the land shall stone him with stones. And I will set My face against that man, and will *cut him off* from among his people; because he hath given his seed to Molech, to defile My sanctuary, and to profane My holy name." Saul "cut off" those that had familiar spirits; he put them away (I Sam. 28:3, 6). They should "not be found" in Israel (Deut. 18:10, 11). "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" (Ex. 22:18). Messiah was to be "cut off" (Dan. 9:26). He was "slain" (Acts 2:23); "killed" (Acts 3:15): "put to death" (I Pet. 3:18). Thus to be cut off was synonymous with being put to death. The final doom of the wicked is expressed in the Old Testament in such terms as the following: "Evildoers shall be cut off" (Ps. 37:9). "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth; and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it" (Prov. 2:22). "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. . . . And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet, in the day that I do this, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. 1:1-3). When neither "root nor branch" is left of the wicked, they are completely gone; they are destroyed.

David said, "The Lord preserveth all them that love Him; but all the wicked will He destroy" (Ps. 145: 20). The foregoing are a few of the Old Testament terms expressive of the doom of the wicked. All speak of the certain and complete destruction of the wicked. None contains the slightest intimation of eternal torment. Was it possible to govern the children of Israel without the doctrine of eternal torment? It was done. If God could thus govern the people of Israel during all the centuries of their national existence without threatening them with endless torture, when did He institute this means of restraint? When Jesus, the Son of God, appeared among His kinsmen with the message which God had given Him, He taught that there were two ways; one a narrow one, and the other a broad one; the narrow way leading to life, and the broad way to destruction (Matt. 7: 13, 14). Is "destruction" a condition of life? Does it mean eternal torment? Jesus told some of the Jews, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13: 3, 5). Does "perish" mean eternal torment? We read of a herd of swine running into the sea, and it is said they "*perished* in the waters" (Matt. 8: 32). Why should the word "perish," when applied to animals, mean cessation of being, and when applied to man, eternal torment? Jesus taught that the righteous shall have eternal life in the world to come (Mark 10: 30), while the wicked shall be punished with everlasting destruction. The apostles likewise taught the everlasting destruction of the wicked. "They shall utterly perish in their own corruption" (II Pet. 2: 12). "To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever" (Jude, vs. 13). What kind of "darkness" is this? "The lamp of the wicked shall be put out" (Prov. 13: 9). When the lamp is out, there is no light; and where there is no light, there is no life; and where there is no life, there is no consciousness and no suffering.

Why should the wicked be preserved throughout all eternity? God has pronounced them unfit to live forever in His universe. He is *able* to destroy them, and has announced that He *will* destroy them. Wherever they might live, they would mar that part of God's universe. But men tell us the wicked need not be preserved, since they are immortal and therefore in-

destructible. Why immortal? Did God make man immortal, and then place him upon probation with the possibility of having an immortal sinner? Was God so lamentably lacking in foresight? Was He capable of committing such a blunder as men would impute to Him? We are taught that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men" (I Cor. 1: 25); then how could He be guilty of a thing that would be vastly more foolish than the most foolish act of men? And since God did not make man immortal at the creation, but purposes to immortalize those who shall be worthy of immortality, He will not immortalize the wicked, and then consign them to eternal torment.

But what of "the lake of fire and brimstone?" First, let me say that the Book of Revelation does not teach a doctrine upon the destiny of the wicked that contradicts the rest of the Bible. In this book, Jesus sent word "unto the churches," "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death" (Rev. 2: 11). We are led to inquire, What is this "second death?" This is the first instance of the occurrence of this term in the Bible. The next time we find it in Rev. 20: 6: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." The next time we find it in the same chapter, at vs. 14: "And death and hell (*hades*, the hell where Christ's soul was not left—Acts 2: 27, 31) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." And the last time we find it in Rev. 21: 8: "But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and the murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." The language of this book was addressed to the "servants" of Jesus Christ (1: 1), to "the churches" (2: 7, 11, 17, 29; 3: 6, 13, 22; 22: 16), and to none else. Whoever of these servants overcomes shall not be hurt of the second death. Therefore, we conclude that whoever does *not* overcome *shall* be hurt of the second death. He that overcomes is "blessed and holy," has "part in the first resurrection," which is to "live and reign with Christ a thousand years." This reigning shall be "on the earth" (5: 10). In the judgment scene in

chapter 20, "Whoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (vs. 14), which is explained to be (or represent) the second death. As "the woman is (or represents) the great city" (17: 18), and "the seven heads are (or represent) the seven mountains" (17: 9), and "the seven candlesticks are (or represent) the seven churches" (1: 20), so the "lake of fire is (or represents) the second death." Thus we see "life" and "death" in contrast. Do those who do not have part in the first resurrection "live and reign with Christ a thousand years?" No, for we are plainly told that "the rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years should be finished" (20: 5, R. V.). They live at the beginning of the thousand years, but not to the end of that period. They die some time before its expiration, we know not how long. Fire and brimstone in combination were the most destructive agencies known to Bible writers, and hence they employed these to denote utter destruction. Fire and brimstone were employed in the destruction of Sodom (Gen. 19:24; Luke 17:29). David said, "Upon the wicked He (the Lord) shall rain snares, fire, and brimstone, and a horrible tempest (margin, burning tempest); this shall be the portion of their cup" (Ps. 11:6). Isaiah said, "For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it" (Isa. 30:33). Thus we see that fire and brimstone were employed to convey the idea of destruction. Whatever was to be destroyed was subjected to fire and brimstone; and nothing that shall be subject to them in the future will finally survive the ordeal. It will perish and cease to be.

As to the "second death." A second implies a first. Death, in relation to Adam and his posterity, was deprivation of life and consciousness. "The wages of sin is death," or the death penalty. Whoever, therefore, is subject to the *second* death dies a second time. This conclusion is borne out by the language of Rev. 20: 12, 13, where the sea, death, and hell gave up the dead that were in them. When the dead are given up they are no longer in the sea, death, and hell; no longer in the death state. Having previously passed from the law of sin and



death in Adam to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8:2), by belief of the truth and baptism into Christ, they are released from death at the resurrection. To them there is "resurrection through Jesus" (Acts 4:2). But the judgment which follows the resurrection will decide whether theirs will be the resurrection of life, or of condemnation to the second death. Whoever of the servants of Christ shall not be found written in the book of life (his name being blotted out on account of unworthiness—Rev. 3:5; 22:19), shall be cast into the lake of fire, which is the *second* death. It is not life, but death. And from this death there is no release forever.

It is said at vs. 14, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." These are the objects, together with the sea, which gave up the dead that were in them. Jesus said, "I have the keys of hell and of death" (1:18). The latter contain, until the resurrection, not only those whom the judgment shall condemn to the second death, but also those whose names shall remain in the book of life (see 20:12, 13). The judgment of all takes place after their release from the sea, death, and hell. Finally death and hell are cast into the lake of fire. What does this mean? Shall they be tormented? Not so; for we are informed elsewhere that "the last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death" (1 Cor. 15:26). When death is destroyed, "there shall be *no more death*" (Rev. 21:4). To cast death and hell into a lake of fire will destroy them, and not torment them endlessly. In like manner will they be destroyed and be no more who are cast into the lake of fire.

But what of the smoke that ascendeth up forever and ever? It does. I believe it. That smoke (into which the wicked shall consume away—Ps. 37:10, 20) shall ascend forever and ever, or for the ages of ages. It will never return and enter again into the composition of the bodies from which it shall go up. Smoke ascends from burning bodies. The longer those bodies burn, the more they are reduced in size until the combustible portions are consumed, and then they cease to be. Thus destruction is everywhere written against the wicked servant. Endless life is promised to the faithful (Titus 1:2; 1 John 2:25). Let us lay hold of eternal life (1 Tim. 6:12) by seeking

diligently for glory, honor, and immortality (Rom. 2: 5-7).

It is in order here to direct attention to the fact that the judgment scene of Rev. 20: 11-15 takes place after the sea, death, and hell shall have given up their dead. This effectually sets aside the doctrine that man receives his reward at death. There will be no reward until the coming of Christ (Matt. 16: 27), the resurrection (Luke 14: 14), and the judgment (I Cor. 4: 5; II Cor. 5: 10). God's servants, prophets, saints, and they that fear the name of God, shall be judged and rewarded at "the time of the dead" (Rev. 11: 18), which will be the resurrection at Christ's coming (I Cor. 15: 23). The worthies of Old Testament times died without receiving the things promised to them, and shall not be perfected without the believers of the present age (Heb. 11: 1-13, 39, 40). All who are worthy shall be perfected together so that none will precede others.

I subjoin extracts from the writings of three authors representing the general doctrine of eternal hell torments:

"The happiness of the elect in heaven will, in part, consist in witnessing the torments of the damned in hell. Among these, it may be, their own children, parents, husbands, wives, and friends upon the earth. One part of the business of the blessed is to celebrate the doctrine of reprobation. While the decree of reprobation is eternally executing on the vessels of wrath, the smoke of their torment will be eternally ascending in view of the vessels of mercy, who, instead of taking the part of those miserable objects, will say, 'Amen, hallelujah, praise the Lord'" (Emmons, Catholic).

"God is present in hell, in His infinite justice and almighty wrath, as an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where they must drink in everlasting torture. The presence of God in His vengeance scatters darkness and woe through the weary regions of misery. It is the presence and agency of God which gives everything virtue and efficacy, without which there can be no life, no sensibility, no power. God is, therefore, Himself present in hell to see the punishment of those rebels against His government, that it is adequate to the infinity of their guilt. His fiery indignation kindles, His incensed fury feeds, the flames of their torment. While His powerful presence and operation

maintain their being, and render all their powers most acutely sensible; thus setting the keenest edge upon their pain and making it cut most intolerably deep; He will exert all His divine attributes to make them as wretched as the capacities of their minds will admit" (Benson, Methodist).

"The smoke of their torment shall ascend up in sight of the blessed forever and ever and serve as a clear glass always before thier eyes to give them a constant bright and most affecting view. . . . This display of the divine character and glory will be in favor of the redeemed, and most entertaining, and give the highest pleasure to those who love God, and raise their happiness to ineffable heights. . . . Should this eternal punishment cease, and the fire be extinguished, it would in a great measure obscure the light of heaven and put an end to a great part of the happiness and glory of the blessed" (Samuel Hopkins, American clergyman).

Reader, this is the logical and necessary sequel of the doctrine that would have God perpetuate not only sinners, but sin. It is revolting in the extreme, shocking to every sense of justice, and grievous to every sense of pity that God has implanted within the human breast. It is a libel upon the character of God. Think of the redeemed, who are to be like God in character and nature, being "entertained" at such a revolting spectacle, and having their happiness raised to "ineffable heights," until they exclaim, "Amen, hallelujah, praise the Lord!" Desperate must be the hardness of heart that can paint such a picture! But infinitely more case-hardened and unfeeling must they be who could experience "ineffable heights" of pleasure at such an exhibition of fiendish brutality! Think of it, parents, children, husbands, and wives! Your loved ones consigned to such a place of exquisite and unending torture, and yourselves entertained at the sight of their writhing in agony. The God of the Bible will mercifully put an end to the wicked. He is no such monster of cruelty as the being described in the foregoing extracts. I admit that the Lord will punish the wicked for their wrong-doing; that their punishment will be everlasting; and that it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God, who shall devour the adversaries (Heb. 10: 27, 31); but

I deny that He will unmercifully torture helpless creatures throughout eternity. "All the wicked will He destroy" (Ps. 145; 20). They "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power" (II Thess. 1:8, 9). They will die; their lives will end. Their names shall rot (Prov. 10:7). Their memory shall perish (Isa. 26:14). "They shall not rise, they are extinct, they are quenched as tow" (Isa. 43:17). Consciousness ends with life; suffering ends with consciousness.

When all enemies, including the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed (I Cor. 15:26) as the result of the righteous reign of Christ and His redeemed hosts upon the earth (Rev 20. 6; 5:10), not an enemy against God or good men will be in existence: "No more death, neither sorrow nor crying, *neither shall there be any more pain*, for the former things are passed away" (Rev. 21:4). All enemies shall then have been destroyed. "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men" (Luke 2:14). Then the earth shall be "full of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Heb. 2:14), and God shall be "All in all" (I Cor. 15:28). What a beautiful picture this; one which we may contemplate with joyous expectation because of the certainty of its ultimate realization; a picture which God Himself will behold with infinite pleasure (see Rev. 4:11).

Reader, let us by careful and painstaking study of the Scriptures acquaint ourselves with the will of God as revealed therein; knowing this let us reverently believe the message which it brings to us; then let us from the heart obey that form of doctrine which was apostolically delivered to us; and if we patiently continue in well-doing and in seeking for glory and honor and immortality, we shall at last be the happy recipients of life, even length of days forever and ever.



THE DEVIL:  
IS HE A PERSON? IS HE A FALLEN ANGEL?

It is quite generally believed by the religious world that the devil spoken of in the Scriptures is a spiritual being who was once an angel of God, and had his abode in the presence of the Almighty; that ages ago he rebelled against the authority of the Most High, and drew a considerable following of other spirit beings after him; that he and his hosts were expelled from heaven; that they visit the abode of man, if they do not actually dwell on the earth; that the devil is the agent of man's temptation and sin; and that he and his wicked following, both angels and men, will finally be consigned to a hell of eternal torment.

If the devil and his angels were once beings that were holy in character, dwelling in the presence of God, how could such holy beings commit sin? If holy and righteous beings could rebel against the authority of God, and thus commit sin of the most wicked kind, it is altogether possible for other equally holy angels to fall into sin, should occasion therefor arise. One is led to wonder why not *all* the holy angels followed the lead of this leader of angels, and likewise became unholy. And since righteous men are to be "equal unto the angels," as Jesus taught (Luke 20: 36), it is certainly possible that they, too, may again fall into a state of sin, after they have reached the state of equality with the angels. Since such a calamity is said to have befallen beings which were once holy, there is absolutely no guarantee that it will not recur in the future.

Again, if men are to "die no more" because they shall be "equal unto the angels," then the angels are immortal; and if

the devil is an angel, he, too, is deathless, as well as the angels who fell away with him. Hence the devil and his following are indestructible, and God Himself cannot terminate their existence. Does the Bible teach that God created beings which, though they may sink to the lowest depth of degradation, are nevertheless immortal? Such procedure would be regarded as either irrational or criminal among men, and it is an imputation which is dishonoring to God in the extreme.

Let us then briefly examine the doctrine of the devil, which men require us to believe, in the light of the Scriptures, and see what is the truth. The first passage in the Bible in which the word "devil" occurs is Lev. 17:7, and reads, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone awhoring. This shall be a statute forever unto them (that is, the children of Israel) throughout their generations." The reader will perceive that the word "devil" is in the plural; hence there was a number of devils of the kind here referred to. The word "awhoring" indicates an adulterous form of worship, mixing a false worship with the true, or forsaking the true worship, and going after strange gods. These gods or "devils" were the creation of men's hands, as we read in the following: "And he (Jero-boam, king of Israel) ordained him priests for the high places, and for *the devils*, and for the calves *which he had made*" (II Chron. 11:15). This proves that these devils were regarded as gods. Of course, they were false gods; and hence to follow or worship them was to go "awhoring" after them (see Exod. 34:15). God through the psalmist made the complaint against Israel that they "were mingled with the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were a snare unto them; yea, *they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils*, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, *whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan*; and the land was polluted with blood" (Ps. 106:35-38). The apostle Paul likewise taught the identity of devils with idols, in these words, "What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say, that *the thing*

which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye have fellowship with devils" (I Cor. 10: 19, 20). Were these devils intelligences? That they were not so regarded by the Bible writers appears from the following language taken from different parts of the Bible: "The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men's hands. They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; they have ears, but they hear not; neither is there any breath in their mouths" (Ps. 135: 15-17). "And the rest of the men which were not killed by those plagues yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship *devils, and idols* of gold, and silver, and stone, and of wood; *which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk*" (Rev. 9: 20). We can therefore readily understand why the apostle Paul should say, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one" (I Cor. 8: 4). An idol, or devil, "which can neither see nor hear nor walk," surely is "nothing in the world." Aside from the visible image, "the work of men's hands," it has no reality, it does not exist. Hence we see that there is a large class of "devils" mentioned by various writers of the Bible which represent nothing more than the vain imaginings of unenlightened men, or men who departed from the true and living God, and followed their benighted and ignorant neighbors.

More than this, we are informed that these devils were a recent creation. "They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods they knew not, to *new gods that came newly up*, whom your fathers feared not" (Deut. 32: 17). Again we see a sharp contrast between these "devils and the devil of popular belief." While the popular devil is supposed to date from a remote past, these devils "came newly up," being unknown to the "fathers" of the nation of Israel. Hence Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lived and died in ignorance of the "devils" of the later inhabitants of Canaan. These passages contain nothing in favor of the devil of popular belief.

Our attention is directed to a passage in the prophecy of Isaiah which reads, "How art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning: How art thou cut down to the

ground, which didst weaken the nations!" (Isa. 14: 12). Due consideration of the context will facilitate a correct understanding of these words. The above words form part of an address to be made by Israel "against the king of Babylon" (vs. 4), and therefore they cannot refer to the devil believed in by the religious world. Moreover, the proverb begins with the words, "How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" The golden city is in the feminine gender, and the marginal reading is, "the exactness of gold." The "oppressor" was an individual who ruled over and "weakened the nations" from the golden city, which was Babylon. The very text which is quoted to prove the doctrine of the devil, is against that doctrine; for instead of being "cut down" first, and then weakening the nations, as the case is supposed to be with the devil, the order is reversed, and the oppressor first weakened the nations, and was afterward cut down. Again, the Lucifer, or day star, of this passage was to be "weak" at the time when this proverb should be made against him. Then the words are addressed to him, "Is this *the man* that made the earth to tremble; that made the world a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof, that opened not the house of the prisoners?" (vss. 16, 17). So he was a human being who had ruled on the earth, instead of a wicked angel who was cast out of heaven. Again vs. 11 reads, "Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the voice of thy viols; the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." Is there anything in this statement that corresponds with the devil of popular belief? The popular devil is supposed to be very active, and almost omnipresent, while the subject of this taunting speech is brought to the grave, and has worms for his bed.

Once again, listen to these words which declare the destiny of the king of Babylon, "Thou shalt not be joined in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people: the seed of evildoers shall never be renowned. Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers; that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities. For I will rise up against them, saith



the Lord of Hosts, and *cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew, saith the Lord*" (Isa. 14:20-22). The cutting off or destruction of even the "remnant" of Babylon is as far removed as possible from the doctrine of the eternal preservation in torment of a wicked angel and his following. Thus the context of the above passage not only does not lend support to the popular notion of a wicked angel devil, but makes directly against that notion. Even Dr. Adam Clarke, the Methodist commentator, saw and acknowledged this fact, for he very pertinently said, "Although the context speaks explicitly of Nebuchadnezzar, yet this has been, I know not why, applied to the chief of the fallen angels, who is most incongruously denominated Lucifer (the bringer of light!) an epithet as common to him as that of Satan and Devil. That the Holy Spirit by His prophets should call this arch enemy of God and man the *light bringer*, would be strange indeed. But the truth is, the text speaks nothing at all concerning *Satan* nor his *fall*, which many divines have, with great confidence, deduced from this text."

But we are told with much assurance that there is a passage which teaches that the devil and his angels were once engaged in a conflict with Michael and his angels in heaven and were cast out, after which they came to the earth. The passage referred to is Rev. 12:7-9, and 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." Our friends of the "orthodox" world point with evident satisfaction to this passage, and say, "Does not this prove that the devil and his angels were once in heaven, and were cast out into the earth?" As far as the abstract wording of the text is concerned, the language appears to favor the view contended for by our friends; but when we examine the context, and consider the character of the apocalypse and the object for which it was written, we see that the use that

is made of the above-cited language is entirely beside the mark. Let us then first of all consider the object for which this book is written. It was given, as the title states, to show to God's servants "*things which must shortly come to pass*" (Rev. 1:1). Again we read the words addressed to John, "Come up hither, and I will show thee *things which must be hereafter*" (4:1). All of which goes to show that the prophecies of this book (see 1:3; 22:19) related to events which were then in the future from John's day, and therefore they could have no reference to things that had taken place in the past, either recent or remote. Since the conflict between Michael and the dragon is one of the events prophesied, it had not taken place at the time when the book was written. Hence if it related to the devil of popular belief, he had not yet been expelled from heaven, so that up to this time the earth had not been the scene of his activities. Moreover, the prophecies of this book were not given in plain terms, but were "signified," or couched in sign language. We notice at the head of chap. 12 two wonders, or "signs," in heaven; first, a woman who is with child (vss. 1, 2), and then "a great red dragon" (vss. 3, 4), styled "the Devil and Satan" (vs. 9). Since a description of the dragon is given for the benefit of the "servants" of God, let us view him a little more closely. We are told (1) that this dragon was "in heaven," which was the same heaven in which John saw the woman with child (vss. 1-3); (2) that he was red; (3) that he had "seven heads and ten horns," and (4) that his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth. Does the reader imagine that this is a literal description? Are they literal heads and horns? Is the tail literal, and are the stars? If the reader is one of the servants of God, for whose benefit this prophecy was given, he is already familiar with the phraseology here used, and he remembers that ten horns were seen upon a beast which Daniel saw in his night visions; and this beast represented one of the world kingdoms that were to operate upon the earth, and the horns represented kings (Dan. 7:7, 17-24). Likewise we have an explanation of "seven heads and ten horns" in the Book of Revelation itself. In Rev. 17:3 we see

a scarlet colored beast "having seven heads and ten horns." What is the meaning of this symbolism? "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. . . . And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet" (vss. 9, 12). And who is the woman sitting upon this beast? John is told, "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth" (vs. 18). The present tense of the verb "to reign" indicates that the city alluded to was reigning at the time when John saw this vision. What city was this? It was Rome. Who was the woman of chap. 17? A system of apostate religion. And since the woman was riding the beast, she was controlling it—a union of church and state; the latter controlled by the former. Hence we see that the heads and horns represent a political system. Is not the same true in chap. 12 where the dragon with heads and horns is seen? It is the political system having its head in Rome—pagan Rome. All of which shows that the dragon is not a wicked angel who was once a good angel and was cast out of heaven, the abode of God, on account of his opposition against God. When we see the dragon drawing one-third of the stars of heaven and casting them to the earth, we ask, Are these literal stars, cast upon the earth, the abode of man? The reader can perceive at a glance that as the dragon itself was the "sign" of a political system, so are the stars signs or symbols. The stars which John saw in the right hand of the Son of Man (Rev. 1: 16), were or represented "the angels of the seven churches" (Rev. 1: 20). When Joseph, the son of Jacob, in his dream saw the sun and the moon and eleven stars do obeisance to him, his father said, "Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth? (Gen. 37: 9, 10). Thus while the sun and moon represented the father and the mother, the greater lights, the stars represented the brethren, the lesser lights of the heaven of Jacob's family. As the stars in Joseph's dream represented persons in Jacob's family heaven, so the stars in Rev. 12 represent lights in the political heavens. It would be impossible for one star of the astronomical heavens to come into collision with the earth without

demolishing the latter, to say nothing of one-third of all the stars falling on the earth. One-third of the stars of heaven represent that proportion of the great lights of the Roman empire or heaven, which were to be brought to the earth, or the level of the common people. Thus, while it is impossible here to enter into all the details of this vision, we see that the language cannot and does not refer to a devil who was once a good angel in heaven, the abode of God, but it clearly refers to a political system which was to be deprived of power to give way to another. In this way another stronghold of the popular devil gives way before the light of the truth.

If the popular devil exists, we shall be obliged to seek him in other Scriptures. We are referred to the word "Satan" as found in many places in the Bible, and we are assured by our friends that this word proves the doctrine for which they contend. What does the word "Satan" mean and to what is it applied? It first occurs in the English Bible in I Chron. 21:1, which reads, "And Satan stood up against David and provoked David to number Israel." But in the Hebrew it is first found in Numb. 22:22, where the angel of the Lord was an "adversary" (Hebrew, Satan) to Balaam. From these examples we see that Satan means an adversary. In II Sam. 24:1 it is said that "the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." This circumstance is the same as that referred to in I Chron. 21:1; and thus God Himself was an adversary or Satan to David. The word Satan does not mean the devil of popular belief. The reader will also remember that upon one occasion Jesus said to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense to me; for thou savorest not the things of God, but those that be of men" (Matt. 16:23). It must be that Peter, in counseling Jesus to avoid His crucifixion, was what the word "Satan" expressed—an adversary or opposer of Jesus in the purpose which He had; no one would for one moment identify him with the devil of popular belief. There is one expression in this statement of Jesus to which I must direct the reader's special attention. Jesus said to Peter, that as a Satan he savored "*not the things of God, but those*



of men." This gives us a clue to the origin of those "things" which Peter had said. They were not of God, as we know; neither did Jesus intimate that they were of the devil, but as He plainly said, they were "of men." Therefore the impulse under which Peter made the remonstrance above referred to was purely human. Inasmuch as the word "Satan" means an adversary or opposer, we can understand why even a political system was designated as Satan (Rev. 12:9). It was the aggregation of human flesh organized under the headship of pagan Rome, which was opposed to God.

Again we are invited to consider the term, "Beelzebub, the prince of the devils" (Matt. 12:24). It is said by those who believe in the popular theory of the devil that Jesus Himself sanctioned the idea of Beelzebub being the prince of devils. And again we ask, Who was this Beelzebub? Was he a good angel who became a wicked angel, and seduced other angels to wickedness? We shall find Beelzebub, or Baalzebub, in the history of Israel, and therefore turn to the Scriptures which deal with this "prince of the devils." We read in II Kings 1:1-3, "Then Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab. And Ahaziah fell down through a lattice in his upper chamber that was in Samaria, and was sick; and he sent messengers, and said unto them, Go, inquire of Baalzebub the god of Ekron whether I shall recover of this disease." Thus Baalzebub was a god of the Philistines, a heathen nation. And the psalmist said, "For all the gods of the nations (or heathen) are idols; but the Lord made the heavens" (Ps. 96:5). Being a god of the nations, Baalzebub was an idol; and since "an idol is nothing in the world," according to the apostle Paul, therefore Baalzebub was in reality nothing. And if this was true of "the prince of the devils," it is equally true of the rest of the devils. Yet we are asked, What about the condition of the persons who are said to have been possessed of devils in the days of Christ? It needs to be remarked that the word rendered "devils" in Matt. 12:14, is the Greek word *daimon*, while the word "devil" in other places is from the word *diabolos*. It must appear to everyone that these two words, being entirely different, must have different meanings. Thus we

have the word *daimon* in the New Testament passages already considered, where the translation renders it "devils." When Paul said, "the gentiles sacrifice to devils" (I Cor. 10: 20), he used the word *daimon*. What does this word mean? Its use will at the same time determine its meaning. Now, the word occurs in a number of places where the English reader would scarcely suspect it. Thus when it is said that "he (Paul) seemeth to be a setter forth of *strange gods*; because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection" (Acts 17: 18), they said in reality, "he seemeth to be a proclaimer of *strange demons*," which shows that the Athenians regarded their gods as demons. Again, according to our Authorized Version, the apostle Paul said, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious" (vs. 22). What did he say to those people in their own language? "I perceive that in all things ye are (*deisedaimonesterous*) worshipers of demons." These demons were gods, as the language clearly shows. Demons, according to the teaching of mythology, are the supposed spirits of dead men. There were good demons and bad demons. As Plato said, "The poets speak excellently who affirm that when good men die they attain great honor and dignity. . . . It is also believed that the souls of bad men become evil demons" (*Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, p. 515). When men suffered from disease or mental derangement they were said to be possessed of demons. This phraseology of the pagans was introduced among the Jews, and was current among them at the time of Christ, which is evident from the fact that when persons were dumb (Matt. 9: 33), or blind (Matt. 12: 22), or lunatic (Matt. 17: 15), or epileptic (Mark 9: 22), they were said to be possessed of devils, or demons—that is, wicked demons; and when these persons were restored to their normal state, they were said to be "healed" (Luke 6: 18; 8: 2), and the insane were "clothed" and in their "right mind" (Mark 5: 15). The "doctrine of devils" or demons (I Tim. 4: 1) was borrowed from the Greeks, and its phraseology was used by the Bible writers in an accommodated sense; but when they used the language of the truth, they corrected those false notions by saying that the persons so afflicted were "healed."

There were none among the "all" who were "oppressed of the devil" whom Jesus did not "heal" in the proper sense of the word (See Acts 10:38). The foregoing remarks about demons are borne out by Josephus, the Jewish historian, when he says, "Demons are no other than the spirits of the wicked that enter into men that are alive, and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them" (B. J. VII. 6:3). Thus if anyone was sick, he was possessed of a wicked demon, which was the spirit of a bad man; if he obtained no help, he died, and it was said that a demon had killed him. But if he recovered from any cause, the demon had been expelled and left him. This is the genuine doctrine of demons of the pagan world, and Josephus but reflects its effects upon the Jewish mind. Not only in ancient times did the nation of Israel "mingle among the heathen and learn their works," recognizing and giving honor to their "devils" or gods (Ps. 106: 35-38), but they still followed this tendency at the time of Christ and the apostles, as the foregoing facts abundantly prove. Demons were not wicked angels, but the product of the imagination of unenlightened men. Hence the cases of demon possession in the New Testament were really cases of various physical maladies or mental derangement. If there were devils at that time who had control over human beings, inflicting all manner of ailments upon them, those devils, if they are deathless, are living today, and certainly their hatred against God and man is unabated. Hence we should see persons in vast numbers today who are possessed by devils as those were, but no such cases are known to exist in enlightened communities; and where there is a similarity of symptoms, the ailment is attributed to other causes than demon possession. And these cases are treated according to the present state of medical knowledge, and in many cases cures are effected.

Once again, the word "devil" (from the Greek *diabolos*) is brought forward to prove the existence of the devil of popular teaching. But here, as elsewhere, the question is in order. What does the word *diabolos* mean? It is a Greek compound, consisting of the preposition *dia*, meaning "through," and the verb *ballo*, "to throw, or cast." Hence we have the idea of

throwing or casting through. Now, it is a fact that this word *diabolos* has been translated "false accuser" and "slanderer." The former is found in II Tim. 3:3 and Titus 2:3, and the latter in I Tim. 3:11. The second passage referred to reads as follows, "The aged women likewise that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers (*diaboloï*), not given to much wine, teachers of good things," etc. If "false accuser" is the correct translation of *diabolos* in this passage, does it not have the same meaning when found in other connections? In I Tim. 3:11 we read, "Even so must their wives (those of deacons) be grave, not slanderers (*diaboloï*), sober, faithful in all things." If *diabolos* is properly translated into English by the word "devil," then we should read, "Even so must their wives be grave, not devils." But we see that "false accuser" and "slanderer" represent the meaning of the word *diabolos*, for a slanderer or false accuser is one who strikes through the good name or reputation of another.

But who is the real slanderer or false accuser? Let us consider a statement made by the apostle Paul, viz., "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also (Jesus) Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). The ultimate object of Jesus in taking part of flesh and blood was that He might destroy the devil. This at once raises the question of the destructibility of the devil. Can the devil be destroyed? There can be no question with reference to the end to be attained in this case. This language implies that the devil can be destroyed. And the Revised Version reads, "That He might bring to nought him that had the power of death," etc., which leaves no doubt as to the end in view. Therefore when the devil is brought to nothing, he does not exist; in other words, when this work is accomplished, there will be no devil in existence. This proves that the devil is not indestructible. But we ask again, Who is this devil? He "had the power of death." If this is the devil of popular belief, how did he obtain the power of death? The Scriptures plainly teach that the soul of every living thing is in the hand of the Lord (Job 12:10). If then the devil, the



wicked personal devil, has the power of death, he must have obtained it from God. If God gave him this power, when did He deliver it to him? We have no record of any such transaction between God and the devil. Since the object was that Christ should destroy the devil who has the power of death, this power is inimical to man; hence when the devil is destroyed he no longer has power over man. The Scriptures set forth beyond all question what has the power of death over man, but this is not the devil of theology; it is sin. The apostle Paul stated in language which leaves no room for doubt, that "the sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15: 56). Then the power of death lies in sin. Sin may be viewed in two aspects: first, as transgression of law (I John 3:4), and sin in the flesh (Rom. 7: 17-20; 8: 3). The first sin was "Adam's transgression" (Rom. 5: 14). By it death came into the world, not only to Adam, but to all that descended from him. When he transgressed God's law, sin became an element of his flesh, and it is in every son of Adam. It is that bent in human nature which inclines men toward actual sin. By one man sin in these aspects entered into the world, and where there is sin, whether in potency or in action, there death has power. Therefore it is sin that has the power of death. And thus sin is the *diabolos*, the slanderer or false accuser. Sin falsely accuses and thus slanders the good name of God. It says, "Ye shall not surely die; for God knoweth that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3: 4, 5). Sin has the power or sting of death. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (Rom. 5: 12).

Let us next notice where the "devil" of Heb. 2: 14 has his seat. It is said that Jesus took part of flesh and blood, that through death He might destroy the devil. Had He not been a partaker of flesh and blood, He could not have died, and without death He could not have destroyed the devil. Thus it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that there is an intimate connection between flesh and blood, and the devil. What is in the flesh? It is sin, as we have seen above. How did Jesus through death destroy the devil? He "put away sin by the

sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. 9: 26). From where did He put away sin? From where it was: the flesh, of which He was a partaker. How was this done? "Through death." Hence, having died and put away sin, when He arose and ascended to the divine nature, He became immortal, and "death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God" (Rom. 6: 9, 10). Thus, as far as Jesus is concerned, sin and death have been destroyed, and He became in His own person an exemplification of the words of the apostle Paul, that He "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (II Tim. 1: 10).

But while "death hath *no more* dominion" over Christ, it did have such dominion over Him. Was this because He sinned? No; for He "did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth" (I Peter 2: 22). Then why did death have dominion over Him? Because of sin in the flesh, as the apostle Paul shows in Rom. 8: 3. And this element was in the flesh of the Son of God because "He Himself took part of the same," that is, of flesh and blood. In yielding obedience to the Father's will, even to the death of the cross, He destroyed, or brought to nought, that which had the power of death, that is, the *diabolos*.

But our friends insist that the language with reference to the temptation of Jesus is very explicit when it says that He was "tempted of the devil" (Matt. 4: 1). This is true, and we freely admit it.

In dealing with the temptation of Jesus it is necessary to consider the sources of His temptation, which are two. In the first place, it is a scripturally attested fact that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (I John 4: 1-3; II John, vs. 7). According to this language He came (*en*) "in," not (*eis*) "into," the flesh. Hence He was in the flesh when He came. This being true, He was not God who had been in a pre-existent state before His birth of Mary, but His personal existence dated from the time He was "made (*ek*) out of a woman" (Gal. 4: 4). Had He been God, and merely come *into* the flesh after pre-existing in a spiritual state, He could not have been tempted;

for the Scriptures explicitly declare that "God cannot be tempted with evil" (James 1:13). To avoid the difficulty presented by this statement our orthodox friends say that Jesus had two natures, the human and the divine, and that, when He was tempted, this was on the human side, and not on the divine side of His being. But they forget that according to their own creed the human and the divine natures were inseparably united in Christ, so that we cannot separate between the two natures in Christ when He was tempted; hence to be consistent with their own position, they must admit that Jesus was tempted in His entire being. God cannot be tempted with evil: this fact is settled beyond dispute; and the Scriptures state with equal clearness, that "every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed" (James 1:14). Since God *cannot* be tempted with evil, and man *can* be tempted; and Jesus *was* tempted, therefore Jesus was not God, but man. And this is a truth which He Himself most clearly taught (John 8:40).

Since Jesus Christ is "come in the flesh," we ask, What is the nature of the flesh in which He came? The apostle Paul designates it as "flesh of sin" (Rom. 8:3, *Diaglott*), by which we understand that it was flesh which descended from Adam after he sinned, and partook of his nature. This flesh, being "made of a woman" (Gal. 4:4), was "the same" as the flesh of the children partakers (Heb. 2:14). It descended from Adam (Luke 3:23-38); and was weak (II Cor. 13:4); unclean (II Cor. 7:1); unprofitable (John 6:63); and mortal (II Cor. 4:11). Of itself it contained no good thing (Rom. 7:18, 20-25; see also Matt. 19:17), and required to be crucified (Gal. 5:24). It possessed these qualities because it was "flesh of men" (I Cor. 15:39). This flesh, of which Jesus was a partaker with ourselves, made it possible for Him to be tempted; and the Scriptures testify with the utmost clearness and precision that He was "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). He was tempted in as many "points" or directions as we are, and "like as we." Since "every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed" (James 1:13, 14), the apostle John designates

the "points" in which we are tempted as "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," and these things are "all that is in the world" (I John 2: 16). Had Jesus been God, "lust" could not have "drawn and enticed" Him, and the temptations of Jesus recorded in the New Testament would not have been real temptations, but shams. However, if we accept the inspired statements with reference to the flesh of man, of which Jesus was a partaker with ourselves, the apostolic comment thereon noticed above is fraught with meaning, and we can understand what Jesus meant when He said at different times, "I have overcome" (John 16: 33; Rev. 3: 21). To overcome is to gain the victory over an adversary, and this involves a combat which requires the exercise of strength. In this combat Jesus was the victor, because He fought with a real enemy, the *diabolos*, sin, who has his seat in the flesh that descended from Adam. This flesh, in which Jesus came, was one of the sources of the temptation of Jesus. Its "weakness" lay in the fact that sin dwelt in it; hence it was unprofitable. Sin had defiled it, or made it unclean (Job 14: 1-4), and therefore it was mortal, or doomed to die. God does not endow that which is defiled by sin with immortality. In order therefore to live forever, it must undergo a change, first of relationship from the law of sin and death to the law of the Spirit of life (Rom. 8: 2), and second of nature from corruption to incorruption (I Cor. 15: 51-58).

The other sources of the temptation of Jesus lay in the fact that He, being a partaker of flesh and blood as described above, had been "anointed with Holy Spirit and power" (Acts 10: 38). This power enabled its possessor to overrule the ordinary laws of nature, and to perform miracles or wonders. And this power had been given to Him not by measure, but in unmeasured fulness (John 3: 34); and He could employ it in two ways, that is, for the gratification of personal desires, or for the good of others and the glory of God. The object of its communication is indicated in the words of Jesus, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and re-



*covering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised"* (Luke 4:18). Thus the object of the communication of this power to Jesus was for the glory of God (John 2:11; 11:40), and not for the gratification of selfish desires. He must have been keenly sensible of this power. And this treasure was placed in an earthen vessel. Will He employ it for the good of poor, sin-stricken humanity, or for the gratification of the desires of the flesh? He who is to feed the hungry multitudes, will He use this power to gratify the craving of His own nature at a time when this would involve distrust in Him who said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee?" He whom the Father would invite to sit at His own right hand, and who would ascend thither by the power of the Spirit, will He employ this power to gratify His curiosity, thus yielding to the pride of life, and presumptuously tempting or challenging God? He to whom the heathen have been promised for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession (Ps. 2:8), will He yield to the desire of the flesh for power and glory, and immediately seize His own, thus evading the cross, when the Father had designed that the sufferings shall be first, and the glory afterward (I Peter 1:11). What will He do with the power thus placed at His disposal? How will He use it? In order that He may be put to the test, "immediately (that is, after His baptism and anointing with Holy Spirit and power) the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness" (Mark 1:12). The object for which the Spirit drove Him thence is indicated in the words, "to be tempted of the devil" (Matt. 4:11). Since "every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed" (James 1:14), Jesus, being a "Man" (John 8:40; Acts 2:22), was to be drawn away of lust and enticed. Hence lust must be awakened in Him to do that which is unlawful. In order to subject Him to this test, the Spirit drove Him into the wilderness, where He continued forty days tempted of the adversary (Mark 1:12, 13). The trial to which He was subjected was threefold, and consisted of an appeal to the flesh when He was hungry; to the pride of life, by the suggestion to cast Himself from a pinnacle of the temple; and to the lust of the eyes by passing the



kingdoms of the world before His mind. The power to make bread by a miracle had been given to Him, as was afterward demonstrated when He fed the multitudes. Why shall He not use this power? He, the Son of God, into whose hand the Father had given all things (John 3:35), was hungry by reason of the fast of forty days. By making bread of stones, He could do two things: first, He could demonstrate that He was the Son of God; and second, He could satisfy His hunger. Were not these two very legitimate objects, which were in every way justifiable? God had previously publicly acknowledged Jesus as His beloved Son (Matt. 3:17); why not put the matter to the test? Why not use the power of the Spirit to satisfy the craving of His nature? Who was the *diabolos* who thus tempted Him? Was it the devil of popular belief whom Jesus must have well known if both had been in heaven. one as an angel, and the other as God? And would the second person of the Godhead be "drawn away and enticed of His own lust" by a suggestion from such a source? Let no one imagine a so-called "human side" in Jesus that was tempted, while the divine could not be tempted; for it was He whom God had previously acknowledged as His beloved Son, who was thus tempted, "drawn away of lust and enticed." Whose "lust" was it that drew Him? It was "*His own* lust," as the apostle James says in his definition of temptation (James 1:14). Where was this lust? It resided in the flesh of Jesus. This flesh, being "flesh of men" (I Cor. 15:39), and the source of "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph. 2:3), was capable, without assistance or even a suggestion from any superhuman devil, of doing "works" which exclude from the kingdom of God (Gal. 5:19-21). As "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," and these are "contrary the one to the other" (Gal. 5:17), the same was true of Jesus who was a joint partaker with us of the flesh and all its disabilities. Thus the suggestion to make bread of stones arose from the flesh of Jesus, and hence it did not originate with a wicked angel. In thus overcoming this temptation Jesus conquered that aspect of "all that is in the world" which John speaks of as "the lust of the flesh" (I John 2:16).

It was not wrong but right amid certain circumstances for Jesus to employ the power of the Spirit to make bread. But to do so at this time would have been an evidence of distrust toward God and of forgetfulness or disregard of the words, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4: 4; Deut. 8: 3). In citing these words at this critical moment, Jesus not only showed His wonderful knowledge of the word of God, but also His estimate of Himself. He Himself was the "Man" who was to "live by the word of God." He did not arrogate to Himself the false honor that is bestowed upon Him by the religious world, namely that of being God; though He might have acted upon the impulse to use the God-given power to gratify the lust of the flesh. He was willing to die of hunger rather than do that which would manifest a want of confidence in God.

The second temptation of Jesus is recorded in these words, "Then the devil taketh Him up into the holy city, and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith to Him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, He will give His angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone" (Matt. 4: 5, 6). Let us notice first where the temptation took place. The evangelist Mark records that "He was there in the wilderness tempted of Satan" (Mark 1: 13). As a matter of fact, the temple was not in the wilderness, but in Jerusalem. Had He been in the city at this time, He would have had to leave the wilderness, go to the city, and afterward return to the wilderness. And we have no account of such going to and fro. Again, if the temptation took place on a pinnacle of the temple, and the devil of popular belief actually took Jesus there, then either the devil carried Him thence by a miracle, or Jesus Himself performed the miracle in order to accompany the devil. Since the temptation took place in the wilderness, the suggestion to cast Himself down arose from the pride of life residing in the flesh, aided by the consciousness of the ability of Jesus to convey Himself from place to place by Spirit power and the promise of angel help.

Why shall He not, as the Son of God, here and now put this matter to the test? What would be more natural to the flesh than such a suggestion? And it required no superhuman devil to awaken such a thought in the mind of Jesus. How did He meet this test? He replied, "It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." In appropriating this Scripture Jesus again showed His excellent knowledge of the word of God and His estimate of Himself. He did not claim, or even imagine Himself to be God. On the contrary He acknowledged the Lord as His God; and having, at His baptism, entered into a covenant with God which carried with it the obligation of perfect obedience, He would not, by an act so rash and presumptuous, challenge His God. "It is written," was the rule of His life. He would not appropriate that divinely given power for the gratification. It must be employed for the good of His fellow-men and the glory of God. Thus He did not allow lust to conceive, and again the victory was on His side.

In the third temptation, corresponding with "the lust of the eyes," Jesus is taken into an exceeding high mountain, from which are shown Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and He is asked to fall down and worship the *diabolos*. It is in order to ask, was there a mountain in the wilderness where Jesus was tempted, from which could be seen "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them" (Matt. 4:8), "in a moment of time" (Luke 4:5)? In the literal sense of the word this was a physical impossibility. Therefore Jesus must have seen those kingdoms in a different sense than with His eyes. The picture which He saw must have been a mental one. To whom had all this been given? To Jesus Himself, as the language of the Scriptures with which He was familiar, clearly shows. "Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for Thy possession" (Ps. 2:8). He was "the Heir of all things" (Heb. 1:2). With this fact before Him, and knowing that He had the power at His disposal "whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself" (I Cor. 15:27; Phil. 3:21), the impulse of the flesh would be to proceed at



once to take possession of that which had been promised to Him. Having had all things given into His hands, and possessing without measure the Spirit by which He could assume control of His own, here was a combination of circumstances which was well adapted to awaken the lust for power and glory resident in the flesh. The only one who could say with any show of truth and reason, "All this is delivered unto Me" (Luke 4:6), was Jesus Himself. If a wicked angel made such a statement to Him, He knew that this was a lie upon its very face; and it was impossible for Jesus to be tempted, "drawn away and enticed," by that which He knew to be false. Therefore the suggestion must have arisen from within Him to whom all this power had been given. Does anyone think that Jesus would in any circumstances have felt drawn and enticed of lust to fall down and worship the devil of popular belief—a hideous, wicked devil—knowing him to be such? Or was it possible for the devil to deceive Jesus as to his identity, by assuming a form in which Jesus would not recognize him? He who from Scripture and experience knew what was in man (John 2:25), could not be deceived by the devil. To believe otherwise would be to impute to Jesus a degree of ignorance which is incompatible with the knowledge which He displayed at the age of twelve years, when He knew that He must be about His "Father's business" (Luke 2:49), ignorance which would unfit Him for the position which He was to occupy. The suggestion to "fall down and worship" the *diabolos*, was the same as the impulse to serve the flesh. The words "worship" and "serve" are used synonymously in the answer of Jesus, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:9, 19). Thus He recognized in the suggestion an invitation to serve the *diabolos*, or sin in the flesh. He would not be the servant of sin, but of obedience unto righteousness (Rom. 6:16). Again He shows His estimate of Himself when He says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Who is commanded to worship and serve God? The Speaker. Who is "the Lord thy God?" Not the Speaker, but One higher than He, to whom He owes His service. This service He will gladly ren-

der as the Servant of God (see Isa. 42: 1). When He afterward invited others to deny themselves and follow Him (Matt. 16: 24), He was but asking them to do what He Himself had done. In combating and repelling temptation, He denied Himself. In resisting temptation, He resisted the *diabolos*, the slanderer against God, which is sin in the flesh; and in overcoming this enemy, He conquered "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," which things are not of the Father, but of the world (I John 2: 16). And this "lust" resides in the "mortal body" (Rom. 5: 12). By this lust He was drawn and enticed, and the same draws His followers. He overcame it, and so must they (Rev. 3: 21). He strove against sin, and so must they (Heb. 12: 3, 4). Thus the temptation of Jesus is perfectly intelligible without the supernatural devil of popular teaching; it can only be understood upon the basis that the *diabolos* is a personification of sin in the flesh, while the common view surrounds the entire subject with impenetrable mystery which confuses and bewilders the mind.

Yet, though compelled to admit the force of the foregoing facts, our friends confidently point to the masculine pronoun "he" as used in connection with the devil, to prove the existence of the devil of popular teaching. The masculine pronoun "he" is used because the word *diabolos* is in the masculine gender. But the use of this word when applied to woman, and translated "slanderer" and "false accuser" (I Tim. 3: 11; Titus 2: 3), is still masculine; yet it would not make those women of the masculine gender. It is also a fact that both sin and obedience are personified, and the masculine pronoun is applied to both. The apostle Paul wrote, "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" (Rom. 6: 16). It is clear that the apostle Paul did not regard sin and obedience as two persons to whom service might be rendered, but as two principles which were thus personified by the pronouns "whom" and "his." The reader will observe that there are but two masters to whom service may be rendered: "sin" and "obedience." Both relate to

God and His law. While the former is transgression of God's law, the latter is submission to its requirements. This leaves the devil of popular teaching out of the account. The "yielding" mentioned by the apostle is voluntary upon the part of those who render such service, whether to sin or obedience. "To whom *ye yield yourselves* servants to obey," etc. That there are but "two masters" whom men may "serve," is further evident from the words of Jesus, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve two masters" (Matt. 6: 24). One of these masters is God; the other, Mammon. Will anyone say that Mammon is the devil of popular belief? It will be seen from vs. 25-34 that Mammon is the overanxious care for the things of the present life, and therefore it cannot be the popular devil.

It is in order, before leaving this part of our subject, to call attention to the statement, "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee; and there went out a fame of Him through all the region round about" (Luke 4: 14). The temptation had ended "for a season," and the fact that Jesus "returned in the power of the Spirit," goes to show that not having misappropriated this power, it had not been withdrawn from Him, but remained in His possession in undiminished fulness. Having proven His worthiness to be entrusted with Spirit power, He now went forth in the power of the Spirit, "doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with Him" (Acts 10: 38). Thus the temptation of Jesus can be understood and explained without the supernatural devil of the common belief, and the character, devotion, and steadfastness of Jesus amid the trials arising out of the flesh, stand forth in bold relief. In view of the foregoing facts we can appreciate the double negative contained in the apostolic statement, "We have not a high-priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4: 15); and also that other statement, "For in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted" (Heb. 2: 18). How comforting the thought that

having endured temptation, He can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and is able to sympathize with us, and to succor us in striving for the mastery over the desires of the flesh.

Lastly, will the devil and his following be eternally tormented? It has been shown that the Bible knows nothing of the devil of popular belief; therefore there can be no eternal torment for such a devil. The *diabulos* of the Bible will finally disappear from the earth, when evil of every kind shall be uprooted from the abode of man; when they shall not teach every man his neighbor and say, "Know the Lord," but all shall know Him from the least to the greatest. And when once this is the state of things, there will be no *diabulos*, slanderer, or false accuser; for the accusing element, sin in the flesh, will then be a thing of the past. However, desirable as such an end may be, and glorious as such a prospect is, our friends direct attention to a passage which upon the surface appears to favor the popular view of an immortal devil who is to be eternally tormented. The passage reads, "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 forever and ever" (Rev. 20: 10). Let us remind the reader that the dragon or "devil and Satan" of chap. 12 was shown to be a political devil, and not a once-holy angel who had become wicked. And the devil of chap. 20 is likewise styled "that old serpent which is the devil and Satan" (vs. 2). Hence this devil is a political devil, similar to the one of chap. 12. What is "the lake of fire and brimstone" into which the devil was cast? It is styled "the second death" (Rev. 20: 14, 15), and the careful reader will observe that both death and hell are to be cast into this lake of fire. We are told that Jesus "must reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (I Cor. 15: 25, 26). Then again, it is said, "And there shall be no more death" (Rev. 21: 4), which is equivalent to saying, death shall be no more. In this case death shall cease to be. Now, if by casting death into the lake of fire, death is destroyed so as not to be, how can the devil live forever in torment when he is cast



into the lake of fire, which is the second death? That the lake of fire is not the same as hell, is clear from the fact that hell itself, along with death, is to be cast into the lake of fire. Hence hell will share the same fate with death. If death, by being cast into the lake of fire, will be eternally tormented, so will hell. But if one is destroyed so as not to be, so is the other. And this is also the fate of the devil. Are the beast and the false prophet literal? It is clear from what has been said above on the character of the Apocalypse, that the beast is not a literal wild beast, but represents a certain political system. Hence also the false prophet is not literal but represents a system of false religion. This being true, the devil is not a literal wicked angel, but likewise a great human organization; and therefore the lake of fire into which the devil is to be cast is not a literal lake of fire, but represents the utter destruction of that which is cast into it, just as death and hell are destroyed by being cast into the lake of fire. The dragon seized by the angel of chap. 20 represents the human governments that shall exist at the time of Christ's coming. These will be compelled to submit to the reign of Christ and His saints on the earth (Rev. 5: 10, 20: 4-6). Since the devil is to be bound for a thousand years, the period of the subjugation of the earth by Christ and the saints is of the same duration. The psalmist testified that the "honor" of binding kings with chains and nobles with fetters of iron, to execute upon them the judgment written, pertains to all "saints" of God, and in view of this exclaimed, "Hallelujah," Praise to Jah! (Ps. 149: 7-9). Thus the "angel" who binds Satan, or human nature in the form of the governments existing at the time of Christ's coming, represents the Lord Jesus and the saints in their official capacity judging or reigning on the earth. Finally, as the result of this reign Satan the adversary, or sin in all its manifestations, will disappear from the earth, and God will be "all in all" (I Cor. 15: 28). What a glorious consummation when there shall be neither sin nor sinners upon the earth to mar the handiwork of God, which He made for His pleasure (Rev. 4: 11).

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY RESPECTFULLY CONSIDERED

In dealing with this doctrine it will be necessary, first of all, to state the doctrine in the terms chosen by those who framed it. The doctrine is set forth in the creed of the Church of England as follows:

“There is but one true and living God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

“The Son which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man’s nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that the two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

“As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell.

“Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man’s nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day.

“The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.”

The foregoing statement of faith is based upon and agrees with the Athanasian Creed, which is the doctrinal standard of the Roman Catholic Church and is likewise repeated in the Church of England. The creed of the Church of England is the basis of many of the confessions of faith in Protestantism. Thus Protestantism, so far as its theology is concerned, stands practically upon the same basis with Catholicism. The question, then, is: Is the doctrine of the Trinity as held in common by Catholicism and the greater part of Protestantism, a Bible doctrine? In other words, Is it the doctrine of the Bible? If the study of the doctrine in the light of Scripture yields an affirmative answer, we may well say, in the language of the Athanasian Creed, “He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity.” Should the answer be a negative, then we are bound to reject the doctrine, venerated and popular though it may be. Jesus, the Teacher sent of God, said: “And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent” (John 17:3). Thus both the creed and the Scriptures make eternal life depend upon the knowledge of the Deity. Let us then calmly and candidly examine the propositions of the doctrine of the Trinity, comparing them with the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the Deity, and thus determine where the truth is.

To begin with, the creed says, “There is but one true and living God, everlasting.” What say the Scriptures? They also uniformly teach that “there is but one God,” and also clearly specify who this one God is, viz, “the Father” (I Cor. 8:6. See also Deut. 6:4, 5; Mark 12:29, 30). In the passage above referred to (John 17:3), Jesus says, “That they might know *Thee, the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” The Speaker is Jesus; the One addressed is the “Father,” the true God, but “the only true God.” Hence there is no true God besides the Father whom Jesus was addressing. And this is “the Father,” of whom the

apostle said, that "to us there is but one God, the Father" (I Cor. 8:6). So far then as the abstract statement of the oneness of the Deity is concerned, the Scriptures and the creed agree. But who is this "one true and living God, everlasting?" Does the creed specify? Let us hear it further: "And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity: The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." But here the creed comes into collision with the Scriptures; for while the latter solemnly affirm the sole Deity of the Father, the former affirms that "three persons" are necessary to constitute the one God. Jesus says "the Father" is "the only true God," and the creed teaches that the Father is not the only true God, but that three persons, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," are necessary to constitute the "one true God." Then again the creed not only contradicts the Scriptures, but reason as well, when it affirms that the only true God is "without parts," and then immediately divides the only true God into three parts or "persons." A person is an individual; and in this Trinity there is not only one individual, but three separate and distinct persons or individuals. The creed teaches that these three persons are "of one substance," etc. Whatever therefore be the "substance" of one of these "three persons," is likewise the substance of the other two. If one be "without body," so are the other two; or if two, so is the third. Still the creed says that "Christ," who is the second "person" of the Trinity, "took again his body, with flesh, bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature," etc. Now, if the three persons are "of one substance," and this substance is "without body," then it is impossible for one of those persons to be at the same time possessed of a "body, with flesh and bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature." Either the three persons are of one substance, without body or parts, or if one of those persons has a body, and therefore parts, they are not of one substance. Since the creed affirms both, it both contradicts itself and commits an insult against reason in requiring men to believe a doctrine that is so manifestly absurd.



But we are led to make the further inquiry: What is the "substance" of the three persons of this Trinity? This the creed does not state, but it says that "the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God." Hence all three persons are "Ghost" or Spirit, for, mark you, according to this creed, they are all of one substance. Thus the Son, who "took again His body," is "of one substance" with the Father and the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost is of one substance with the Father, who is without body or parts, and with the Son, who has both body and parts.

The creed further states that these three persons are not only "of one substance," but of "one power and eternity." Hence each is as powerful and as eternal as the others. Again we ask, "What say the Scriptures?" Are the Son and the Holy Spirit equal to the Father? The Father is "the Almighty God" (Gen. 17:1). He whose name alone is Jahwe is "the Most High over all the earth" (Ps. 83:18). There is not another who is higher, or even as high, as He.

Jesus, repeatedly and in a variety of ways acknowledged the superiority of the Father over Himself, and His own inferiority to and dependence upon the Father. "My Father is greater than I" (John 10:29; 14:28). "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do. . . . I can of Mine own self do nothing" (John 5:19, 30).

But what does the creed mean when it speaks of the "Father" and the "Son"? Did not the former beget, or bring into being, the latter? The creed says the Son was "begotten from everlasting of the Father." What this means the creed does not say, and we are left to infer that there never was a time when the Son was not "begotten." In other words, the Son is as old as the Father, and the Father no older than the Son. Yet one is the Father, and the other is the Son. Did "Jesus Christ the Son of the Father" (II John, vs. 3) have a beginning? Was there a time when He was not? The Scriptures clearly teach that Jesus was begotten of the Father in the womb of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:30-32, 35; Matt. 1:20, 21). And it is spe-

cifically stated that because He was to be so begotten by the power of the Holy Spirit, "therefore also that holy thing . . . shall be called the *Son of God*." It will be useful for us to consider the form of words here used. Luke 1:32 says, "He shall be called the Son of the Highest," and vs. 35 says, He shall be "called the Son of God." Therefore God and the Highest are synonyms, having the same meaning. From this we see that God, or the Father of Jesus, is "the Highest," or "the Most High" (Ps. 83:18), and the relation in which Jesus stands to the Highest is, that He is His Son. Therefore Jesus is not one of three persons who together are the Highest. But if Jesus were of "one . . . eternity" with the Father (as well as with the Holy Spirit), He could not be "the Son of the Highest." The Father antedates and begets, or brings into being, the Son. The Son is begotten of the Father, and hence it is impossible for Him to be of "one eternity" with the Father as regards the past. This view is both scriptural and reasonable, and therefore comes within the scope of human comprehension.

The creed says that the Son is "the very and eternal God." The qualifying word "very" in ordinary usage means real, actual, true. So if Jesus was "very God," He was really, actually, and truly God. And since He is also said to be the "eternal God," He was God from eternity. And yet the creed tells us that He was "begotten from everlasting." Thus there never was a time when He was not begotten, and yet the creed styles Him "The Son." What is the truth? Let us again hear the testimony of the Scriptures. Jesus not only directly disclaimed being God, but also definitely affirmed that He was "a Man." "Behold, one came and said unto Him (Jesus), Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And He said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? There is none good but one, that is, God" (Matt. 19:16, 17). Jesus did not claim inherent goodness; and the statement, "There is none good but one, that is, God," shows that He did not claim or imagine that He was God. I am not the good One; it is God. Upon the other hand, Jesus distinctly affirmed that He was a Man. He said to the Jews, "But now ye seek

to kill Me, a Man that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God; this did not Abraham" (John 8:40). The Speaker here affirms that He is "a Man," and very sharply draws the contrast between Himself and God. He, the "Man," had heard the truth of "God." Thus, according to His own words, Jesus was not God, but a Man. Likewise the apostle Peter speaks of "Jesus of Nazareth" as "a Man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by Him in the midst of you," etc. (Acts 2:22). There is no mistaking who this Man was: it was "Jesus of Nazareth." God approved of the Man, and the evidences of His approval were the "miracles and wonders and signs which God did by Him." And as Jesus Himself said, He could do nothing without the Father, but the Father wrought "by Him." Again we have the word of the apostle Paul to Timothy, "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2:5). As to who this "one God" is, the apostle specifies very clearly that it is "the Father" (I Cor. 8:6). Between the one God, the Father, and man there is "one Mediator," and He not a God, but a Man, "the Man Christ Jesus." There is another line of thought touching this matter that is worthy of our attention. The apostle James taught that "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man" (James 1:13). Now, it is a fact that Jesus was not only susceptible of temptation, but was actually tempted, and that "in all points like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15). Since God cannot be tempted, and Jesus *was* tempted, we see that Jesus was not God. But the apostle further says, "Every *man* is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed" (James 1:14). And we see that Jesus was tempted; therefore He was a Man. It may probably be objected that Jesus was tempted on His human side, but not on the divine side. However, we must not lose sight of the statement in the creed that "the two whole and perfect natures—that is to say the Godhead and Manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided." So it matters not what phase of the life of Jesus we are considering, according to the creed we must never divide the two natures of

Jesus, as if He might be tempted on the human side and not on the divine. We are therefore governed by the creed when we keep the two natures inseparably united. From the time those two natures were united into one "in the womb of the Blessed Virgin," according to the creed they are inseparable. If the human nature could be tempted, so could the divine; if the divine could not, neither could the human: for they stand or fall together—that is, if the creed be true. But no amount of argumentation can demonstrate away the fact so clearly brought to view in the Scriptures, viz., that Jesus was tempted, and this because He was a Man, and not God.

The creed not only speaks of the complete and inseparable union between the human and the divine natures in one person, but also teaches that Christ "truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried." Bear in mind that the Son is "of one substance with the Father." If therefore the Son could truly suffer, die, and be buried, so could the Father, He being identically of the same substance with the Son. If the Father could not die and be buried, neither could the Son who was of the same substance with the Father. For it is inconceivable how two persons could be of the same substance: one capable of death and actually dying, and the other incapable of death. And it will not help matters to say that Christ died as to His human nature, but that divine nature could not die; for the two are "never to be divided" according to the creed. If Jesus is "the very and eternal God," and "truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried," then we have the strange anomaly that "the very and eternal God" was "crucified, dead and buried." Reader, can God die? He Himself says, "I live forever" (Deut. 32: 40). He is "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God" (I Tim. 1: 17). He cannot die. Did Jesus die? Yes, He was "killed" (Acts 3: 15), "put to death" (I Pet. 3: 18), and was "dead indeed" (Rom. 6: 11), so that He Himself could say after His resurrection, "I am He that liveth, and *was dead*; and behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen: and have the keys of hell and of death" (Rev. 1: 18). Nor did Jesus raise Himself from the dead by His own power, but He was "raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father" (Rom. 6: 4).



Having been thus raised, and having received of the Father glory and honor, He now can "die no more" (Luke 20: 36); "death has no more dominion over Him" (Rom. 6: 9). This also is clear and intelligible, but the creed leaves us in darkness and confusion.

The creed says, "Whereof (that is, the two natures, human and divine, joined together in one person) is one Christ, very God and very Man." What this was intended to mean is by no means clear. As for the word "Christ," we know that it means Anointed. How, then, could the union of two opposite natures, human and divine, make one Christ, or Anointed? Jesus is God's Anointed in the full sense of the word. How was this done? With what was He anointed to make Him Christ? Not with oil as the priests and kings of Israel had been (Exod. 30: 30; I Sam. 10: 1), but with Holy Spirit, as Jesus and others most clearly set forth. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel" (Luke 4: 18). "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power" (Acts 10: 38). This refers to the anointing at the baptism of Jesus when God gave Him the Spirit in unmeasured fulness (John 3: 34). Then we also read the words of the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, "God *hath made* that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2: 22); and the words of Heb. 1: 9: "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." The last two passages refer to the immortalization of Christ, which was also accomplished by the same anointing Spirit. The first anointing took place at the beginning of Christ's public ministry; the latter after His resurrection. Neither has reference to a union of two natures in the womb of Mary. In fact, no such transaction is mentioned or even hinted at in the remotest way in the Scriptures.

The creed says that Christ "suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us," etc. It is the last statement that calls for remark. How could the death of the very and eternal God reconcile the Father to us? To reconcile

is to restore to friendship or favor, to adjust, to harmonize. Hence if Christ died to reconcile the Father to us, it was to restore the Father to our favor; to adjust Him to us, to harmonize Him with us. The reader will perceive at a glance that this is quite the reverse of the process instituted by the Deity. The Scriptures call upon men to "be reconciled to God" (II Cor. 5:20). We were not the offended party, so that God needed to be reconciled to us; but we were the offenders, and needed to be reconciled to God and His ways. His ways are right; man's ways are wrong. Hence the need of reconciliation with God. How did the death of Christ reconcile the Father to us? The creed again leaves us in darkness. But the Scriptures teach that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). The Son did not give Himself to induce the Father to love, or be friendly toward, the world; but God loved the world, and out of love gave His Son. Quite a difference between the reconciliation contemplated in the creed, and that brought to view in the Scriptures!

Another statement in the creed which calls for remark is this: "As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell." We are not informed as to the nature of this "hell," and hence are left to infer what it is. However, we have a clue in the words, "died and was buried." This descent into hell must therefore be understood as having taken place between the death and the resurrection of Christ. Yet even this does not say what this hell is, nor what Christ did while there. But we are informed in the Scriptures that Christ's soul was not left in hell (the place of the unconscious dead—Eccles. 9:5, 10), and that this had reference to His resurrection (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27-31). Jesus has "the keys of death and of hell" (Rev. 1:18), which gives hope of resurrection to those who have become favorably related to Him as "the Resurrection and the Life" (John 11:24, 25). When "the time of the dead" shall come (Rev. 11:18), the sea, death, and hell shall give up the dead which are in them (Rev. 20:13), and when the worthy shall have put

on incorruption and immortality, "then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave (margin, 'hell'), where is thy victory? But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord" (I Cor. 15: 51-58). This is also clear, while the creed makes a proposition that leaves the mind in uncertainty and unsatisfied.

Lastly, the creed not only makes the Holy Spirit a person, but "the very and eternal God." Yet it offers no kind of proof in support of this proposition. I grant it is true, as Jesus taught, that "God is Spirit" (John 4: 24), but it is also a fact that the Holy Spirit is "the Spirit of God" (Rom. 8: 14). The Spirit proceeds from the Father (John 15: 26), who alone is God. God is Spirit in substance; Spirit focalized in a person. The Spirit of God is Spirit in diffusion, going out and radiating from His person and presence, and performing His pleasure. The psalmist said, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me, yes, the darkness hideth not from Thee: but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to Thee" (Ps. 139: 7-12). Thus God is shown to be everywhere present, not personally (for God is in heaven, His "dwelling place"—II Chron. 6: 30), but by His Spirit flowing out from His presence. God is personally in heaven, man upon the earth (Eccles. 5: 2). When Jesus went to the Father, He went to heaven. We read, "So after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God" (Mark 16: 19). If God were everywhere personally present in the same sense, it would not have been necessary for Jesus to ascend to heaven. But though God is everywhere present by His all pervading Spirit, He is personally present in a place which the Scriptures style "heaven," and in this sense in no other place.

The question will arise, How is it that men of intelligence would adopt a statement of faith which is manifestly at variance with the plain declarations of the Scriptures? I must first remind the reader that the doctrine of the Trinity is not to be found in the Bible. Robert Flint, professor of divinity at Edinburgh, said, "The propositions constitutive of the dogma of the Trinity were not drawn directly from the New Testament, and could not be expressed in New Testament terms. They were the products of reason speculating on a revelation to faith. . . . They were only formed through centuries of effort, only elaborated by the aid of the conceptions and formulated in the terms of Greek and Roman metaphysics" (*Enc. Brit.*, XXIII. 240). The Greek word *triados*, as expressive of a Trinity, was first introduced into the Christian vocabulary by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, in the year A. D. 168. The conception of a trinity of persons in one God is foreign alike to the Old and New Testaments. The theology of the Bible is monotheistic, that is, that God is one person. The Trinity is a heathen conception. Lao-tse, the great philosopher to whom the Chinese pay almost divine honors, who lived B. C. 600, says: "Tao is by nature one: the first begat the second; both together brought forth the third; these three made all things." The Indian Trimurti (or Trinity) is Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, who are also represented and worshiped as three persons, though the original divine principle is but one. One of their sacred writings plainly declares that the great unity is to be distinctly recognized as three Gods in one person. In the *Rigveda* it is said, "There are three deities, but there is only one Godhead, the great soul." Almost all religions, except that of the Bible, have a plurality of Gods, or of persons in the Godhead. Binney's *Theological Compend* says, "Nearly all pagan nations of antiquity acknowledged a trinity, which is no mean evidence of the truth of this doctrine." It is therefore little wonder that when men of philosophic minds, who had never really been converted to the truth of the Bible, gained an entrance into the church in the second and third centuries, they brought a flood of false teachings with them, and in this way soon introduced doctrines which are contrary to the Word



of God. And once the false doctrines were introduced and got a foothold, men would cast about for supports for them in Scripture terms. And when once Bible terms were brought forward in support of foreign doctrines, it was next to impossible for those not versed in philosophy to resist the current of false teaching.

When we contend that the Father alone is God, our attention is directed to the statement of Jesus, "I and My Father are one" (John 10:30); and the objectors say, "How can Jesus and the Father be one if the doctrine of the Trinity is not true?" However, our friends need to be reminded that Jesus did not say, "I and the Father and the Holy Spirit are one God." Far from it! But unless the words of Jesus had this import, this passage can have no bearing upon the doctrine of the Trinity. If he meant to say that He and the Father were one God, this passage would at the most prove a duality in the Godhead, and still not a trinity. But the question is, In what sense were Jesus and the Father "one"? He did not say "one God," and in order to make His words mean this, we should have to read that thought into them. But there is a sense in which these words were true. We have an indication in the words of Jesus in that most remarkable prayer He made, "That they (whom the Father had given Him) may be *one as we are*. . . . That they may be *one, even as we are one*" (John 17: 11, 22). Those given to Jesus by the Father comprise, besides the twelve apostles, "all them also which should believe on Him through their word" (vs. 20)—a vast number, certainly. And these were all to be one, even as Jesus and the Father were one. The oneness between Jesus and the Father is to be the standard of the oneness that is to subsist between them "all." Are they all to be one God? This will not be claimed. Then the sense of the words cannot be that Jesus and the Father were one God, and hence they must be one in some other sense. Are His words susceptible of some other construction? They are. He and the Father were one in the sense that they were of one mind. This is expressed in the words of Jesus, "The Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (John 5: 17). He always did those things which were

well-pleasing to the Father, and the Father repeatedly attested His pleasure with the Son.

Moreover, Jesus acknowledged the Father as His God, not only during His mortal life, but also since His resurrection and glorification and ascension. When He was expiring on the cross, He said, "*My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?*" (Mark 15:34). After His resurrection He said to Mary, "Say to My brethren, I ascend unto My Father, and your Father; and to *My God, and your God*" (John 20:17). And since His glorification He sent word to the churches, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *My God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, which is new Jerusalem which cometh down out of heaven from My God, and I will write upon him My new name*" (Rev. 3:12). Now if Jesus is, as the creed states, "the very and eternal God," it would be absurd for Him to speak of another as "My God." His words prove that He was not God, and that God was higher than He. And this since His glorification as well as before.

The Revelation was given to Jesus Christ, by whom? The opening words of the book inform us that it is "the revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto Him" (Rev. 1:1). Did one person of the Godhead reveal something to another who was "the very and eternal God," and "of one substance, power, and eternity" with the other? It would be needless and useless for one who is in every respect the equal of the other to receive from the other a revelation concerning matters of which He was as well informed as the other. But if we accept the statement of the apostle Paul, that "Christ is God's" (I Cor. 3:23), all becomes clear. Christ is not God, but "God's," that is, God's possession or His Agent. The Possessor is God; the possessed is Christ. The possessor has power over and controls his possession; in like manner God has power over and controls Jesus Christ. God sent Jesus Christ into the world, of which fact the apostles were witnesses (I John 4:14). He anointed Him with Holy Spirit, and did works by Him (Acts 10:38; 2:22). He raised Him from the dead (Rom. 6:4). He received

Him to His own right hand in the heavens, and the heavens must receive Him until the times of the restitution of all things which God spake by the mouth of all His holy prophets (Acts 3:21), and will "judge (or rule) the world in righteousness by the Man whom He hath ordained, whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead" (Acts 17:31). Thus we see that "Christ is God's" in every sense of the word, and He and the Father are "one," working in unison for the accomplishment of God's great purpose in the earth.

Once again let me revert to the words of Jesus in the prayer above referred to, "And this is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent" (John 17:3). Since eternal life is involved in such knowledge, we may be assured that God has not failed to give us that knowledge in a form that is within the scope of our comprehension. As the apostle Peter wrote, "His divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who hath called us to glory and virtue" (II Pet. 1:3). "The light of the knowledge of the glory of God" is "in the face of Jesus Christ," as Paul informs us (II Cor. 4:6). If we then approach Jesus Christ, and humbly listen to His "words of eternal life" (John 6:63, 68), we shall gain that knowledge of the true God and His Son Jesus Christ that tends to eternal life. Did Jesus either in His words or in His person reveal three persons as constituting "the only true God?" He repeatedly disclaimed being God, but avowed that He was God's Son. He said that He by the Spirit of God cast out demons (Matt. 12:28), but He never asserted that either He or the Spirit were God. What the Scriptures reveal concerning the only true God is clear and comprehensible, but the dogma of a trinity of persons in one God is not merely "a great mystery," as its friends and defenders are pleased to style it, but a labyrinth of contradictions, and totally incomprehensible to the divinely given understanding. It contains no element that begets admiration or veneration. No wonder therefore that there is so little interest in it among the masses, and that growing numbers, not only of laymen, but also of the

clergy, are turning away from it! In the clear statements of the Word of God there is relief from the doubt and perplexity engendered by this doctrine.

I do not claim to have covered this subject fully, but have endeavored to direct the reader's attention to the propositions of the man-made creed upon the one hand, and the doctrine of the inspired Word of God on the other, and I now leave the matter with the reader himself. I assure him that personal search of the Scriptures will bring to light a greater array of testimony to the same purpose as that here brought to view, and personal reflection will disclose additional beauties that call forth the sincere admiration of the devout mind.



## THE SPIRIT SHALL RETURN UNTO GOD WHO GAVE IT (ECCL. 12:7)

When we tell people that man is mortal (Job 4:17), that he dies wholly on account of sin, and that in death there is no remembrance of God (Psa. 6:5), they refer triumphantly to the statement at the head of this article, to prove, as they imagine, that "there is a part of man which never dies." In citing this passage in favor of the immortality of the soul, they assume the very thing they wish to prove. Let us take a calm view of this passage and its connections, and it will be found in perfect harmony with the rest of the Bible teaching on the condition of man in life and in death.

The existence of God is taken for granted in this verse, though in other portions of Scripture it is set forth dogmatically. "There is a God in heaven, that revealeth secrets," said the prophet Daniel in presence of the haughty monarch of Babylon (Dan. 2:28).

The *God who is* "gave" something to something. That which was given passed from the "God who gave it" to that to which it was given. That which He "gave" is termed "the spirit." To whom was it given? To man. Was that which was given a being endowed with consciousness before and at the time so given? Did it have personality? Men who dogmatize on the immortality of the soul should engage their thoughts along this line. Their teaching is one-sided and inconsistent. They have much to say about the conscious existence of the immortal soul after the dissolution of the body, but we hear them say nothing about how or when this soul became conscious—in short, when it began to be a soul. If "the spirit" in

the Scripture under discussion is the same as the theological immortal soul, was it conscious before being given? We would not evade the statement that "the body without the spirit (margin—breath) is dead" (James 2:26). The very "giving" of "the spirit" (Eccl. 12:7) implies a necessity. But there are a few questions of which we should not lose sight. If that "spirit" was not endowed with consciousness before being given to man, upon what reasonable grounds can it be argued that there will be consciousness when it "shall return unto God who gave it"? It is a fact that we have no recollection of what transpired before the spirit was given. It is an unwarranted assumption that it will be conscious when it returns unto God who gave it. When the question of previous consciousness and knowledge is properly considered, the argument for consciousness after death falls flat.

What is "the spirit" when it returns "unto God who gave it"? Is it a man? a woman? an angel? a saint? a sinner? Was it pure and sinless when it was given? Is it so when it returns unto God who gave it? Or does the fact that "the spirit" animates "the body" (James 2:26) modify its condition? If this is affirmed, what modifies that spirit? Does the body, or do external conditions? If either, would not the inevitable tendency be downward? In this case no spirit returns unto God pure and holy. The fact is, "the body without the spirit is dead"; and how a body which of itself is lifeless could influence a spirit for evil or good is not so easy to imagine, much less to say. Let it be steadfastly kept in mind that "the spirit shall *return* (not *go*) unto God who gave it." It is no more "the spirit" when it "returns unto God" than it was when He "gave it." Whatever entitles it to the distinction of "the spirit" when it "returns" belonged to it when God "gave it."

It is assumed that the statement under consideration means, "The immortal soul goes to heaven." Be it remembered, "The spirit shall return unto God," goes back to where it was before it was given. It was "the spirit" *before* God "gave it." It was "the spirit" *when* He "gave it," and will be the same "spirit" when it *returns* "unto God who gave it." I repeat these things in order to rivet them upon the reader's attention.

It is supposed that when "the spirit shall return to God who gave it," a sentient being with thought, volition, and emotions takes its flight upward, away from the earth, and passes through space into heaven. But stop and reflect a moment. The earth is supposed to be a globe. If six men die at the same time at six different points of the earth, and they each go up, or away from the earth, the longer they go, the farther they will be apart. Do not dismiss this matter with a sneer. It needs and deserves looking into along with the rest.

Whose "spirit shall return unto God who gave it"? A further question will answer this one. In the first part of our text it is said, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was." Question: Whose dust returns to the earth? Man's, when he is dead. Which man? Every man, whether good or bad. There is no difference. Then since the first statement applies to all, good and bad alike, why should not the second? No difference is made between "the spirit" of a good man and "the spirit" of a wicked man. All men have this "spirit," and when "the dust shall return to the earth as it was the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

Theology has it something like this, "The immortal soul of a good man goes to God who gave it, and the immortal soul of a wicked man goes to a hell of eternal torture (who gave it?)." This is not, of course, very consistent, but it is the only conclusion you can reach from the premise of the immortality of the soul. If "the dust" of the most pious "returns to the earth as it was," then with equal reason does "the spirit" of the most wicked person "return unto God who gave it."

There is an adverb in this statement which we must not overlook. "Then shall," etc. Question: When? When "the silver cord is loosed, and the golden bowl is broken, and the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel is broken at the cistern" (vs. 6). "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was." All of which is but the culmination of "the evil days" and "the years . . . in which thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them." People want to die and go to heaven. They try to make themselves and others believe that their dying day will be a happy one, though they take medicine and do all in

their power to ward off death and keep out of heaven as long as possible. They really feel like Hezekiah felt when he was about to go to the gates of *Sheol*—they “chatter like a crane or a swallow” (Isa. 38:14). Solomon had “no pleasure” in the days which culminate in the return of the dust to the earth as it was, and the return of the spirit unto God who gave it, and he knew there would be others to share this feeling with him.

What is that spirit which God gave to man? “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). This is the simple narrative of man’s creation, indorsed by the apostle Paul (I Cor. 15:45-47). Thus we see very clearly:

1. God formed man.
2. He formed him out of the dust of the ground (of the earth).
3. He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.
4. Man became a living soul.

If anything further was done with man or added to him, to make him what he was, the record does not state it. Job said that “the spirit of God” was in his nostrils (margin, “That is, the breath which God gave him”) (Job 27:3). This spirit (or breath) “God gave him” when He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. It is the same breath (or spirit) referred to in Eccl. 3:19, 20, where it is said, “Yea, they (man and beast) have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.” Where was “the spirit” before God “gave it?” Do you say “in heaven”? In that case a spirit will return to heaven from whence it came. But where is your authority? Surely, the text does not say so. Read the first chapter of Genesis. “And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” This is that which was in Job’s nostrils, and is the element which causes man to live. When “the spirit” leaves the man and returns “unto God who gave it,” it goes back to the fountain of life (Psa. 36:9), which supplies all creatures with life and consciousness.



With God there is no less life, because He gives of His spirit to quicken man, and no more when that same spirit returns to Him. That spirit is not a person with consciousness or individuality, but the vital element that acts upon the organism of man, causing him to live and move, and when it returns unto God who gave it goes back to the great reservoir of life. In Ezek., chap. 37, this "breath" came into the dead, and they lived. No immortal souls or immortal or deathless spirits came down from heaven, but "breath" came "from the four winds" and breathed upon the slain, and they lived. At the raising of Lazarus (John, chap. 11), that which had been laid in the tomb was by the Lord called "Lazarus." Lazarus, "our friend," had not taken his flight to heaven, was not called and did not come from thence, but "came forth" from the "place" where he had been "laid" by human hands before.

Thus, then, Eccl. 12:7, when duly considered in all its bearings, and divested of all preconceived notions, so far from teaching the immortality of the soul, teaches the exact opposite. The man of theology is immortal, does not die, and needs no resurrection, while the man of the Bible is mortal, He is buried, and needs a resurrection in order to live again. "Let God be true."

---

### THE SPIRITS IN PRISON (I PET. 3:18-20)

As far as those are concerned who accept the Bible teaching on the condition of man in life and death, they have no difficulty with the passage above referred to. There are so many passages scattered all over the Bible that clearly teach the mortality of man, and that in death there is no remembrance of God, that there can be no reasonable doubt as to the fact. It must be admitted, to begin with, that a few obscure statements in the Bible cannot be taken to contradict or overthrow the meaning of dozens or scores that are clear. This is true of the passage above referred to. Is it a fact that in death there is no remembrance of God? The Scriptures say so (Psa. 6:5). Does

the Bible teach that there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave (Heb. *sheol*), whither thou goest? It does (Eccles. 9:10). Does it teach that the dead know not anything? It does (Eccles. 9:5). All this being true, could the Bible at the same time teach that dead men are conscious? that they know more than the living? That is impossible.

Let us now examine I Pet. 3:18-20. Here we have the following statement: (1) Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust. (2) The object was, that He might bring us to God. (3) Being put to death in the flesh. (4) But quickened by the spirit. (5) By which (Gr. *en ho*, in which) also He went, and preached to the spirits in prison. (6) Which (spirits) some time were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah. (7) This was while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.

The crucial point seems to be Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison. Mark well, this does not say or even hint that He preached to *disembodied* spirits. They were spirits "which some time were disobedient . . . in the days of Noah." If this Scripture taught that the preaching was simply to disembodied ghosts, there would be no need of specifying a particular class of spirits, as is the case here. But why did Christ preach to those spirits? And what did He preach? Was it the gospel? Was it with a view to their salvation? Did they repent? Let us notice in what manner this preaching was done, which will help to determine when it was. "By which (spirit, by which He was quickened after being put to death in the flesh) He also went and preached." So it was by the same spirit which quickened Him that He preached, and not a personal visit to the so-called "spirit-world" between His death and resurrection. When were those spirits disobedient? In the days of Noah while the ark was preparing. What did they disobey? The preaching which they heard. Who preached to them? "Noah, the eighth person, a preacher" (II Pet. 2:5). What did he preach? "A preacher of righteousness." How did he preach? By the Spirit of God which was in him,

because he "walked with God" (Gen. 6: 3, 9). In vs. 3 "the Lord said My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be 120 years." That "spirit" was then "striving" with those fleshly men, but would not and did "not always strive."

But it says Christ "went and preached to the *spirits* in prison." True. And this is not the only time when living persons are styled "spirits." John the beloved disciple wrote, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God" (I John 4: 1). Are we to "try" disembodied ghosts "whether they be of God?" If so, how can we do this? We are not required to do anything of that kind. "Try the spirits. . . . because many false prophets are gone out into the world." These "spirits," or false prophets, did not confess "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." They were living men, whose teaching was to be subject to the test here mentioned. In like manner, the spirits to whom Christ preached by the Spirit, were men.

But what about the statement that "he *went* and preached?" Does not this prove that Christ "went" in person and preached? That does not follow. "By *which* (spirit) he went." He "went" by the spirit which quickened Him. Notice a statement of Paul's which will throw light on the verb "went." "And *came* and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh" (Ephes. 2: 17). Did Christ who "came and preached" personally preach at Ephesus? If He did, we have no record of the fact. But preaching was done there by someone. By whom? By Paul and others (Acts, chaps. 19 and 20).

Where was Christ in the interval of His death and resurrection? The apostle Paul tells us "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried" (I Cor. 15: 1-4). Jesus Himself had said that "the Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12: 40). And Paul further says, "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" (Ephes. 4: 9). And Peter, speaking of His resurrection, says, "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you

of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. 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" (Gr. *hades*, "grave"), neither His flesh did see corruption. *This Jesus* hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses (Acts 2: 29-32). "This Jesus" had been dead, was raised up, and therefore His soul was not left in *hades*, neither His flesh did see corruption. After He had risen, the angel said to the women, "Come and see the place where *the Lord* lay" (Matt. 28:6). These Scriptures show the whereabouts of Jesus while He was dead. Thus we see that this Scripture, when examined in the light of other Scriptures, does not teach that an immortal soul of Christ went to the abode of departed (?) spirits and preached to them (to what purpose we would be left to conjecture), but He preached to the antediluvians, through Noah, by the same spirit by which He Himself was quickened after having been put to death in the flesh.

---

## IN THE BODY; OUT OF THE BODY

(II COR. 12:2, 3)

The above passage is supposed to teach that a man can be in a conscious state while dead as well as while he is alive. If Paul here taught that doctrine, he was greatly at variance with other portions of his own writings, and the Scriptures in general. Neither does this Scripture teach that Paul went to the theological "heaven" where immortal souls are supposed to go "when the body dies." We can avoid a great deal of misunderstanding of Scripture by giving due attention to everything an author says on any given subject. About what is Paul writing in this chapter? What prompts him to use the terms here employed? "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord," says Paul (vs. 1). Let us "come to" these, and



follow his line of thought. He knew a man above fourteen years ago (whether in the body or out of the body, he could not tell; God knew), that such a man was caught up to the third heaven and paradise, and heard words which he was not permitted to speak (vss. 2, 4). This he calls "visions and revelations of the Lord." In these "visions" he saw things which added to his stock of knowledge of divine matters, and these he styles "revelations." This was perfectly in keeping with God's manner and methods of making "revelations" of His will concerning mankind. We would not rob any term here employed of its meaning or import. Yet I cannot help calling the reader's attention to the Greek verb, here translated "caught up"—*harpazo*. It is found ten times in the New Testament. The preposition "up" is not in the original, so that we are not obliged to read "caught up." We might as well read "caught down," as far as the requirements of the original are concerned. It depends upon the context and general import of the text what preposition to use. We find the same verb in Acts 8:39, where it is said that "the Spirit of the Lord caught away (Gr. *eerpasen*) Philip." The latter was conveyed away bodily. In our chapter is a man who is caught away as far as the third heaven and paradise, but whether bodily or not he is not able to say. The terms "in the body" and "out of the body" are found in other parts of Paul's writing (see I Cor. 6:18-20). "Every sin that a man doeth (except fornication) is without the body" (*ektos tou somatos*). This is precisely the same as "out of the body" (*ektos tou somatos*) in II Cor. 12:2, 3. Did the apostle mean that sins other than fornication are committed without any relation to the body, or in a disembodied state? What about theft? or murder? or swearing? Is not the body concerned in them? Certainly. Yet they are *ektos tou somatos*. Since the term "out of the body" in one case manifestly does not refer to a disembodied state, why should the other, especially in the entire absence of such teaching from the Bible?

Where was this man while thus "conveyed away"? As far as the third heaven and paradise. What heaven? Men are in the habit of dividing heaven into three stories: (1) the atmospheric heaven; (2) the planetary heaven; (3) the place of God's

abode. And the supposition is that Paul was caught up into the presence of God. Bear in mind, Paul did not pretend to know whether in the body or out of the body; therefore let no one dogmatize that a disembodied spirit went to heaven. There is as good reason to affirm that a literal, tangible body went to heaven, as far as this language is concerned. God only knows the exact manner in which he was conveyed away. What was the object of this "vision"? The apostle does not say except to associate the idea of "revelations" with "visions." What was revealed to him he was not permitted to tell. No doubt it was for his good and that of the ecclesia. If this proves anything in favor of going to heaven, either in or out of the body, it is difficult to see where the proof lies. He states that such a one was conveyed away to the third heaven and paradise. What heaven? "The third." We read in the epistles of Peter of "the heavens" which "were of old and the earth standing out of water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth which are now (in distinction from 'the heavens and the earth' constituting 'the world that then was') by the same word are kept in store, reserved against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (II Pet. 3:1-7). Here we have two "heavens and earth" in succession. Is there a third? "We, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (vs. 13). Here is a third. Paul was caught away to "the third." In connection with this he saw "paradise." We understand that paradise was once upon the earth. Does it exist now? Not on the earth, as far as we know. Is it in heaven? If it is, we have no record of the transfer. Paradise with all its beauty and loveliness is to be restored. The curse pronounced upon the ground because of man's transgression (Gen. 3:17) is to be taken away, so that "there shall be no more curse" (where it was—on the ground) (Rev. 22:3). The overcomer has the promise of eating of the tree (wood) of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God (Rev. 2:7) The tree (or wood) of life is on either side of the river issuing from the throne of God and the Lamb (Rev. 22:1). That river is in the midst of the street of the Holy

City which John saw coming down from God out of heaven (Rev. 21: 1-3). That city came down when the new heaven and earth were established (Paul's "third heaven"). Here are some of the features of the first paradise: The tree of life, with its fruit for the overcomer and healing for the nations; the river of water of life; no more curse, no sorrow, no crying, no more pain; all these done away, as belonging to "the former things," the "former heaven and earth" in which we now move (Gen. 2: 8-15; Rev., chaps. 21, 22). The things which Paul saw in his "visions" seemed so lifelike and real that he was unable to tell whether he was conveyed away bodily or in spirit, as the prophet (Ezek. 8: 3) and others. Here the prophet says, "The spirit lifted me up between the earth and heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem." He was not lifted up bodily, for he himself says it was "in the visions of God."

---

## WHO ARE THE CHRISTADELPHIANS, AND WHAT DO THEY BELIEVE?

BY JOHN W. LEA

The name "Christadelphian" is derived from two Greek words, *Christou adelphoi*, signifying "brethren of Christ." The founder of the sect was John Thomas, who, having obtained his medical diploma in London, emigrated to America in 1832. On the voyage a terrible storm arose and threatened the ship with destruction. It caused Dr. Thomas to reflect upon his position in case of shipwreck, and ask, "Where would he be? What was his hope?" Being unable to satisfactorily answer these questions he resolved that if ever he landed safely he would investigate the Scriptures and religious matters generally. He accordingly united himself with a body called Campbellites, but soon found that his scriptural inquiry led him to conclusions opposed to those forming the basis of that sect. He began to see that many things taught by them in common with the majority of the other sects were not sup-

ported by the Word of God. He made known his conclusions, which produced a great stir in the church. He could not reject the Word of God for the teaching of man, and because he would not cease to make known his discoveries he was cut off from fellowship. Being convinced of the importance of the newly found truths, he began to publicly proclaim them, and gathered around him a number who were convinced by his preaching and confirmed in their conviction by their own private study of Scripture. Ecclesias or assemblies of believers, were established in many parts of America, and the Doctor visited England and Scotland in 1848 and again in 1862 and 1869, delivering many lectures on his beliefs and founding numerous ecclesias. Into these ecclesias admission was gained by baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins, after a satisfactory confession of faith in the things revealed in the Scriptures concerning the kingdom of God and the saving name of Jesus Christ. Such believers meet together on the first day of the week, according to Christ's ordinance, for the breaking of bread in remembrance of Him, and for the public proclamation of the truths which they believe. Dr. Thomas died at Jersey City in 1871 and was buried in Brooklyn, and until this day the work which he began has been continued by those who were converted through his instrumentality; the same truths are held and the same conditions of fellowship obtain. "The Bible True," is the Christadelphian motto, and they contend that in many matters the speculations of men have been allowed to supersede the teaching of the Scriptures, and they feel bound to proclaim what they believe and to recommend that all who hear should act as the Bereans did of whom Paul said, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, examining the Scriptures daily whether these things were so. Many of them therefore believed" (Acts 17:11, 12).

An outline of the Christadelphian faith is presented in the following propositions:

1.—GOD IS. The existence of God is abundantly testified both by Nature and by revelation. "He that cometh to



God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him" (Heb. 11:6).

2.—**GOD HAS SPOKEN.** The Bible is a revelation whereby God has made known to man what His purpose is, and what is man's nature and destiny, and is the only reliable source of information upon these matters. "To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them" (Isaiah 8:20).

3.—**THERE HAS BEEN A GREAT DEPARTURE FROM APOSTOLIC TRUTH.** Since the days of Jesus and His apostles false teachers have crept into the church, and the bulk of modern theological teaching is a mixture of Christian doctrine and Pagan speculation. "But the Spirit saith expressly, that in latter time some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies" (I Tim. 6:1, 2).

4.—**THERE IS ONE GOD.** Instead of there being a Trinity of co-equal, co-eternal Gods, there is one God, out of whom are all things, even the Spirit and the Son. "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through Him (I Cor. 8:6).

5.—**JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD AND NOT GOD THE SON.** He was not co-existent with the Father from all eternity, but was begotten of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit. "He was in all things made like His brethren" (Heb. 2:17) and was "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

6.—**THE HOLY SPIRIT IS NOT A PERSON.** The Holy Spirit is not a third person in the Godhead, but the medium whereby the one God fills all space and executes His will.

7.—**MAN IS MORTAL.** By nature man is mortal, and the doctrine of the soul's natural immortality is a pagan myth; man is never in Scripture spoken of as immortal. Death is never in Scripture spoken of as a continuation of life in some other sphere, but as a state of complete unconsciousness. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not

anything . . . as well their love as their hatred and their envy is now perished" (Eccles. 9: 5, 6). "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish" (Psa. 144: 4). "The grave cannot praise Thee, death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down unto the pit cannot hope for Thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise Thee as I do this day" (Isa. 38: 18, 19).

8.—FUTURE LIFE IS POSSIBLE THROUGH RESURRECTION. What God has done for Jesus in raising Him from death to endless life, He will do for all who believe on Him through Jesus and serve Him faithfully during this time of probation. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him (I Thess. 4: 14).

9.—THE KINGDOM OF GOD WILL BE ON EARTH. The kingdom of God is not the church, nor a realm beyond the skies, but a divine political organization to be established on earth, radiating from Jerusalem as center, to the uttermost parts of the earth. "And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him" (Dan. 4: 27).

10.—THE JEWS WILL BE RESTORED TO THEIR OWN LAND. As the center of God's future kingdom, the Jews will be gathered to their own land. "He that scattered Israel will gather him and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock" (Jer. 31: 10). "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the nations whither they be gone and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land, upon the mountains of Israel: and one king shall be king to them all" (Ezek. 37: 21, 22).

11.—JESUS CHRIST WILL RETURN TO THE EARTH AS KING. He is to reign as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and King of the Jews. Once they rejected Him, but Zechariah has said of His coming again: "They shall look unto Him whom they

have pierced" (Zech. 12: 10). At that time "all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him" (Psa. 72: 11).

12.—THE PROMISES MADE TO THE FATHERS WILL BE REALIZED IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD. The promises God made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had reference to the day of Christ's kingdom and glory, when all nations shall be blessed in Abraham and his Seed. "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises, God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect" (Heb. 11: 39, 40).

13.—THE RETURN OF CHRIST was promised by Himself, and confirmed by angels and apostles, and will shortly take place, for the purpose of fulfilling the promises: "This Jesus which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven" (Acts 1: 11).

14.—That the doctrines of HEAVEN-GOING and of ETERNAL TORMENT IN HELL are UNTRUE.

15.—That there is no supernatural personal DEVIL, the devil being a personification of sin in all its forms.

16.—THAT BAPTISM IS ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mark 16: 15, 16).









G. E. Marsh Memorial Library, Church of God  
General Conference: McDonough, GA; <https://cogc.org/>