

RECTIFICATION

CHAPTERS DEVOTED TO THE REFUTATION OF SUBTLE ERRORS, AND
DEMONSTRATION OF TRUTHS ON MORTALITY, SINFUL FLESH, IMMORTALITY AND
INCORRUPTIBILITY, BEING

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS

**Was Man Made Mortal? What is Mortality? What is Sinful Flesh? What Is Immortality?
What Is Incorruptibility? Was Jesus Mortal? Was Jesus Made of Sinful Flesh? When
Was Jesus Immortalized? When will His true brethren be Immortalized.**

By Thomas Williams

INTRODUCTION

The history of Gospel Truth has been one of many ups-and-downs. When freshly revived from the effects of the wounds received in the house of its friends, it has for short seasons been nourished, loved, and defended; but sooner or later - mostly sooner - subtle errors have crept in among its supporters, gradually and steadily supplanting it, not by openly denying its plainest principles; but by so mystifying some of its more difficult elements as to destroy its saving power.

Before the latter-day revival of the Truth as a system of salvation, there was not one of its fundamental principles that could not be found in the literature of religious authors; but these were fragments powerless to save, since they were as helpless individual Israelites among hostile and ferocious Philistines. Of the principles of the Truth, possessed of the power to save, it must be recognized that "United they stand; divided they fall."

Whether the Truth is to suffer another fall before the Lord comes is a question; but if not, it will not be because of having been spared exposure to blighting winds of false doctrines. If the question we have now proposed to give special attention to, seem to some to be harmless and needless of attention, it is because their present dangerous attitude is not known and their forthcoming fatal effects are not foreseen. "While they slept an enemy sowed tares." Whatever the dark future may have in store for that precious Truth which has spent so much of its history in exile as a homeless wanderer, its true friends must stand by, watch, quit themselves like men, and be strong.

In making these introductory remarks we are quite well aware that those who have unfortunately fallen into the errors that are to be the subjects of our warning will, perhaps honestly, regard us as egotistic, perhaps conceited; but a zealous, valiant fight for right is often nicknamed "Egotism;" and confidence in the right, branded "conceit." To be frank, however, but

not conceited nor egotistic, we believe we can refute the errors and rectify the wrongs, by the help of the Word of God. This belief, yes, this confidence, is what gives us the needed courage to undertake it; and it is our candid belief that refutation is needful and rectification desirable that we must offer as - apology? No, it calls not for apology. What then? - that we must offer as a *reason* for inviting our readers to the consideration of Mortality, its origin and meaning.

Mortality, Its Origin and Meaning

There are subjects which in themselves are not of much importance, while in their bearings upon other subjects they are of vital importance. For example, the belief that the dead are immortalized in the process of resurrection or immediately upon their emergence from the grave, would be almost harmless apart from its bearing upon the doctrine of the judgment-seat of Christ. It is in its nullifying bearings its danger becomes apparent; and a comprehensive view reveals it as one of many "traditions which make the word of God of none effect."

There has been much dispute on the origin of mortality, some claiming that Adam was created mortal; others, that he became mortal by sin. The vital importance of the question is found in its bearings upon God's plan of salvation generally.

The meaning of mortality will help to the discovery of its origin, and the two aspects - its meaning and its origin - will be found to be mutually helpful. But there are two meanings, rather, the word mortal has two aspects - one legal, the other physical. While the dictionary will give us the meaning of the word mortal in the legal sense, the Scriptures only can give us the full meaning in the physical sense. But I must explain what I mean by legal mortality and physical mortality, and show the difference.

The dictionary gives as the meaning of "mortal," "destined to die, subject to death." To be destined to die is to be the subject of a decree which declares that the one concerned shall die. "Destined to die," therefore, is legal mortality because it is a sentence of law; and for one to be the subject of such a sentence is for him to be mortal according to law.

Now this kind of mortality may exist and yet the physical nature of the subject not be affected. A criminal at the bar is not legally destined to die for his crime until the sentence is pronounced; and the passing of the sentence does not change the physical condition of the criminal; therefore before the sentence is passed he is not legally mortal; but when the sentence is passed he is legally mortal. As to destiny, allowance must be made for the difference between the finite and the Infinite. Since all things are foreknown to God, all things are destined; but their destiny is in many cases predicated upon conditions that are to arise. From the stand-point of the finite, the destiny is not seen before the condition, or cause, arises. If we mentally transport ourselves back to Eden before many fell, deprived of the knowledge which developments have since imparted, we must say that man is now at our transported view point, before man has sinned, *not mortal* in the legal sense, because the law he is under has not yet decreed death, and cannot, until he produces the cause - sin. As soon as he sinned the cause arose and the effect followed in his becoming destined to die according to law, and this is what we, for convenience, have termed "legal mortality."

But while we are away back in Eden and can only see that if man sin he will become mortal, or "destined to die," we do not know whether he will sin or not; but since the future is known to God, *He* knows what Adam, in the exercise of his free volition, will do, and therefore knows that the law will decree his destiny to death. Therefore in this sense, from the standpoint of the Infinite, man is destined to die, because God knows that he will produce the cause. God can judge from the remote; we can judge only from the direct; God from the illimitable distance; we from the limited nearby.

Now that the reader may not think our distinction between "legal mortality" and "physical mortality" is artificial and a distinction without a difference, we will give a case where there is physical mortality in the absence of legal mortality, a case that the enlightened reader will readily understand and appreciate. Let us transport ourselves mentally to the judgment-seat of Christ, and fix our eyes upon the approved. They have appeared there in those "mortal bodies" that are to be "swallowed up of life;" they have been judged and approved. A certain time must elapse between the declaration of approval and the "mortal putting on immortality." During this time, are they "destined to die?" Of course not; then they are not "legally mortal." But are they anything but mortal physically? There is only one kind of mortality here to be "swallowed up of life," and that is the kind of mortality that we must be most concerned about, and it is the element in the case that is vital; and, moreover, it is a vital element of the gospel that is made of none effect by theorists who are contending that Adam was made mortal, and who are manifesting their superficiality in ridiculing some writers for saying that Adam before he sinned was neither mortal or immortal.

There are a few well-meaning brethren who, without carefully reflecting upon the bearings of the theory that man was made mortal, are impressed with it as a clever discovery, that God created Adam mortal, and then gave him the tree of life to hold in check the ravages of mortality so long as Adam remained obedient; and after he sinned all that was needful was exclusion from the tree of life, when and whereby the Divinely created ravages of mortality were left to do their fatal work unchecked. I say, to some well-meaning brethren this commends itself, but when the subject is more profoundly considered, they will see that its effects upon the fundamental principles of the Truth are as fatal as mortality is in its ravages in our nature, which evokes the cry, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?"

One way of arriving at a correct knowledge of the origin and meaning of mortality is to ask and consider, Is it a good thing? or is it a bad thing? If it is a good thing, we can believe that it was part of the work of the creation, and that it may have existed before sin, and that it was a part of the "every thing" which God, before sin entered, pronounced "very good." On the other hand, if it is a bad thing, no reasonable mind can, after careful reflection, believe that God created it before there was any other bad thing in existence; because it requires a bad thing to produce a bad thing, upon the principle that like produces like. Two things may be good in degree, one of them not as good as the other; but this does not mean that the one is bad, because a lesser degree of goodness is not badness. The "heavenly" nature of the angels is good, and the earthly nature in which they created Adam was good, but not as good as the "heavenly." But neither was bad. If, then, we find that mortality is a bad thing, we shall thereby know that it was not an element of the "very good" earthly nature of Adam when he was created and before he sinned. To say that mortality is a bad thing, and that God created Adam in a state of mortality, is to logically say that

God created a bad thing. On the other hand, to admit that "every thing that God had made was very good," and at the same time admit that mortality is a bad thing, is logically to admit that God did not make man mortal. The matter thus presented to some, evokes the thoughtless question, "Was the serpent good?" If it was not good, it was bad; and since "every thing that God made was very good," the careless questioner is compelled to perch himself upon one of the two horns of the dilemma his question raises - either that God did not create the serpent; or the serpent was, when made, "very good," and therefore not bad. It is the fact that the serpent became bad that inspires the thoughtless question, the questioner overlooking the fact that since the serpent *became* bad, he was not bad before he became bad. Before considering whether mortality is revealed as a bad thing or a good thing, it will be well to present it in another form, which will help to reach the same conclusion; and this form of presentation will also make more apparent the importance of a correct understanding of the subject in order to avoid making the gospel of none effect by a tradition. For one who uses the word mortal in accordance with its correct meaning, and yet says God made Adam mortal, is for him to thereby nullify the true gospel almost as completely as does the believer in the immortality of the soul. But more of this farther along.

Let us ask and consider the question, Is mortality a thing, *the* thing, from which God, through the gospel, offers redemption? If it is, then another question forces itself, namely, If mortality is the thing God is good enough to offer us redemption from, is He offering to redeem us from a thing He created before sin entered into the world? And still another question comes, If mortality is a thing of God's creation before sin came, and if redemption is from this Divinely created mortality, did not the necessity of the operation of the gospel of salvation arise from a thing which God created before and irrespective of the advent of sin into the world?

Now these two forms of presenting the subject require the same to two questions:

1. Is mortality a good thing, or a bad thing?
2. Is mortality the thing from which God, through the gospel, offers to redeem mankind?

To realize fully the badness of the mortal state, it is necessary for the reader to know what the original word is for mortal, in its several forms. The original word is not many times translated "mortal" and "mortality." This rendering of the word in a few cases, however, is enough to show that it stands for a condition that cannot be attributed to God's *creation* of man.

Following are the forms of the word in the Greek, and the number of times it occurs in each, with the translations.

Original Word	Greek Word	Occurrence	Scripture
Mortal	<i>thnetos</i>	five times	Rom. 6:12;8:11 I Cor. 15:53-54 II Cor. 4:11
Mortality	<i>thnaton</i>	once	II Cor. 5:4
Mortify	<i>thanatoo</i>	once	Rom. 8:13 (meaning "put to death")
Deadly	<i>thanateephoros</i>	four times	James 3:8 (from <i>thanatos</i>)
Dead	<i>thanatoo</i>	once	Rom. 7:4
Death (1)	<i>thanatos</i>	113 times	only examples of which we can give, presently below
Death (2)	<i>thanatoo</i>	four times	Matt. 26:59; 27:1 Mark 14:55 I Pet. 3:18
Killed	<i>thanatoo</i>	twice	Rom. 8:36 II Cor. 6:9

Now to emphasize the badness of mortality, and to make manifest that it is a deplorable thing, we have only to substitute the word, or keep it in mind, in reading all the foregoing scriptures; and then ask ourselves, Do these words which stand for mortality describe or refer to what God created; or do they describe what sin produced? A reasonable man will shudder at the very suggestion of applying them to the condition in which Adam was made by the hand of Him who said that "every thing that he made was very good."

- ◆ The word rendered "deadly" is used thus: "if they drink any *deadly* thing;" "an unruly evil, full of *deadly* poison;" "his *deadly* wound was healed;" "whose *deadly* wound was healed."
- ◆ The word rendered "*dead*" is used thus: "Ye also are become *dead* to the law."
- ◆ The word rendered "*killed*" thus: "we are *killed* all the day long;" "as chastened and not *killed*."
- ◆ The word rendered "*death*" is used thus: "cause *death*;" "and shall cause them to be put to *death*;" "shall they cause to be put to *death*."

Out of the one hundred and thirteen instances of the word "*death*" from *thanatos*, we can give only a few examples, leaving the reader to examine all the passages by the help of the Concordance. Examples: "The region and shadow of *death*;" "sit in darkness and in the shadow of *death*;" "condemn him to *death*;" "sorrowful unto *death*;" "loosed the pains of *death*;" "By one man's offense *death* reigned;" "sin reigned unto *death*;" "The wages of sin is *death*;" "who shall deliver me from this body of *death*?" "*Death* is swallowed up in victory;" "the last enemy, *death*, shall be destroyed;" "hath abolished *death*;" "suffering of *death*;" "*death* and hell cast into the lake of fire;" "There shall be no more *death*."

Now in the view of all this, can the reader see any thing but badness in mortality? Does he know of any thing worse than could befall mankind than mortality? (We are presuming, of course, that his mind is free from the pagan fiction of endless torture.) Is not mortality man's greatest evil? Is it not in mortality man groans for deliverance? Is it not from mortality God through Jesus will deliver His people? Now who will presume to say that mortality was an element of man's nature when God made man, and before sin entered into the world? Did God create and call "very good" a "*deadly* (mortal) poison," a *deadly* wound, a "*killing*" thing, a *deathly* region and shadow, a sorrowful thing, a *painful* thing ("pains of death," *mortality*), an "enemy" to be "destroyed," a thing to be cast into the "lake of fire?" One who says Adam was made mortal has not carefully considered what he is saying - what an insult to God it must be, to claim that the worst evil the Bible deplores is a thing of God's creation.

Let him test his theory thus: "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death" (mortality)? Will the theorist say that this is a cry for deliverance from a condition God created? "Sin reigned unto death" (mortality). Will he say in the face of this that God made man a subject of mortality before he sinned? "By one offense death (mortality) reigned." Will he say "By God's creation mortality was in man ready to do its evil work unless man carefully and regularly took his medicine from the tree of life? That man could not get along without medicine, even before sin made him sick?" "The last enemy, death (mortality) shall be destroyed." Does this mean that God will destroy that which He created in man before sin came?

What does a Paganized theology tell perishing people? It tells them that they must realize that they are destined to go to a hell of endless torment, and thereby understand what they are to escape and how to escape it by the gospel. Our readers have found this to be a fraud and a deception. And they tell perishing people that they must know that *they are mortal* in order to understand what salvation saves them *from*. That is right, and it is truth; but what will perishing people think of one who will tell them that this mortality from which they are to be saved was the condition in which God created man? How can such a one understand the gospel in its application to man lost? Must not the seeker after truth come to see that the lost state is the mortal state, and that mortality is the very thing he is to be saved from? Must he not, therefore, know the true origin and meaning of mortality as well as the origin and meaning of immortality?

Here is the vital aspect of the question, and here the bearings of the erroneous claim that Adam was made mortal are seen in their nullification of the gospel, not to say in the insult such a view offers to Him who has emphatically declared that "everything that he had made was very good."

Now to drive our stake at the point where mortality originated, we have only to recall the words, "The sting of death (mortality) is sin," and then we have the start of the pedigree of that

evil thing whose name is Mortality. This creature was born in and by sin, and shapen in iniquity. He is the curse of mankind. He is the festering, torturing leprosy that makes sinful flesh "unclean" and unfit for the kingdom of God. He is the monster who made "very good" bodies "vile bodies." His evil influences transformed man's propensities from the normal equilibrium of a "very good" creation to that abnormal state of weakness in which no man can say, There is no sin in me. This hideous, sin-conceived creature whose name is Mortality is the king of sickness, pain, sorrow, and death. He has caused tears to flow as rivers overflowing their banks. He has populated thousands of lonely, dismal cities of the dead with friends, brothers, mothers, fathers, and children, torn from bosoms of love and from throbbing hearts bleeding from the stabs of his relentless, cruel hand; and he laughs in the faces of the sorrowing ones who in pain and anguish bend in solemn meditation over the silent tombs of their loved ones. He is the Evil one, the *Diabolos*, the *Devil*. His name is Death, he caused death, his pedigree is from sin all the way down through the region of death, the valley of the shadow of death. There is no good in him; he is bad, all bad. He is fit only for destruction, and destruction is his destiny. When he has finished his raging rushing mission through wreck and ruin with hell (hades) following him to receive the millions of his slaughtered ones, he and his satellite - Hades - will find their well-deserved end in that "lake of fire" which means oblivion. And what then? What then? Then the great victory is won, the triumph is complete, and with shouts of adoration, praise, and thanksgiving, tempered with the sweetness and melody of immortal tongues, hosannas will ascend from the saved to the Saviour on high and to His Son on the eternal throne of glory; while to the vanquished foe the victors will exclaim, "O Mortality, where is thy sting; O hades, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Say not thoughtlessly that this is a triumph over an evil of God's creation; but charge it all to sin, date its origin from the first sinful act - "By one offense death (mortality) reigned" - and realize that the meaning of mortality is not to be learned from the dictionary, but from that human experience which causes "the whole creation to groan, and travail in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:22-23). "For in this (earthly house) we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon...that mortality might be swallowed up of life" - II Cor. 5:2-4.

The Facts as Recorded

There are some who confound an "earthly body" with a body in a mortal state; they think that if a body is earthly it must be mortal. This arises from the fact that all earthly bodies are *now* mortal, and we never saw an earthly body that was not mortal. But a close examination of the subject will show that what is, is not a criterion for what was. An earthly body now is a "body of sin" - "sinful flesh," and we never saw an earthly body that was not "sinful flesh;" but this is no proof that an earthly body when created was "sinful flesh." As a matter of fact, all must know that the earthly lot of Adam when created was not "sinful flesh." Now when the earthly body of Adam became "sinful flesh" its nature was not changed from being an earthly body, but *the condition* of the earthly body was changed. The *condition* of the sinful flesh body is of sin-production, while the earthly body was originally of Divine production. So with mortality, it is a word descriptive of a condition into which an earthly body passed by sin, and the term "mortal body," therefore, is not necessarily synonymous with "earthly body."

"But would not the earthly body of Adam have died in time if he had not sinned?" No, we may be sure it would not, since God had predetermined that the cause of death should not be a condition produced by His creative hand, but by the evil effect of sin. There was only one cause of death, and the effect could not come without that cause. That cause is what the Apostle Paul terms "the *sting* of death" - sin.

"But how could Adam, an earthly body, live perpetually?" This question arises from the fact that earthly bodies cannot *now* live perpetually, and the mind seems bent, in some, upon making the *now* decide what was possible *then*. But even after man became mortal, or sinful flesh, it was possible for him to live much longer than we can live now; and if we had a man among us now at the age of nine hundred and sixty-nine years, as was Methuselah (Gen. 5:27), it would be comparatively as great a "miracle" as for Adam, before he sinned to have a perpetual life. Since the earthly body that God created for Adam was "upright," "very good," with supply and demand equal and all the functions normal, there was nothing to "wear it out;" and since every thing was Divinely balanced, and in perfect poise, accident was impossible. Men have racked their brains in attempts to produce machines of perpetual motion, and failed; but who will question that God had the wisdom and power to produce an earthly body of "perpetual motion," whose life could be interfered with but one thing, namely, a breach of that law to which it was subjected?

While the created earthly body was susceptible of being affected by sin, the cause that would start the decline of life must come from without; it was a thing to enter into man, and not a lurking latent evil there by creation. Mortality, therefore, or mortification, could come only from what is termed the "sting," and whether this "sting" fastened itself upon man's vital functions through the medium of the fruit of the forbidden tree, or by a direct power, cannot be known. But this can be known; that the sting entered by sin, and it will be pulled out by righteousness.

The Tree of Life

The theory that God made man mortal must necessarily seek for an antidote; for error is often logical. A mortal man means to this false theory a declining man, a dying man - if no antidote is at hand. Starting, therefore, with a man whose very nature, by creation, was deathful, a search for medicine must be made. In this search it is found that of the trees of the garden of Eden it is recorded, "And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and *good for food*" not for medicine (Gen. 2:9). Where, then, is there a medicinal tree to prevent this mortal man and his mortal wife from dying? It cannot be the tree of knowledge of good and evil, for that is the one forbidden. There is only one choice; this man and his wife are a dying pair if no medicinal tree is found, and the "tree of life" is the only one to choose. Medicine this mortal man and his mortal wife *must* have, and if the record does not say that they ate of the tree of life, the absence of a record does not defeat this diligent, desperate search for medicine to keep this mortal man and his wife from dying. The theory of Divinely created mortality requires that Adam and Eve must either die or eat of the tree of life; therefore the theory says they *did* eat of it; and since the record does not say that they ate of it, so much the worse for the record, they ate of it, nevertheless - they had to eat of it or die that death which had been implanted in their natures by that creation which was pronounced very good! How often it was necessary for Adam and Eve to take their medicine, the theorist is modest enough not to venture to say; but since mortality is a very busy and persistent thing, frequent doses of the antidote must have been

needful. In any event, eat of the tree of life they did, for the theory requires it, and therefore the theory declares it, and perhaps laments the brevity, not to say the delinquency, of that record which failed to record a word to confirm the assertion of this medicine-seeking theory that so earnestly is trying to obviate the death of a pair who had been created mortal beings.

But what *does* the record say concerning the tree of life? Perhaps it does not say that Adam and Eve ate of it, there will be a hint somewhere that implies that they did. "There is no record that they were forbidden to eat of it." No; neither is there record that men are now forbidden to eat of the tree of life in the future paradise - indeed they are invited to eat of it; but a probation, requiring time and merit, lies between them and the eating of the antitypical tree of life. Reasoning from antitype to type, one might infer, but not dogmatically assert, that an unrecorded arrangement provided for a time to elapse, and merit to develop, before the unforbidden tree of life could be reached. This may have been the normal state of things before sin, and the abnormal state after sin required exclusion from even the possibility of eating of the tree of life till the rescuing hand of love interposed. Perhaps it is more than vaguely implied that there was "a way" to the tree of life - an intellectual and moral "way" - that had to be traversed before eating of it; and failing to walk in that "way" and partake of the forbidden tree, all is lost.

Most people read the words of Gen. 3:24, "to keep the way of the tree of life" as meaning "to shut the way;" and good scholars tell us that the Hebrew may mean "to keep the way," in the sense of, "to preserve the way," so that it might again be open to fallen humanity. We all know what is meant not by "the way." It is a process of intellectual and moral training, with Christ, the tree of life, as the end and object. "Strait is the gate and narrow is *the way* that leadeth to (the tree of) life." I am not dogmatizing now, but suggesting, that by the analogy of the antitype we may allow that there was "a way" to the tree of life, not forbidden, yet not walked in to the end to which the "way" led; and therefore our first parents never ate of it. We know they did not need it to keep them from dying, for as long as they refrained from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, they were assured of their natural lives; and the trees of the garden were good for natural life; but here was a tree of life, peculiarly, emphatically, preeminently a *tree of life*. Is there any danger in suggesting that it was a tree of a higher *life* than those which sustained natural life?

After Adam had sinned in partaking of the forbidden tree, it is said, "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" (Gen. 3:22-23). Now we do not suppose anyone claims that the eating of the forbidden tree was repeated. The one act was the "one offense." The words "lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life," seem, at least, to imply the prevention of one act similar to the other one. And this one act, if not prevented, would have caused a "living for ever;" and this implies that, instead of Adam having habitually eaten of the tree of life before he sinned, he had not performed the *one act* of putting forth his hand and eating thereof. In the absence of a record that our first parents did or did not eat of the tree itself, the implications of the words of the record, and the inferences reasonably to be drawn therefrom, are that they did not do so before they sinned, and were prevented from doing it afterwards. It is safer, therefore, to say they did not than it is to say they did.

"Live For Ever"

Some claim that the length of time allotted to Adam and Eve to live, in case they did not partake of the forbidden fruit, was one thousand years, and the term "for ever" is taken to mean one thousand years, the inventors of this claim basing it upon the fact that the Hebrew word is *olam*. To them, therefore, the words "lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and *live for ever*," mean, "lest he live one thousand years, as he would had he not sinned." Reason refuses to take the suggestion of this claim seriously; for it would lead to the absurd conclusion that the punishment of Adam consisted only of seventy years deprivation of life, since, notwithstanding that he sinned, he lived nine hundred and thirty years. The word *olam* cannot be made to always mean a definite period of one thousand years; it sometimes means a limited time exceeding one thousand years; and sometimes, unlimited time. The Mosaic *olam* was about fifteen hundred years, and we read, "The Lord shall endure for ever" (*olam*); and "For his mercy endureth for ever" (*olam*), it is manifest that the word stands for unlimited time. But the strange part of this claim is that it is made to support the theory that Adam was made mortal, on the ground that he would have died at the expiration of the supposed one thousand years lease of his life. If the tree of life was given as an antidote to mortality, why should the antidote suddenly lose its power at the end of the thousand years? The fact is, no possible loop-hole is left in the record for the speculations of these theorists, and no speculation can improve upon what the record states and what it implies.

Man is by creation given an earthly body. This body is capable of change to a higher or to a lower condition, dependent upon man's intellectual and moral actions. It is susceptible of being mortalized or immortalized. While susceptible of being immortalized it is not immortal; and while susceptible of being mortalized, it was not mortal. It was therefore an earthly body neither mortal nor immortal. Mortalization is a child of sin; immortalization a child of righteousness.

Immortality and Eternal Life

There is a theory advocated concerning immortality, similar to that we have referred to on the mortality of Adam ending with death in a thousand years. Its claim is that the terms "everlasting life" and "eternal life" mean the life of the aeon, or age, and that this age is the one thousand years reign of Christ over mortal nations. Based upon this is the claim that the terms "eternal life" and "everlasting life" do not mean immortal life, and the promise they involve only extends to an assurance that those who are worthy shall live for the thousand years; and, if they are ever immortalized it will be after the expiration of the "age."

This is another of those traditions which make the word of God of none effect. It is a theory, like many others, which is a slave of a technicality of words. With this subject as well as with that of mortality, the general teachings of the Bible are the best dictionary to define the meaning and use of the words. Limit the word *aeon* to age, and the age to one thousand years, and let one tie himself to this technical meaning of the word, ignoring other explanatory parts of the Scriptures, and the promise of the glorious gospel is thereby limited to one thousand years lease of life, with no assurance of deliverance from our mortal nature. If a change of nature is not involved in the promise of "eternal life," salvation is reduced to a small compass. It is "redemption of the body" we are "waiting for," and if this is left an undecided question and the

gospel only assures us that we shall live a thousand years, postponing the "redemption of the body" indefinitely, disappointed makes hope hang her head muttering, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

Now we need not here spend much time on the philology of the words "eternal life," it is more satisfactory to study the doctrine of the terms. Presently we will give the original words and their meanings which stand for "immortal" and "incorruptible," simply asserting here, that "eternal life" doctrinally means life manifested in and through incorruptible bodies. In Rom. 2 we are, in substance, told, "If you will seek for immortality, I will give you eternal life." If "immortality" is superior to "eternal life," and the latter only means duration of life for a thousand years, then we are asked to seek for a superior thing and only promised an inferior thing. Reason rejects this as absurd, and concludes that since we are exhorted to seek for "immortality" and promised "eternal life," the one must be involved in the other, or, in substance, both mean the same thing; and therefore to receive the "eternal life" promised is to receive the "immortality" sought for.

The most instructive and satisfying way to find truth is to compare scripture with scripture. We can be assured that to receive eternal life is to receive immortality thus: Christ is immortal (this is admitted) when He appears "we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." In the resurrection we shall be made "equal to the angels" in that we shall "die no more." In the resurrection, this mortal shall put on immortality; and at the same time "eternal life" is received; therefore "immortality" and "eternal life," doctrinally and in essence, mean the same.

Immortality and Incorruptibility

Here we have the words, mortality and corruptibility, with the prefix "im." This prefix has the effect of making the words mean the reverse of their meaning without the prefix, that is, *not* mortal and *not* corruptible. But here, again, what we have said concerning the two aspects of the word "mortal" applies, and we must go beyond the bare technical meaning in order to fully appreciate the Bible meaning. Confining ourselves to the naked legal meaning, we may say that if a man is not "destined to die," he is not mortal, and therefore he is immortal. Since the prefix *im* means *no*, the words "not mortal" must mean immortal. But this reasoning will leave us on the surface without reaching down to the important meaning of the word, which we term doctrinal meaning, which is the vital aspect of it. To emphasize this, we may be allowed to recall an illustration we have previously given: Of the living, righteous saints when Christ comes, it can truthfully be said, they are not destined to die, therefore, in the legal sense, if they are destined to die, they are not mortal; and if they are not mortal they must be immortal. But will these saints be satisfied with this legal, technical immortality? No indeed; they will have hoped for a more substantial immortality than this, and will meet with disappointment if there is not something more real. A theorist may stand before them and give them a lecture on theoretical immortality somewhat after the following fashion: "You see, my dear friends, you have been righteous and lived such probationary lives as deserve the approval of the Judge, and of such we are told that they "shall never die." Now, just think of it, you are not destined to die, and that means that you are not mortal; for "mortal" means "destined to die." Now, my dear friends, try to realize it, that if you are not "destined to die" you are not mortal; and if you are not mortal, of course you can be nothing else but immortal, and so your hope of immortality is realized."

We can well imagine these saints replying: "Your reasoning is quite in accord with the dictionary, and it is quite logical. In fact, as a logician you have excelled even yourself. Your 'immortality' looks quite well - on paper - as a theory. Your theory assures us that we shall never die; but, sir, look here at our poor bodies! There is a dear old sister, blind, another deaf; and look at that young man on crutches, a poor cripple. Yes, and do you hear those dear creatures over there coughing in a manner that prints upon your brain the fearful word "consumption?" - the *fact* is, despite your theoretical immortality, we are all more or less suffering creatures - in our very bodies, a suffering that your theory does not alleviate. If yours is the immortality we have been seeking for, we must hang our heads in sorrowful disappointment; but stand aside, sir, with your superficial theory, let the mournful echoes of your scientific, logical lecture die away, and listen to a prophet of the Lord giving us a lecture on what the immortality we have hoped for, and lived for will do for us: "Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, *Be strong*, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped; then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert" (Isa. 35:3-6). 'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint.' Now, sir, while we are glad to have heard your lecture on the theory of immortality, and to know that we are not 'destined to die,' we prefer the prophet's 'lecture,' since its realization will be that which can be felt in every fibre of our being to the glad and glorious extent of that poor cripple over there joyfully throwing his crutches away; those eyes that are closed in blindness will open to behold the wonders of the Lord; those ears, to listen to the strains of heavenly music; the word "consumption" rubbed out never to torture - in short, God's "saving health" will manifest itself *in* heavenly bodies that shall no more experience sorrow, pain, sickness and death - this, sir, is immortality worthy of the name, this is immortality in its essence, its vitality, its substantiality, its reality."

The Difference in the Meaning of Immortality and Incorruptibility

Doctrinally there is no difference in the meaning of these two words, that is to say, when we are immortal in the Scriptural sense, we are incorruptible, and vice versa. Still, a thing can be incorruptible and not be immortal; but it cannot be immortal in the sense of the promise of immortality, and not be incorruptible. A substance that will not decay is incorruptible, such as gold and diamond, but the word *life* is not necessarily an element of incorruptibility. But the word "immortal" means life, unending life. Paul's employment of the two words, therefore, is not redundant, when he says, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (I Cor. 15:53). Since God can perpetuate life, even in the physical mortal state, as He has prolonged it in the cases of Enoch and Elijah, and since the reward of the worthy saints is to be more than this, the apostle's words embrace the entire extent of the reward, in that they provide for unending life in incorruptible bodies. Since immortality is God's nature, it cannot but be good, pure and holy, and it must be impeccable. While, therefore, we have seen that mortality is always spoken of as a bad, deplorable, and sorrowful state, immortality is always represented as a state to be sought for, to be earnestly desired, a state of goodness, gladness and joy.

In view of the scriptural character of immortality, the idea of an immortal sinner and an immortal devil is inconsistent; "immortal sinner" is a contradiction of terms, as much so as "white blackness." Since God is immortal, immortality is the ideal nature to which man should seek to attain, as the highest attainment possible. Peccability is a necessity for man, while he is on probation, and this was an attribute of man when his earthly body was "very good," and it is, in a greater degree, an attribute of man in his earthly *mortal* state. But when he passed a successful probation, and thereby fitted himself for the highest nature, no further trial is needful, and he is therefore commissioned to do a heavenly, glorious work as a tried and perfected man; and therefore he is impeccable because he is immortal. This is the Divine principle of the "survival of the fittest," and it is based, not upon the Darwinian theory of the survival of the most cunning, and most brutishly strong; but upon a "fitness" arising from the use, though feeble and difficult, of the higher intellectual functions and the moral faculties of human endowment.

Since it is the scriptural view of immortality and incorruptibility that we should be concerned about, in its intended and promised effect upon our physical nature, and in its relation to our salvation, it will be well to examine the words in their original and translated forms.

Original Word	Greek Word	Verse/Description
Immortal	<i>aphthartos</i>	I Tim. 1:17 - Now unto the King eternal, <i>immortal</i> , invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.
Immortality (1)	<i>aphtharsia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Rom. 2:6-7 - Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and <i>immortality</i>, eternal life. ◆ II Tim. 1:10 - But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and <i>immortality</i> to light through the gospel.
Immortality (2)	<i>athanasia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I Cor. 15:53-54 - For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on <i>immortality</i>. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on <i>immortality</i>, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. ◆ I Tim. 6:16 - Who only hath <i>immortality</i>, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen.
Incorruptible	<i>aphthartos</i>	I Cor. 15:52 - The dead shall be raised <i>incorruptible</i> .
Incorruption	<i>aphtharsia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ I Cor. 15:42 - So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in <i>incorruption</i>. ◆ I Cor. 15:50 - Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit <i>incorruption</i>. ◆ I Cor. 15:53-54 - For this corruptible must put on <i>incorruption</i>, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on <i>incorruption</i>, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.

These are all the texts where the words "immortality" and "incorruption" relate to the physical or bodily state, first as applied to God's glorious nature; second, as the great reward man is to seek for; third, as that glorious state into which man will be changed when death (mortality) is swallowed up in victory.

In the English Version in I Tim. 1:17, the Greek word *aphthartos* is rendered "immortal." In Rom. 2:6-7, *aphtharsia* is rendered "immortality," while in I Cor. 15:52 *aphthartos* is rendered "incorruptible;" and in verses 50,53,54 *aphtharsia* is rendered "incorruption." In the Revised Version I Tim. 1:17 the word is rendered "incorruptible," and in Rom. 2:7, it is rendered "incorruption." Evidently, *aphthartos* should be rendered incorruptible, "immortality" is the word for *athanasia*.

The word *aphthartos* does not always relate to bodily state. It is rendered "sincerity" in Eph. 6:24 and Titus 2:7, and it relates to our "inheritance incorruptible," in I Pet. 1:4; and it relates to the "incorruptible seed," in verse 23; also to the incorruptible crown," in I Cor. 9:25; and it stands for "the hidden man of the heart in that which is *not corruptible*" in I Pet. 3:4, meaning strength of character to resist temptation, as we sometimes speak of honest officers who are incorruptible in the sense that they cannot be bribed.

Now the important thing is that all these scriptures represent immortality and incorruptibility as a state of goodness, glory and happiness, while mortality is the opposite. Mortality is a creature of sin; immortality for man, worthy men, is the perennial fruit of the tree of life, "the way" to which has been preserved by the mercy and goodness of God for poor, fallen, suffering man, but "Every man in his own order, Christ the firstfruit; after they that are Christ's at his coming."

Incorruptibility Exemplified

In II Tim. 1:10 we read that "Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." The Greek word here for "immortality" is *aphtharsia*, and should be rendered "incorruptibility," or "incorruption," as in the Revised Version. Now this passage will compel the diligent student to discriminate between incorruptibility *promised* and incorruptibility *realized*; and it will show that the great desideratum of fallen, mortal man, whether it be termed immortality, incorruption, eternal life, or everlasting life, is the "redemption of the body," the change of the vile body; fashioned like unto the body of Christ.

This verse cannot be carefully read without suggesting the question, Was not incorruption brought to light through the gospel before Christ came in the flesh? We are assured that Abel had the one faith which was "once for all delivered to the saints," and if he had the one faith, he had the gospel; for these are but different terms expressive of the same thing. We are also told that the gospel was preached to Abraham; also Job's hope was that in his flesh, by resurrection, he would see the Redeemer; and David said, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness;" and Daniel understood that some would "come forth to everlasting life." From the time of the fall of Adam the gospel had been revealing the doctrine of eternal life and incorruption of body. How, then, are we to understand Paul in saying that Christ brought life and incorruption to light, since it had been brought to light during four thousand years?

To understand the apostle we are compelled to distinguish between the doctrine of life and incorruption, and the realization thereof. Indeed this text is our best Bible dictionary meaning of the doctrines exemplified. There is reference here to a "bringing to light" in a sense never before exhibited. Glorious and glowing words of inspiration had heralded the truth to mankind through patriarchs and prophets, and ancient worthies had died in the faith thereof; it had been the theme of prophetic poetry and it had been sung to the sweet, melodious strains of heavenly music; but where and when had it appeared as exemplified, realized, materialized? Where had a mortal ever been seen transformed into incorruptibility? Promises from Him who is able to perform will give hope the wings of an eagle to soar to lofty heights, and view the broad landscape of the Divinely planned prospect; but there must be a spot, distant through it be, upon which it may light, fold its wings, and rest in sweet content and satisfaction. Hope had heard of that Word (logos) which was "in the beginning," and of the "seed of the woman," and the "seed of Abraham," and the "seed of David;" but its four thousand years' flight and happy anticipation must finally find the "word made flesh" and hear the angelic words, "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is "Christ the Lord" before it could fully realize the meaning of that which made its heart beat with heavenly joy. So in the promises which meant deliverance from mortality and the ecstasy of a thrilling deathless life, which "brought life and immortality to light" in promise, the question was, Where and when should these find their goal? In whom should they be first fulfilled as the means of their ample and absolute fulfillment? Here He is, a babe in Bethlehem; then behold Him at twelve years of age about His "Father's business;" out of the rolling waters of Jordan He is coming and heaven declares, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased;" tempted by every means that the subtilty of the flesh could suggest, but yet victorious; suffering and triumphing in the sadness of Gethsemane; impaled upon the cruel cross; buried in the darkness of the tomb; soon exclaiming, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended;" afterwards inviting the closest scrutiny; and then an apostle declares, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which *we have seen with our eyes*, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; for the *life* was manifested, and we have *seen it*" (I John 1:1-2). Thus was incorruption brought to light as it never had been before - tangibly, corporeally, and in this *fact* is the assurance that hope, though it must wait still a little longer, waits not in vain; but will yet be realized in the fulfillment of its own inspired and heart cheering words, "Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" - Phil. 3:20-21.

Jesus in Relation to Mortality and Sinful Flesh

Under this heading the subject in hand naturally leads us to the consideration of mortality in relation to Jesus. Was He mortal? If He was mortal, would that mean that He was made of sinful flesh? If He was mortal, when did He pass from the mortal state to the immortal? These are questions which, as experience shows, need answering many times, on account of the persistency of errors respecting them which make the word of God of none effect.

Many who have become enlightened in most of the fundamental principles of the gospel, seem still to linger on the outskirts of Rome on the nature of Christ. They protest against the Romish theory of immaculate conception, and declare that Jesus was made of our identical nature in that

He was mortal; but the admission that Jesus was mortal is logically contradicted by a denial that His flesh was the same as that of His brethren in the sense of being sinful flesh. By the subtlety of this deceptive distinction between mortality and sinful flesh many superficial, but well-meaning, minds are led astray, and conducted backwards into the outlying ditches of Rome.

Most of those who deny that Jesus partook of sinful flesh are advocates of the claim that Adam was made mortal. Therefore when they say that Jesus was mortal and that He was not made from sinful flesh, they represent Him as completely free from any effect of sin as Adam was before he sinned; and thereby they nullify the general teaching of the Scriptures which describe Jesus as "a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief," and they endeavor to evade the force of the declaration that "He bore our sins in his own body to the tree" by reducing the antitype to a level with the type. If Jesus did not inherit in His body the effects of sin, it follows that the only sense in which He could bear away sin was by our sins being imputed to Him; and in that case the "substance" was no more substantial than the "shadow," for it was only by imputation the sins of the people of Israel were transferred to the sacrificial victim. But the experience of our Saviour in the flesh, wherein He was "touched with the feelings of our infirmities" (Heb. 4:15), "was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin," suffering the pangs and pains which are the inherited effects of sin - all of this is a standing protest against the no-sin-in-the-flesh theory. Some flippantly ridicule the thought of sin in the flesh by asking what it is, and can it be microscopically detected? Is it a chemical element running through the blood? They seem unable to believe that there is an evil in the flesh because they cannot subject the evil to a microscopic examination or a chemical test. Human experience and a sick, suffering and morally and physically weak and dying humanity render microscopic and chemical examinations needless to intelligent, observing minds. When Gahazi's sin became an element of his flesh in the form of leprosy, there was such a manifestation of "sin in the flesh" as needed no artificial means of examination; and when Adam had sinned, no such means were necessary to inform him that he was naked, that shame had taken hold of him, and that his sin had become "sin in the flesh" to the extent of yielding that *experience* described in the words, "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life...and unto dust shalt thou return."

It is true that the primary meaning of sin is "transgression of law," but transgression of law is an act only, and if it goes no further than this, it will remain an abstract thing which will not affect the sinner in the way of punishment. Transgression of law must yield its own retribution in some form unless the transgressor be allowed to view it as a mere act and an abstract thing at which he can flip his finger and to which he can say, "You cannot hurt me, for you cannot take effect in my flesh, in my body."

A better definition of sin in the flesh cannot be given than we will presently give, a definition which has been the butt of taunts from many who seem to imagine they can outshine the sun with farthing rushlights. The definition is from an uninspired man, but it is the teaching of inspired prophets and apostles reduced to few and convenient words. It is as follows:

"The word *sin* is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies, in the first place, '*transgression of law*;' and in the next, it represents that physical principle of the animal nature, which is the cause of its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh '*which has the power of death*,' and it is called *sin* because the development, or fixation, of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. Inasmuch as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled '*sinful flesh*,' that is, *flesh of sin*; so that *sin*, in the sacred

style, came to stand for the substance called *man*. In human flesh 'dwells no good thing;' and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him (Rom. 7:17-18) - Elpis Israel, p.113.

This lucid definition is borne out by the following testimonies:

Job 14:1 - Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble.

Psa. 51:5 - Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

Psa. 51:7 - Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.

Eccl. 2:23 - For all his days are sorrows, and his travail grief; yea, his heart taketh not rest in the night.

Matt. 19:17 - And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.

Matt 26:38 - Then said he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.

Rom. 7:13 - Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it may appear *sin, working death in me* by that which is good.

Rom. 7:17-18 - Now then it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me*. For I know that in me (that is, *in my flesh*) dwelleth no good thing.

Rom. 17:21 - I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

Rom. 17:23-24 - But I see another law *in my members*, warring against the law of my mind, and brining me into captivity to the law of *sin which is in my members*. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from *this body of death*?

Rom. 8:3 - 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* (Likeness here means sameness. See Heb. 2:14).

II Cor. 5:21 - For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

I Pet. 2:24 - Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.

Let the candid reader closely examine these passages and he will find no escape from the fact that sin, as an *act* produces sin as a *state*, and that sin as a state stops not with its actual producer, but is transmitted in the flesh, so that the sins of fathers are inherited, in their physical effects, by their children, and their children's children.

The first passage says that man is "full of trouble," and observation and experience prove that this is not a truth simply to be *seen*, but it is felt, being an element of mortality; and, of course, trouble of all kinds, bodily or mental troubles, have their origin in sin directly or remotely.

Psa. 51:5 evidently refers to Christ, and therefore the "iniquity" and "sin" cannot mean transgression of law. The very words of this passage compel us to recognize the fact that sin is set forth in the sacred writings as a state as well as an act; and it is because the state is the product of the act that the name of the cause is given to the effect. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (Job 14:4). Since God's plan was that, notwithstanding that Jesus would be Divinely begotten, He would be "made of a woman," the "seed of the woman," made in all points like unto His brethren," since flesh had become defiled by sin, it was a sinful state and an iniquitous *state*, and this is the only conclusion left to be derived from the words of this text. It is an unthinkable thing that one should be shapen in personal actions, and in personal actions be conceived from his mother; but if the mother had inherited that sinful flesh state, mortality, which is "unclean" in the sight of God, and which needs "purging as with hyssop;" and if this *state* had been Divinely named "iniquity" and "sin," then in this *nature* of "iniquity" are we all shapen, and in this *nature* of "sin" are we all conceived.

To transgress the law is *to do* a wrong thing; but Paul represents sin as doing wrong. How could the doer and the thing done be sin? They could not both be "transgression of law;" only one of them - the thing done - could be sin in this sense; but the apostle says that the doer is "sin that dwelleth *in me*." This sin was in all men to overcome them, and if itself were never to be overcome by any one, all were lost. But He who would overcome that kind of sin "that dwelleth in me" must have it dwelling in Him in order to overcome it; and His merit was not, therefore, in exemption from possession of man's tempter, which exemption, if by birth, would have been no merit at all; but His merit consisted in His successful struggle with the inward sin natural to sinful flesh; and this He completely overcame, first, in resisting its proclivities; and second, in "purging it as with hyssop" and ascending to the cleansed nature of immortality.

It is from mortality man needs redemption; it is from sinful flesh man needs redemption; it is from the *diabolos* man needs redemption. Does it follow that mortality, sinful flesh, and *diabolos* are three different enemies of man? No; these are but different words, or names, for the one thing. Sinful flesh is mortal flesh; and mortal flesh is that state of physical decline and mental and moral abnormality which sin produced. The "weakness of the flesh," and its sin-inflamed proclivities and passions constituted the devil, *diabolos* - that which is constantly striving to cause a crossing the line from right to wrong. If this *diabolos* was not in the flesh of Jesus, He was not "touched with the *feelings* of our infirmities; He did not overcome the *diabolos* in "the same flesh as that of the children;" but Paul says, "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.

Therefore to say that Jesus was not sinful flesh, and yet that He was mortal, is to confuse scripture terms, and to very nearly answer John's description of antichrist, more nearly, no doubt, than such thoughtless theorists are aware; for the fact that they attempt to distinguish between things which do not differ shows they have not made the matter a subject of careful reflection.

What Is Antichrist?

John says, "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh* is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: *and this is that spirit of antichrist*, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world" (I John 4:2-3).

The words "in the flesh" are omitted in a number of manuscripts, and by the Revisers; but this is not a conclusive reason for discarding them. The fact that they are found in some ancient manuscripts and not in others would suggest a greater probability of the difference arising from the omission by some copyist rather than from an addition by others. The doctrine of Christ's coming in *the flesh* needed emphasizing in apostolic times, and its necessity has never ceased, for this was to be a doctrine destined to be perverted by the predicted antichrist.

There are many who deprive the word "antichrist" of its specific meaning by giving it a general meaning, as any thing or all things opposed to Christ. But that "antichrist" was the name given by John to Daniel's little horn of the beast, and to Paul's man of sin seems evident when the facts are carefully considered. Mr. Elliott, in his *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, on page 67, Vol. I, says:

"Indeed to himself, St. John, the same issue of events had been revealed" (as referred to by Daniel and Paul); "and he had been directed to remind the Christian Church of this great coming enemy under the very remarkable name of 'the Antichrist.' I say, a name very notable! For it was not pseudo-Christ, as those false self-styled Christ (in professed exclusion and denial of *Jesus* Christ) that the Lord declared would appear in Judea before the destruction of Jerusalem, and who did in fact appear there and then! but was a name of new formation, expressly compounded, it might seem by the Divine Spirit for the occasion, and as if to express some idea through its etymological force, which no older word could so well express. ANTICHRIST; even as he would appear someway as a Vice-christ, in the mystic Temple or professing Church; and in that character act the usurper and adversary against Christ's true church and Christ himself."

In support of the idea that "Antichrist" was a word having a special meaning, and not that in a general sense it meant anti in the sense of opposed to, Mr. Elliot says:

"*Antichristos*. When anti is compounded with a noun signifying an agent of any kind, or *functionary*, the compound word either signifies a *vice-functionary* of the same *kind opposing*, or sometimes *both*."

He then gives sixteen words compounded in the same way as examples.

Now what does this lead us to? It leads us to the fact that antichrist is no other than the man of sin, and the little horn of the beast. Then what follows? It follows that the meaning of John's words respecting the denial that Christ came in the flesh is to be found in the theory of antichrist, or Rome. This theory is not a positive denial that Christ came in the flesh; but it is of that nature which makes the word of God of none effect, and this is the danger which John's imperative warning should guard against. The theory admits that Jesus was "made of a woman," and therefore came in the flesh of mankind; but it changes that flesh from "sinful flesh" to "immaculate flesh," and this, in effect, is a denial of the true meaning of "Christ coming in the flesh," "the same," as Paul terms it.

Now while we have not claimed that teachers among us are leading followers back to Rome, we have said that they lead them to the outskirts. And when they teach that Jesus in flesh "was holy, spotless, and most holy," and that "there was no sin in Him inherent, innate, nor acquired," is not this a denial, similar to, but not to the full degree of, antichrist's denial that Christ came in *the flesh*?

The reason why antichrist's theory nullifies the truth is because it allows not for Jesus being an exemplification of "the way" out of the lost state into the redeemed state. If, as those on the outskirts of Rome say, His flesh was "holy, spotless and most holy," then, from this standpoint, He was not practically "the way" out of the fallen state into the redeemed state; and, moreover, if He was not made of sinful flesh, then He did not partake of that flesh in which alone, and no other, dwells the *diabolos*; and in that case He did not destroy the *diabolos* in the flesh; and if He did not do this He did not fulfill the most important part of His mission. Therefore it is needful that we repeat the warning John gives, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits."

Redemption in Relation to Jesus

The word redemption, as expressive of man's actual need, cannot be dated further back than sin. Sin which caused man's fall, made redemption necessary. Sin was the cause; a state of nature and a relationship of alienation of man from God, was the result; and redemption was the Divine institution to meet the demands of the situation and rescue man from passing for ever out of existence.

If Jesus was born in a state and relation which needed redemption, and if He was a subject of redemption, it follows that He was "made in all points like unto His brethren." If He was not born in this fallen state and relation, His sufferings must have been directly imposed upon Him, and were not the inherited consequences of sin, and this would be unjust; and all that He suffered, including His death, was for us and *not for* Himself, and therefore substitutionary, and therefore, again, unjust. We have not carelessly said that Jesus was born in the same fallen state of nature common to Adam's race, and *in the same relation* in respect to redemption, we mean this; but here a careful explanation is needed to calm the impulsive excitability of some who cry out, "What, Jesus an alien!" "Was Jesus an alien from God?" Now let us reason here in the light of Scriptures, and avoid the influence of that prejudice which, in intending to be complimentary to Jesus, robs Him of the honor of being the actual Redeemer in His own person, practically manifesting redemption in His own very self - yes, redemption in respect to relationship and to state of nature.

Failing to distinguish between things that differ, the question is indignantly asked, "Was Jesus ever an alien from God?" and with many this seems to settle the question - in the negative; but it does not settle the real question involved. Let us put two questions and compare them, and then decide what answer to give:

- Was Jesus ever an alien from God?, and
- Was Jesus ever an alien from the "law of the Spirit of life?"

Here are things that differ; for a natural-born Jew was not an alien from God; but was he, by birth, an alien from the "law of the spirit of life?" To say he was not is to say that birth did for the Jew what was the work of being "born again;" that relationship to the law of eternal life ran through the blood, instead of being dependent upon and resultant of faith in the gospel. The Jew was not an "alien from God" by birth; neither was Jesus. But natural birth under the Mosaic covenant would give neither ordinary Jews nor Jesus relationship to the law of faith - the "everlasting covenant." Those who were in the Mosaic covenant were "nigh" to God (Eph. 2:17), but they had to receive that "faith which cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," without which "it is impossible to please God" (Rom. 10:17; Heb. 11:6), before they became subjects of the everlasting covenant; and Jesus was no exception to this. In the sense of being "nigh to God," the Jews were "His own;" and "He came to his own and his own received him not. But as many (of His own) as received him, to them gave he power *to become the sons of God.*" How? By natural birth? "Even to them that *believed on his name*" (John 1:12).

There was a sonship to God for the Jew by birth; but there was a higher sonship by being "born again;" and with Jesus there was sonship by Divine begetting (Luke 1:35); by birth under the Mosaic covenant (Ex. 13:2); by baptism (Matt. 3:17); and, finally, by change to Divine nature (Rom. 1:4). For a Jew and for Jesus to enter that relationship to God which the law of the one faith only can produce, there had to be voluntary action, prompted by the knowledge and love of the Truth. Thus was Jesus an exemplification of "the way, the truth and the life;" and in order that He might be this, He must start outside the law of faith, enter therein, live and die therein, and thus work His way to and into final and complete redemption for Himself in order that He might become our Redeemer. Therefore we read that "by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having *obtained eternal redemption*" (Heb. 9:12); and He prayed to be "saved out of death, and was heard in that he feared" (Heb. 5:7).

Another Invention

There is another invention which nullifies the word of God and which has led some astray from the simplicity of the Truth. Recently it has been masquerading under the name of "new light." It is related to the claim that "the sacrifice of Christ has nothing to do with Adamic condemnation," and that "all that baptism does for us is remove the penalty of the second death, which comes upon us when we learn the gospel." It runs as follows: There is no removal of the Adamic sentence; it must be paid by "natural death," and by this death each one pays it for himself. Therefore a Jew by keeping the law of Moses earned eternal life, and by dying a natural death he paid all that was against him in the Adamic sentence. On this basis it is further claimed that since Jesus kept the law, He was not required to shed His blood for His own redemption. All that was required of Him was that He die a natural death to pay off the claim of the Adamic sentence that was upon Him. The only reason why He had to die on the cross - by bloodshedding - was because those He came to redeem were guilty of personal sins. For these He must die a violent death; but were it not for these, a natural death would have been sufficient for Himself. To start with a false statement requires many more false ones to prop the first one up. The false one that started all this was, "There is no forgiveness" (remittance) "of Adamic sin" - the meaning being that there is no interference with the Adamic sentence; it must be met by natural death.

The question of redemption for us from Adamic condemnation, and Christ's relation thereto; also the second death theory, we have dealt with in the pamphlet entitled, "Adamic Condemnation and Responsibility." Therefore we limit our remarks here to the question of natural death being sufficient for Jesus, while violent death was required for our personal sins. If Jesus could have obtained redemption by natural death, that would have been *one* way of salvation. If we could obtain redemption only by violent death, that would have been *another* way of salvation; and there would have been *two ways* of salvation. If Jesus' salvation could have been obtained by natural death, He did not die the death by which His salvation could have been attained. If it was provided that Jesus could save Himself by natural death, then God made arrangements by which He could "enter eternal life alone." If no such arrangement was made, then the inventors of this theory have no right to say that natural death would have been sufficient for Jesus. Will they presume to say that God provided alternatives in the plan of salvation? They could present their case to Jesus like this: "Now so far as you are concerned, you need not "endure the cross" to obtain the "joy that is set before *you*." You can prolong your days of natural life, evade the shame and pain of the cross, and obtain eternal redemption for yourself by allowing nature to take its ordinary course. True the Abrahamic covenant can never come into force without the death of the covenant sacrifice, and that sacrifice was always by blood-shedding in the types, but you can attain to all the blessings of that covenant for yourself by keeping the law of Moses, and evading violent death on the cross. If you die any other than a natural death, it will not be the death that would have saved you; and any sufferings and death that you may endure over and above that which would save you will not be for yourself, but for others, and therefore you, to this extent, will die as their substitute, and as their substitute only, since you will be doing what is not needed for yourself."

In all this speculation of minds anxious to pose as producers of "new light" God's plan is represented as confusion worse confounded. The redemption of the first born in Israel by the blood of the sacrifice is meaningless, and the atonement for the typical altar by the sprinkling of blood is without antitype, with many other beautiful forms of revealing the sublime truth concerning Jesus. In the days of His flesh Jesus was in the holy place; the veil hung between Him and the Most Holy place of complete redemption. In that veil is the scarlet color of sinful flesh. That veil represents His flesh. The scarlet represents the blood of the flesh, and the only way for Jesus to pass in to the Most Holy was through the rending of the veil "from top to bottom," thereby "consecrating for us a new and living way through the veil, that is to say, his flesh." The only way that He could pass through was the one way God had provided for Him in order that it might be for us. Therefore "*by his own blood*" (not by natural death) "he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). In the face of Paul's declaration that "*By his own blood,*" which means, by means of his own blood, "he entered in once into the holy place," the so-called "new light" theorist assert that Jesus could have entered into the most holy place by allowing nature to take its course in natural death; in other words, He could have reached the most holy state without passing through the veil. This absurdity would leave it optional with Jesus, whether He would enter the most holy state of salvation through the veil (which, by its scarlet color typified the shedding of blood) or "climb up some other way," and thus obtain salvation for Himself alone; leaving us unredeemed, because to save us He must allow His blood to be shed and thus die a sacrificial death. What a pity that superficial minds will meddle with and mar the complete plan of salvation! As Adam was, as our federal representative, the way into the first state, into that state which necessitated the plan of salvation;

so Jesus was, as our federal representative, the way out of the fallen state of condemnation and mortality into the way of life everlasting. Look at the first man, and you will see the fall of the race in him; look at the second man, and you will see the rise of the obedient of the race in Him. As the first man was a personal participator in the fall; so was the second Man a personal participator in the rise. As the first man was the first to fall; so was the second man the first in the rise.

Now if any further testimony be needed to show that natural death would not have sufficed for the redemption of Jesus, we have the positive declaration of Paul in Heb. 9:22 - "And almost all things are by the law *purged with blood*; and without the shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should *be purified with these*: "BUT THE HEAVENLY THINGS THEMSELVES WITH BETTER SACRIFICES than these...Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin *by the sacrifice* of himself. And as it is appointed unto (the) men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," etc.

"The heavenly things themselves" must be purified by the blood of the antitypical sacrifice. Was not Jesus part of these "heavenly things?" What would purify Him from the impurity of mortality? Natural death, in which there would be no sacrifice, but a helpless submission to nature? No, no, it required the blood of the "better sacrifices" to cleanse the antitypical altar, the victim, and the priest - Him who was the end - the object - of the law in all its types

What Would Be a Keeping of the Law?

To say that Jesus could have entered life by keeping the law of Moses without suffering the death of the cross is as absurd as if one said Jesus could have entered eternal life by keeping the law of Moses without keeping the law of Moses. It is a contradiction of terms; for if the law of Moses required Jesus to do one thing more than another, it required Him to "pour out His soul (the life that is in the blood) unto death." Follow Jesus from His birth to the foot of the cross, and stop there for a moment and ask, Has He *kept* the law? Has He completed what He said He came to do - "not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to *fulfill*?" While He stood at the foot of the cross, He had kept the law *that far*; but He had not fulfilled it; for He must be "obedient unto death, even *the death of the cross*" (Phil. 2:8); and for Him to be obedient means that He had been commanded to die the death of the cross, and where is the command found? Is it not in all types of the law of Moses? Therefore when standing at the foot of the cross Jesus had not kept the law of Moses, He had not "fulfilled" that which He came "not to destroy, but to fulfill," the most essential part of the law remained yet to be fulfilled - the "cleansing of the heavenly things themselves by the better sacrifice;" for "without the shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22).

If it be claimed that this "remission" relates only to our personal sins, and not to any thing to be remitted in Christ's case, let the reader examine the context and the error will be corrected. Many quote this passage as if it read, "Without shedding of blood is no remission *of sins*," adding the last two words. The apostle is speaking of "sprinkling both the book, and all the people...Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry;" and to all of these his words are applied - "without shedding of blood is no

remission." And these things, in their natural state, as parts of a world that had come under a common and universal curse, were "common and unclean," and until they were sanctified, or the "uncleanness" remitted, they were unfit for spiritual use. By the sprinkling of the blood this "remittance," or putting away of uncleanness was effected. An illustration of this is given in the atonement made for the altar, of which Jesus was the antitype, as shown by Paul's words in Heb. 13:10 - "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." Typical of this Moses was told, "And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin-offering for atonement; and thou shalt *cleanse the altar*, when thou hast *made an atonement for it*, and thou shalt anoint it to sanctify it" - Ex. 29:36. In this very type, as well as in many others, Jesus, who had spiritual discernment to perfection, could read a *command* to which He must be "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" and since this applied to Him specially, what folly it is for men to claim "new light" in the gross darkness of which they assert, to suit a preconceived theory, that Jesus need not to suffer for Himself, a sacrificial death by the shedding of blood, that for Him natural death would have sufficed, and the death of the cross was for us only! The shedding of His blood "remitted," or put away, the sinfulness which makes flesh "sinful flesh;" it destroyed the *diabolos* in His flesh; and thus, as the altar He was "atoned for," cleansed, and anointed. Having *fulfilled* the law God's requirements were met, and "righteousness delivered (Him) from death" (Prov. 10:2), and thereby He became our Deliverer from all that He was delivered from as well as from our own personal sins.

The Covenant Nullified

By teaching that Jesus could have entered eternal life alone by natural death, the word of God, as embodied in the everlasting covenant, is made of none effect. The covenant could not come into force for any one without the covenant-sacrifice. In dying a natural death, Jesus would not have been the covenant-sacrifice; the sacrificial element is not found in natural death. Therefore had He died a natural death, the covenant would have been left without force. Since eternal life was one vital part of the everlasting covenant, and since the covenant would have been without force without the sacrificial death of the victim, how could Jesus obtain eternal life in a covenant that He had left without force by dying a natural death and not a sacrificial death by bloodshedding? For Paul to say that Jesus entered into the most holy place, into which he also says "we have boldness to enter by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way," is for him to say that He entered eternal life. How did He enter? Answer, "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by *His own blood* He entered in once, having obtained eternal redemption" (for Himself). For Himself is the meaning of Paul's words, and the Italic words of our translation, "for us," were not in Paul's words, nor in his mind; for Paul's teaching is that it was for Jesus in order that it might be for us. "It was therefore *necessary* that the heavenly things *themselves*" (of which Jesus was the most important) should be "purified with better *sacrifices* than these" (Heb. 9:23). "Wherefore it is of *necessity* that this man have somewhat also to *offer*" (Heb. 8:3). Natural death is not an "offering." He offered for Himself and for us, for it is positively declared, "This he did once, when he *offered up himself*" - Heb. 7:27.

Attempting to limit the sacrifice of Christ to personal sins and to ignore its relation to Adamic or racial sin, a writer occupying a prominent position in the Truth's affairs, has written and repeated as follows:

"Concerning condemnation: We believe that condemnation to death rests upon the race because of Adam's transgression, and that this is its misfortune and not its fault. 'Not willingly, but by reason of him who did subject it' (Rom. 8;20) was the creation made subject to vanity, or death.

That personal condemnation is entailed by personal transgression, for which alone men are personally responsible" (Ez. 18:2-4).

Answer

We have here first, condemnation because of Adam's transgression, which is nothing else but racial condemnation; and second, we have "personal condemnation;" and these are the two aspects we have constantly contended for as involved in the plan of salvation, to which Christ's baptism and death, and our baptism into His death, stand related; while our opponents have omitted and sneered at the *racial* aspect. Of this aspect the foregoing says: "This is a misfortune and not a fault." And the contention of our opponents throughout the controversy has been that, since racial condemnation "is a misfortune and not a fault," baptism has nothing to do with it, nor it with baptism. Now let us quietly, calmly, yes, kindly, reason together upon this matter as it is focused in the statement that

Racial Condemnation Is a Misfortune and Not a Fault

In doing this, hard words are not needed; all that is needed is mutual frankness in accepting the facts and truths involved in the statement. Let us keep the affirmative and negative parts of the statement before our minds. Affirmative: Racial condemnation is a misfortune. Negative: Racial condemnation is not a fault. Now let us ask, Was it not for the purpose of delivering us from "misfortune" that God in His goodness delivered the plan of salvation? To make it as clear as possible, let us define the "misfortune" in Scripture words. Is not the "misfortune," "mortality," the "sting of death," "unto dust shalt thou return," "body of death," "sinful flesh" - do not these words define the "misfortune?" Grant that these words do not express the 'fault' of individual descendants, and grant that there are personal "faults" for which there is personal responsibility; but leave this negative part of the above statement aside for a moment, and let us, by the aid of the simplest fundamental principles of the gospel, decide whether the plan of salvation was given to redeem man from the "misfortune" of "mortality," the "sting of death," "unto dust shalt thou return," "body of death," "sinful flesh." Is it not the *primary work* of the plan of salvation to deliver from mortality, death and the grave? Is not this the "misfortune" from which the gospel came to redeem? How can we be sure that this is the purpose of the plan of salvation? There is a KEY. Shall we mutually agree to accept this key? Where is it and what is it? It will, yes, it *must* be seen in a moment by asking, *Was Jesus a subject of redemption?* If so, was He redeemed from the 'misfortune?' If so, was He not redeemed by baptism, by a righteous life, and by an obedient, *sacrificial* death? If so, was not His redemption *entirely* from the "misfortune" and *not* from the "fault?" If so, was He not an exemplification of what salvation is? If so, do we not need the very same salvation, which can be obtained only by baptism into the very death which redeemed Him from the "misfortune?" Now add the negative part of the statement, and let us also agree that in this great plan of salvation which redeemed One who was free from "fault" there is also provision for our "faults," and let us praise God that

in His great love He provided a plan that comprehended redemption from racial condemnation and from personal condemnation - from "misfortune" and from "fault."

Shall we write this down as agreed to, and end the dispute so far as this part of it is concerned? If you say no, then we ask, Why?

To make the matter doubly sure, let us recall how God's law dealt with cases where there was "misfortune and not fault." Illegitimacy to the offspring was a "misfortune and not a fault." Yet the law of God prohibited the unfortunate from entering the congregation of the Lord. Leprosy was a "misfortune and not a fault," yet the poor leper must not approach the sanctuary; and when cured and cleansed, a sin-offering must atone for him, and many other instances will occur to the informed reader illustrating how "misfortune" without "fault" estranged from God, and how atonement had to be made for such helpless "misfortunes" before the subjects could be received in the congregation of the Lord. Even to the age to come this principle is carried, when the "misfortune" of descent from unfaithful ancestors is required to bear its burdens: "And the Levites that are gone away far from me, when Israel went astray, which went astray away from me after their idols; they shall even bear their iniquity" - Ez. 44:10.

Let us illustrate this essential truth by

A Prince and a Peasant

A benevolent prince is good enough to invite a poor peasant to the royal palace to receive much-needed help. While on the way the poor peasant falls a victim of a railroad wreck. He is thrown into a muddy ditch, his clothes torn and tattered. He emerges bespattered with mud from head to foot and barely clothed with rags. He hurries on to the door of the Palace, and is about to enter, when one of the Royal Guards quickly shouts, "Stand back!" "But," says the peasant, "I have been invited by the Prince to meet him in this Royal Palace." "I am aware of that," says the Guard, "but the invitation meant that you must enter the Palace in a decent condition. Look at your rags, and your mud-bespattered body. Do you think the Prince will receive you in this unsightly state?" "But sir," replied the peasant, "it was all a 'misfortune and not a fault.' I did not wreck the train, I was a helpless victim, had no hand whatever in the cause of this 'misfortune.' I hope neither you nor the Prince will hold me responsible for a 'misfortune' that was not a 'fault' of mine. It was purely a 'misfortune,' a 'misfortune,' sir, and why do you keep me from the presence of the Prince because of a misfortune?" "My dear, honest friend, I will not keep you from the presence of the Prince; but you will keep yourself therefrom if you do not put yourself in proper condition to approach the Prince." "Put myself in proper condition, have I not told you that my condition is due to 'a misfortune and not a fault?' I have no means of washing off this mud, neither have I a single garment to put on. All I have and all I am you see here now, and just as I am I come to thee and humbly beg to make my plea."

"Do you blame me for this 'misfortune?' Does the Prince blame me for this 'misfortune?' It is not my fault that I am in this condition." "No, it is not your fault, but is your fact, and your condition is a fact that makes it utterly impossible for you to approach the Prince." "Alas! my bright and burning hope is quenched by the cold, chilly waters of despair. What shall I do?" "Cheer up, my dear friend. You are only one of thousands who are victims of 'misfortune,' and

one of many who have come to see the Prince. For all such as you the benevolent Prince has made ample provision for your 'misfortune.' Enter yonder door, and you will see the words written on the wall - "Wash and be clean."

Every facility will be found there for you to carry out this motto. Hanging on a nail in a sure place you will see a clean, white robe. Upon your emergence from the cleansing waters, this robe will be thrown over you, your 'misfortune' will be thus hidden from the pure eyes of the benevolent Prince, you can then enter and he will receive you and bless you." "Thank you a thousand times, and to the Prince be all praise due. But...

My Faults

I feel that it is not all 'misfortune' with me, for I have my 'faults' too. What will the Prince do for these?" "Fret not, dear friend, the Prince who has made provisions for your 'misfortune' has, in his goodness, provided for your 'faults.' The same water that will so remove your 'misfortune' as to make you fit to approach the Prince will also wash away your faults. Make haste, believe and do, and God speed you."

Despair gives place to revived hope and joy, and the poor peasant is on his way to yonder door, when an enemy confronts him and says, "Do you think the Prince requires you to wash and robe yourself because of 'a misfortune and not a fault?' Pray, do not let that Guard deceive you. The Prince knows you are not personally responsible for your 'misfortune;' you banish from your mind the thought that you must enter the water to cleans you from your 'misfortune' or that a robe is provided to hide it from the eyes of the Prince. Entering those waters and putting on that robe will not affect your 'misfortune' in the least in the eyes of the Prince. All you must think about is your 'fault,' and with the mud rags of your 'misfortune' you can pass into the presence of the Prince. The faithful and strict Guard will not allow you to enter, but you can enter some other way." "Ah! I have heard about 'climbing up some other way,' and read of those who attempt it as 'thieves and robbers.' I am not going to be of that class. 'Get thee behind me, Satan.' I am going in here to 'Wash and be clean.'"

Sins of an Obnoxious Type

As to the Responsibility matter, there are two ways of viewing the question of rejection of the gospel. To illustrate: It is not often that a person in a sinking ship, *if he realizes his predicament*, will reject the offer of a life-boat crew. When he does, it is not regarded as a "personal transgression of a specially obnoxious type;" but attributed to various causes. He may not be fully confident that he is able to make the change and endure the hardship to be encountered before reaching the shore, and many other hindrances, may appear to him to stand in the way, and these may be all imaginary, but they are as they appear to him, and a few will charge him with guilt of "personal transgression of a specially obnoxious type."

On the other hand, there is a class who have magnified the "rejecter question" to the extent that instead of the gospel being an invitation of love extended to perishing creatures, it is an imperative command which threatens the penalty of the second death if not obeyed. It was enough for our Lord to teach poor, perishing creatures that they were already perishing, and if

they did not believe and obey, perish they would; but modern methods with some require a threat reaching far beyond perishing under the weight of death under which creation groans, and constantly brandish over men already in this bad plight, the fearful sword of second death.

In the parlance of royalty, a "command" is often an invitation to favor, such as when a king "commands" a company of musicians to render their music before him. Should timidity or any other cause be a reason for declining, the king would not regard it as "a transgression of a specially obnoxious type;" he would regard the loss of the honor and the reward, as a loss for which the losers were to be pitied, rather than construe it into a "transgression of a specially obnoxious type."

These quoted words which we have purposely repeated, have been kept flaming before the eyes of some very much after the fashion of the Johnathan Edwards and Spurgeon manner of frightening children and ignorant people with the horrors of hell torment. The "conversion" of any one by such a method is no conversion at all. If a person will not be baptized unless there is punishment of second death for refusing, that is the person that cannot be baptized into Christ, though he be dipped in water a thousand times. The one who can be baptized into Christ is the one who realizes that he is a perishing creature, that Heaven's hand of love is within his reach, and who cries out, "Here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?"

The "good and honest heart" never thinks about future punishment; it is salvation and reward that is the power in his mind that hurries him into baptism. To him the threat of a second death is useless; to another who, as some think, needs such a threat, it is worse than useless, since to offer such an one to God is to offer a polluted sacrifice.

But this oft-repeated expression, let us examine it. Here it is in full from the pen of one who seems unable to preach the gospel without it: "That condemnation to the second death is entailed by personal transgression of a specially obnoxious type, namely, a sinning against the light, whether on the part of those who have made some effort to obey God, as in baptism, or of those who have made no effort at all."

The phrase "sinning against the light" is found in Job 24:13:

"Men groan from out of the city, and the soul of the wounded crieth out; yet God layeth not folly to them. They are of those *that rebel against the light*, they know not the ways thereof, nor abide in the path thereof." The reader can judge whether this refers to "enlightened rejecters."

But the evil of the statement is to be seen by intelligent men in the Truth in that it places unbaptized Gentiles on the same plane as baptized believers, as if they were under the same law; while Gentiles, according to the most rudimentary principles of the Truth, are under "the law of sin and death," "without Christ;" and saints have passed from that law to "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus."

The evil, further, is to be seen in the injustice it sets forth, to illustrate which, let us suppose two persons, one who lives a life of sin of every sort - he lies, steals, commits adultery, murders and blasphemes. He knows that every sin he commits is contrary to the law of Christ; he is well

versed in all the *precepts*, but not in the *doctrines* of Christ; to this extent he is "sinning against the light." But the framer of the statement we are examining holds no threat of second death over him. The other man has from childhood known and striven to respect all the precepts of Christ, but he has not known the doctrines. At last he learns the doctrines, but for some reason, refuses to be baptized; and we are asked to believe that he is guilty of "personal transgression of a specially obnoxious type," punishable with the second death, while the other man, the miserable wretch, never comes under the second death - Why? Why, if they are both under the same law? If the latter is under the law of resurrection to the second death, why is not the former? Will any one dare say that the wretch of a long, sinful life has not committed sins of "a specially obnoxious type?" If the one must come forth to the second death *because* he has committed sin of an "obnoxious type," it follows that if the other does not come forth to the second death his sins are not of the "obnoxious type;" this makes the "ways of the Lord unequal." Now take the reasonable view, which is the Scriptural view, and regard those of this evil world as subjects of Satan's kingdom, entitled, as Dr. Thomas says, "to all that Satan's kingdom can give them," left of God to take their punishment (and they all get it, though it may not be visible to the finite mind), and in special cases to have it visited upon them, like Nebuchadnezzar and Herod, all to go down to oblivion, better for the world out of existence than in existence. "Like sheep they are laid in the grave, death shall feed on them." "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."

Now take those who have been redeemed from Satan's kingdom and have "passed from (the sentence of) death into (the sentence of) life," out of Adam into Christ. They have received favors. To them "much is given," and of them "much is required," for they are on a new and high plane, a plane of probation with a second life before them, on the one hand, and a second death, on the other hand. Having taken on the Great and Holy name of Yahweh, if they dishonor it, they surely will be guilty of "personal transgression of a specially obnoxious type;" and since they have become related to a law that has a day of reckoning beyond the resurrection, they must appear to receive, after judgment, not before, the penalty of the second death.

But, thank God, if we honor His name we shall "not be hurt of the second death."

God punishes no one for "making an effort to obey Him;" what an absurd thing to say; and what a mistake to impute to any sane man the belief that God will punish any man for "making an effort to obey Him;" the punishment of those who take on the name of Christ and dishonor it is not for "effort to obey," but for desecrating sacred ground, to which love had admitted them. Let every one, therefore, "count the cost" before he steps upon "holy ground," and let no one press "fools to rush (under ignorant fear) where angels dare to tread" with solemn care and deepest concern.

Blood Relationship

"Concerning our relation to Adam, we believe it to be a matter of blood relationship, that we are in Adam by flesh descent and therefore die."

This is intended to deny any change of *relationship* from "in Adam" to "in Christ" by baptism, and to hide the change of position on this which has taken place in late years. The "Declaration" was secretly changed. Originally, it declared baptism to effect a *legal* union with Christ," that is, that the subject passed from one law to another, from the law of the Adamic race, the law of sin and death, to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The change that reduced baptism to the remission of personal sins only, and ignored the passing out of Adam into Christ could not endure a "Declaration of First Principles" that declared a *legal* change at baptism, and without confession and without notice to the brotherhood, the "legal" was cut out of the plates and the "Declaration" as it is now, sails under false colors, as do other books of deceased authors which reckless hands have presumed to change to suit new theories sailing under old colors. This change is a return to the Campbellite theory of baptism, which allows only for remission of personal sins, a baptism which Dr. Thomas repudiated when he came out from that body with the full light of the gospel.

But this "blood relationship" has deceived some. Let us examine it, whether there is not more than a "blood relationship," one that can be changed at baptism, even though the "blood" remains the same. Dr. Thomas could see "two states," one before and one after baptism; two "constitutions," one into which all are born, the other entered by being "*born again*." This he illustrates as follows: "By constitution, then, one man is English, and another is American. The former is British because he is *born of the flesh* under the British constitution" ("blood relationship") and *under the constitution of Britain*.

"There are two states or kingdoms in God's arrangements, which are distinguished by constitution" (but which our opponents fail to distinguish). These are the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God. The citizens of the former are *sinners*; the heirs of the latter are *saints*" (good or bad according to the law of saints). Please read the Doctor's argument in full in "Elpis Israel" pp. 114,115,118.

Then on what baptism does in respect to the change of "constitution," read pp. 121-122. Bro. Roberts says, "When he passes into Christ, his *relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced is put off*." "The (genuine) Declaration" - Baptism is the means of the present (legal) union with Christ. Bro. Roberts: "There is a passing *out of Adam into Christ*." The present editor of the same paper: "We believe that the apostolic phrase in Adam, found once in the Scriptures (I Cor. 15:22) is expressive of *physical, moral nature and nothing else*."

Therefore Bro. Roberts is contradicted, since he said, "There is a passing out of Adam into Christ" at baptism, and of course he did not mean that the physical, mortal body was changed. The new editor can see nothing else but a changeless blood relation; the old one could see "a present *legal* union," and a "passing into Christ" whereby is effected "his change of relation to the whole death dispensation which Adam introduced." The new editor has departed from the simplicity of the Truth into a mere Campbellite baptism, and therefore can see "nothing else" but "flesh and blood" in the case. Dr. Thomas could see a change from the "constitution of sin to the constitution of righteousness."

An Illustration

Let us take the Doctor's illustration of the naturalized Englishman and try to make even those unwilling to see open their eyes and see.

John has been a good, honest plow-boy most of his life. The furrows he had plowed across the fertile fields of old England were as straight as a line, and his "master" was proud of him. But John was ambitious, and thought he would try fortune in a new land, and off he starts for America. Upon his arrival, he finds that he cannot claim or receive the benefits of the Republic unless he becomes a citizen thereof. "John," he is told, "you cannot vote for any of the officers of this government, nor hope to become one yourself; neither can you own land in some of our States unless you change yourself from an Englishman into an American." "Change myself," replies the astonished plow-boy, "I am an Englishman by 'blood relationship,' sir, and how can I change my 'blood relationship,' sir?" "But, dear John, although you were an honest plow-boy of old England you must have heard something about the British Constitution" and of your relationship to the Government of Great Britain." "I do not know anything about your hard words, 'Constitution and all the rest of it,'" replies John. "All I know is that I am an Englishman by 'blood relation,' by 'blood relation,' sir. I belong to England, sir by 'blood relation' and '*nothing else*,' I tell you." But, dear John, you must try to learn that while you are an Englishman by 'blood relationship' you are also a British subject according to law - it is a question of *law*, you must understand; and unless you change your relationship from being a subject of the law, constitution, or government of Great Britain and become a citizen of the United States, that is, declare your intention to obey the laws and accept the emoluments of this government, you cannot hope to be anything more than John the plow-boy. "Well, then," says John, "I do not have to change my 'blood relationship?'" "No, no, my boy, you cannot get rid of your English blood; you had better keep that as long as you can in its good old English richness and redness. You are to cease to be a subject of the laws of Great Britain, and become a citizen, subject to the laws of the new country that will adopt you. In England you were a son by birth, here you will become a son by adoption. When you were in England you were not responsible to the laws of this country; when you become naturalized, you will cease to belong to the laws of Britain, and to our laws you must be obedient; for by them you will be commended or condemned according to the life you live. Now John, do you fully understand?" "It is clear enough to me now," said John, "I change my relationship from England to America, but I thought at first, in my simple way, that it was impossible for me to change, because, you see, I knew I was English by 'blood relation,' and I thought there was '*nothing else*.' Excuse me for being so short-sighted, but in my plow-boy simplicity I had not thought of these - let me see, what do you call them over here - these politics." "Yes, John, 'politics.' A polity is a government, in which there are laws governing the various policies to be carried into execution by the administrators of the law. So, to use this word you have just thought of, you have left the politics of England, and you are about to pass under those of a new country. Success to you, dear John."

"Paul says, 'in Adam all die' (I Cor. 15:22), in that 'all' he of course includes himself and all in Christ." Indeed? who said that "all of course includes himself and all in Christ?" Is that the way to prove an assertion? "Jesus said they "cannot kill the 'soul,' and the soul here, 'of course,' is immortal." This is as good as that, since this and that are mere assertions without proofs. Paul said that in baptism there was a "putting on of the new man;" and we cannot be subjects of both

men's politics or constitutions at the same time. When Paul said "in Adam all die" he declared that in Adam only death could be hoped for, since the sentence upon all in Adam, "Dust thou art and into dust shall thou return," has never been revoked, and it will therefore hold its own; while "even so in Christ shall all be made alive" is said of those who have, as Bro. Roberts says, "passed *out of Adam* into Christ." Since Christ, and not Adam, is the resurrection, all in Christ are in the resurrection, to come forth for judgment by the law of Christ under which they started their probation as soon as they put off one constitution and put on the other. Instead of Paul's "of course" meaning "himself and all in Christ" when he said "In Adam all die," he "of course" did not mean "all in Christ," for in the same chapter he said of some in Christ, "We shall not all sleep."

All these errors are the result of the theory that resurrection to the judgment seat of Christ is based upon "sins of an obnoxious type;" upon this basis, every miserable sinner of the Gentile world who knows that what he does is wrong, will be raised to judgment with the saints. The Scripture basis is clear. "They preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead" - Acts 4:2; Heb. 13:20.

For the Editor of The C. in answering The A. to labor to prove that baptism is for the remission of personal sins, is for him to imply that we deny this truth; but he must well know that we accept this as heartily as he does. Therefore the list of texts he gives proves for us what it proves for him, leaving the real issue to be decided by the evidence in its favor. To prove what is not denied is needless, and one truth will not cast out another; each must be allowed to have its place. The issue is not what baptism does for personal sins, but it is: Does baptism have anything to do with the effects of Adamic sin? The claim we are contending for is, that in baptism there is a transition from condemnation inherited from Adam, to reconciliation in Christ, and this is what our opponents deny, and assert that baptism and the sacrifice of Christ have nothing whatever to do with Adamic condemnation. In our contention for this we are contending for a principle which underlies the whole plan of salvation - the vital principle that was exemplified in the salvation of Jesus Himself, who was a subject of salvation, or redemption, yet free from personal transgression. This salvation was a needful thing for us before we committed personal sins; and it is this "misfortune" God's love is primarily extended to, all other evils included as results of the fall of the race of mankind in Adam.

Texts Examined

On page 5 of the circular containing the "extracts" we are examining, our careless editor, who flippantly charges his opponents with dishonesty (page 3), refers to twenty-four texts without analyzing them in attempting to show that they prove what he asserts - the remission of personal sins only. Believers in the immortality of the soul and heaven-going and hell-going at death often print a list of texts, such as refer to the thief on the cross, the rich man and Lazarus, etc. But we all know how deceiving this is to ignorant people, and how fruitless it is to those who are intelligent, and who must see for themselves. An examination of these texts will show the short sightedness of those who quote them to prove they refer to personal sins only. It will not be unprofitable to carefully examine them.

Acts 2:38 - "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Our critic is unable to see in this any more than all the sects see, the forgiveness of sins, which was all Dr. Thomas saw in it when he was baptized with a Campbellite baptism and this he afterwards found to be a useless baptism, since it did not comprehend all the truth. Upon further enlightenment, he saw a meaning in the word "repent," a change of mind, and a change of sides from Adam to Christ. He also saw a meaning in the words, "baptized in (Greek *eis*, into) the name, a meaning which implied out of one relation into another, which he termed a "passing from (the sentence of) death unto (the sentence of) life." Of this he said:

"The apostles taught that death had been cancelled and immortality, that is, deathlessness or life and incorruptibility, brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel of the kingdom - that the writing of death against the saints had been crossed, or blotted out." This is why death cannot hold saints in the grave; while all who die without having death, or the sentence, "crossed out" are held in death under that sentence which had not for them been "crossed out."

This is what Bro. Roberts termed a "wiping out of the whole dispensation of death which stands against us in Adam," when we, at baptism, are, he said, "given a clean slate." All this the present editor spurns, and reduces the object of baptism to the bare Campbellite limits. Allow the full meaning of "repent" and "baptized into the name" as well as that of the "remission of sins," and you will have saving truth in this text."

Acts 3:19 - "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ," etc. In this there is not a word about baptism, and the "blotting out of sins" is to be when "He shall send Jesus Christ." These words were spoken to representatives of the guilty *nation*, whose *national* sins will not be "blotted out" till the "times of refreshing shall come" when "he shall send Jesus Christ" and the "restitution" shall take place when, as "Moses truth said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me: *Him shall ye hear in all things*," etc.

Acts 5:31. Here we have "repentance" - a change of sides - as well as "forgiveness of sins." Accept the two and you will have the truth with its saving power; separate them, and you make the word of God of none effect.

Acts 10:43. What is the use of referring to scriptures if you do not try to understand the words they use. Open your eyes again here and try to see some thing more than "forgiveness of sins," you will see in the words, "believeth in (rather, *into*) him" - a "putting on of the new man," and you cannot "put on the new man" without "putting off the old man with his deeds" (Col. 3:9). Acts 13:38-39. Here we have, in addition to "forgiveness of sins," "by him all that believe are justified *from all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Jesus himself was a partaker of this "justification" though he had no personal sins (I Tim. 3:16); you cannot partake of this justification unless you acknowledge God's justice in condemning the race. This Jesus did by submitting to death and burial; this we do by being "baptized into His death" (Rom. 6:3).

Acts 15:19. There is no issue here.

Acts 17:20. This again provides for "repentance" - a changing of sides from the "old man" to the "new man," whereby we may share rulership with Jesus in the day appointed to "rule the world in righteousness."

Acts 22:16 - "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." This "washing" meant more than personal sins, for Jesus was "washed" in His baptism. Paul explains the nature of this "washing," well understanding what his baptism was for. He says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, *by the washing of regeneration,*" etc. Mark the "regeneration," and ask what placed man in that condition in which *regeneration* was marred and made "unclean," and then you will see where "the washing of *regeneration*" has its origin. This was what Paul was baptized for. But to be baptized for the forgiveness of personal sins only is to lose sight of the principle design of baptism, the very form of which relates to the death and burial which the "one sin" brought, and to the resurrection which is "through Jesus." To be born is to be "born in sin;" to be "born again" is necessitated by the fact that we are "born in sin."

Acts 26:18 - "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and *from the power of Satan unto God,* that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." All in Adam are "under the power of darkness and Satan." Baptism transfers from Satan's dominion to a citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel. In the process of this transition, personal sins are forgiven or remitted. Another word in this text must be noticed - "sanctified." The typical altar was sanctified; and Jesus, as the antitypical altar, was sanctified, with personal sins absent. It is in baptism we are sanctified (set apart) from relationship to the Adamic system of sin and darkness, termed the "power of Satan;" and when sanctified thus, we are in the atonement. Then, too, do not overlook the word "inheritance." We are aliens to the inheritance while we are in Adam and "without Christ" (Eph. 2:12), and from this alienation we, by being baptized out of Adam into Christ are "made nigh by the blood of Christ;" for this is "the blood of the everlasting covenant," which to us is without force till we symbolically die and are buried, thus acknowledging the sentence of death upon the race, and coming forth new creatures in Christ Jesus. It seems strange that an intelligent man can refer to this text as proof that personal sins only are meant.

Rom. 4:7 - "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered." Sinful flesh must be "covered" with the garment of Christ before there can be approach to God; for in its inherited state of "nakedness" it cannot, shall not, approach. Jesus clothed Himself with the garment of righteousness, and thus was admitted to God's presence. By baptism into Christ He becomes a garment to us which renders us fit to approach God, and to address Him as "Our Father." Dr. Thomas renders Jer. 30:21 as follows: "Who is he that pledged his life for approaching unto Me, saith Yahweh?" Jesus pledged His life to approach God. Only when clothed with Jesus can sinful flesh man approach God; and we must die, be buried, and rise new creatures in order to be sin-covered sanctified ones in God's sight. Christ's part in this process was performed without there being any personal sins; our part includes personal sins. Our flesh nakedness is clothed or "covered," and "our iniquities" are forgiven.

Rom. 6:2. "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" In chap. 5:21 the apostle refers to that "sin which reigned unto death." Before we die to this sin, it "reigned" over us as king, and we were in "Satan's kingdom;" but having passed from the dominion of Satan's kingdom into the dominion of righteousness in Christ we have changed from one constitution to another, like the Englishman of Dr. Thomas' illustration. Having renounced our former king, who brought death upon all mankind, and "reigned unto death," we died unto him, and rose out of a watery grave quickened into a new life under a new king who reigns unto life. We "repented" (changed sides), we were "sanctified," "regenerated," "born again." The Diaglott renders this verse thus: "By no means: How shall we, *having died by sin*, live any longer therein?" Jesus is our forerunner in this. He broke through from Satan's death-dominion into the constitution of righteousness. Hence verse 7 says, "He who died has been justified from sin." This in respect to Him without personal sins. When we are baptized into his death (verse 3), it can be said of us, "He who hath died (symbolically) has been freed from sin" - sin's dominion. How an enlightened man can refer to this scripture to prove that baptism is for personal sins only is a mystery indeed. It is a pity to see such superficiality.

I Cor. 15:17. "And if Christ be not risen from the dead, ye are yet in your sins." To be "in our sins" is to be in "Satan's dominion" - in that sin that reigneth unto death," in which dominion we serve our king in committing sins; and in addition to our personal sins, we are "children of wrath." If we remain in sin's dominion, into which we are *born*, and are not "*born again*," we shall continue in Adam, in whom there is nothing but death to hope for. "For as in Adam all die." But if we pass out from sin's dominion and not remain "in our sins," we shall be in Him who is "the resurrection;" "For even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive." This change from "in Adam" to "in Christ" is effected by baptism, as Bro. Roberts says: "We pass out of Adam into Christ," a truth which the present editor of *The Christadelphian* denies, and attempts to prove that all in Christ are also in Adam.

2 Cor. 5:19. "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Mark the word, "reconciliation." Were we ever *personally* in conciliation with God? No; we "were without God" (Eph. 2:12). When were we in any sense in conciliation with God? Only in Adam before he fell, and therefore only as a race, not as individuals. We are born aliens, out of conciliation with God, and we inherit this from our father Adam - it is a family legacy. By adoption into a new family we become *re-conciled* to God, and then our sins are not "imputed." By the way, is there not a point here a little perplexing? Many times we read of personal sins forgiven, if forgiven, how are they not "imputed?" What "transgressions" are not imputed? Peter says Jesus bore our sins (plural) *in His own body*. Our personal sins were not in His body, for they had not been committed. It was Adamic sin, in its effects, that He bore in His body. Why sins (plural)? Because the original sinner had multiplied into a plurality of persons, each having his share of the one sin multiplied, therefore "sins." May not the "transgressions" (plural) in this text be the same? And may not this be the reason for the none imputation? That is, when we pass into Christ out of Adam, that sin (or transgression) that "reigneth unto death" in all who are in Adam, is not imputed to us in the sense of visiting death upon us without restoration to life. Upon every Adamite it is fully "imputed" to the extent of death without hope; not so with those in Christ, with whom death is a temporary sleep. I am not dogmatizing on this, only suggesting an explanation of the phrase "not imputing." In any event, we must see in the text the

meaning of reconciliation, and we must not reduce such a far-reaching truth to a mere Salvation Army cry of "Get your sins forgiven."

Eph. 1:7. "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins," etc. Here are two things to be considered - redemption and forgiveness of sins. Of Jesus it is said He "obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). Therefore redemption must be considered as needed and obtainable apart from personal sins; therefore the "forgiveness of sins" of this verse is an additional thing in our case. Redemption has its root in the fall of man in Adam, and if it had been possible for all men to live free from personal sins, redemption would have been needed for fallen man, and that by reason of Adamic sin. This verse, like all others, shows that remission of personal sins is an incident in the great plan of salvation; and let it be understood that by this we do not, as alleged, mean to speak lightly of these sins, as if they are almost innocent; and for a brother to have represented us in this false light is worse than unfair, and it shows what extremes some will go to when they are hard pressed in an attempt to uphold a false theory.

Col. 1:14. The words here are the same as those we have just considered. But notice verse 13, and give "translated" its proper meaning, and you will see that it provides for a translation from Adamic alienation to reconciliation in Christ.

I Tim. 1:15. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." There is no issue on the question of saving sinners; but you lose sight of the fact that the fallen condition from which sinners are saved precedes the commission of personal sins, and has its origin in the fall of Adam. Then, too, do not forget that Jesus was saved, for "with strong crying and tears he prayed to Him that was able to *save him out of death*; and was heard in that he feared" (Heb. 5:7).

Titus 2:14. "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from *all* iniquity?" Why can you not compare scripture with scripture? Why did not this verse remind you of Psa. 51:5 - "Behold, I was *shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me?*" To be redeemed from all iniquity is to be redeemed from that state in which we are "conceived," and Jesus was redeemed from this; and while He "gave Himself for us," He also gave Himself to effect redemption for Himself first, and by this He became our Redeemer.

Heb. 9:14. This relates to what the blood of Christ accomplished, and surely it is not in this letter limited to its effect on personal sins. Read verse 12 - "By his own blood he entered," etc. Read verse 23 - "The heavenly things themselves" (were purified), etc. Was not Jesus part of the "heavenly things?" Read chap. 13:20, and you will see that it was through the blood of the everlasting covenant Jesus was redeemed out of that death which Adamic sin brought upon all the race.

I Pet. 1:22. This relates to the same purifying, as does 2 Pet. 1:9.

I John 3:5. No one denies that He takes away our sins; but since He was "made sin," He had this to deal with for Himself as well as for us.

Rev. 1:5. Jesus was a subject of "washing," "purifying," "justifying," etc. Therefore the "washing" means more than the forgiveness of personal sins. Read the first part of the verse, and you will see that He was redeemed from the death which came upon Him and upon us by Adamic sin. No where can you escape this fundamental part of the work of salvation.

Rev. 7:14. This is the same thing.

Now we have examined every text given. To simply refer readers to these as proofs that baptism relates only to personal sins, is worse than "orthodox" methods of referring to texts popularly supposed to teach the immortality of the soul, etc. To print the figures proves nothing. It is the careful examination in the light of the general teachings of the scriptures that will govern minds that refuse to be swayed by men, and require a reason.

In all the passages there is clear reference to Adamic condemnation and death. We could add more; but enough has been said. By the way, our editor has counted the pages we have written and called attention to this as compared with the few hours he wrote. But if the Christadelphian must break windows, The Christadelphian Advocate must repair them, and it always requires more work to repair than to break. But we are writing to clearly explain to the simplest minds, and we are not stingy as to the number of pages we devote to this.

Now let all keep in mind the general teachings of the scriptures and the truth will be seen. This is to be seen in "born again," "passed from death unto life," and such phrases. This will expand the mind to take a comprehensive view of the great plan of salvation, and lift it out of the dwarfed Salvation Army superficiality shouted in the words, "Get your sins forgiven." Let us open our eyes wide to the grand work of God, and we shall know the origin and meaning of the words, "restitution," "reconciliation," "salvation," "redemption," "atonement," etc. May our Heavenly Father help those blinded by invented theories to see the truth in its glorious fullness and beauty. Amen.

When Was Christ Immortalized?

The question of when Christ was immortalized was much discussed in the early revival of the Truth; and recently it has been given prominence by several who departed from what had come to be generally believed among the brethren. Some have sent us questions concerning it, and others have asked us to reply to the arguments of those who have recently changed their views. Having had in mind to deal with the questions along with others treated under the title "Rectification," we have not responded, except in the brief review of the pamphlet bearing the name of J.J.A.

There are three answers given to the question.

- ◆ First, that Jesus was immortalized in the tomb and came forth immortal.
- ◆ Second, that He was immortalized in heaven after His ascension there.
- ◆ Third, that He was immortalized after He came forth from the tomb, during the interval between Mary's interview with Him and the time He met His disciples.

The second claim is based upon a private interpretation of types and upon the words of John 7:39 and Heb. 9:12. The text in John reads, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed in him should receive: for the Holy Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Conclusions arrived at from types must allow all the types to fit their antitypes, which the claim that Jesus ascended to heaven mortal does not allow, as we shall presently show. On the verse quoted, the claim is that since it is said that the Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified (assuming that "glorified" means immortalization) He was glorified (immortalized) in heaven when the Holy Spirit was given on the day of Pentecost. In this, logic limps somewhat; for it does not follow that if one thing has not happened because another has not, the first thing must happen immediately before the second. While the statement requires that the first thing happen before the second, it does not measure the length of time the one must precede the other. Christ's coming as a lamb had to precede His coming as a lion, and the latter could not take place at a certain time because the other had not taken place; but a long interval separates the two events. Jesus, therefore, may have been glorified or immortalized (admitting that the two words may mean the same thing) before He ascended to heaven, and yet it might be said of the giving of the Holy Spirit at pentecost, "The Holy Spirit was not yet given because the Jesus was not yet glorified."

The argument based upon this text must assume that the giving of the Holy Spirit referred to the day of pentecost, and this is not without question. There was a giving of the Holy Spirit before Jesus ascended to heaven, as recorded in John 20:22, and this was after His interview with Mary: "And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit." The pentecostal out-pouring of the Holy Spirit was specially provided for a special purpose, but it did not prevent previous impartation of the same Spirit for various purposes.

The text principally relied upon as proof that Jesus entered heaven in the mortal state is Heb. 9:12: "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." The high priest under the law took the blood of the victim into the Most Holy place; therefore, it is claimed, Jesus must enter heaven, the antitypical Holy place with His blood. To make this fit the theory, the word "with" is substituted for "by," because in the type the priest entered *with* the blood; but the words used by the apostle mean, by means of, and the Diaglott renders the verse as follows: "He entered in once for all, into the holy places, not indeed by means of the blood of goats and bullocks, but *by means* of His own blood, having found aionian redemption."

Thus we see that the lesson of the type was that all depended upon the blood of Christ as the ratifying blood of the everlasting covenant, by means of which Jesus was brought again from the dead (Heb. 13:20).

The blood of the sacrifice which the high priest took into the Most Holy place was a token of death; it evidenced the fact of death having taken place outside the Holy Place. For Jesus to enter heaven with the blood of life circulating through His veins would not be a token of a sacrificial death having taken place outside the Holy Place. There would be no fitness of type to antitype. A fitness would require the living lamb to have been taken into the Holy Place.

Christ as the end of the law was the antitype of all - the victim, the altar, and the priest. He is represented by Joshua as "clothed with filthy garments" (Zech. 3:3), which can mean nothing but mortality or "sinful flesh." The high priest could not enter the Most Holy with unsanctified garments. He must "be clothed with change of raiment" (verse 4). Since the garments to be put off can mean only mortality, and since "change of raiment" must precede entering the Holy Place, Jesus must have been changed before "He entered heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24).

Redemption, in its full and final sense, is the "change of our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:21). The apostle Paul says, "We are waiting for the adoption, to wit, *the redemption of our body*" (Rom. 8:23). Redemption is not a glorious experienced fact till this redemption of the body takes place. This redemption Jesus obtained for Himself in order that He might have it to impart to us. When did He obtain redemption of the body? Whenever He did He was changed from mortality to immortality. "He entered in once into the holy place" (heaven itself, Heb. 9:12,24) not to obtain, but "*having obtained* eternal redemption." Therefore we must conclude that Jesus was immortalized before He ascended to heaven.

Concerning the first theory, that Jesus was immortalized in the grave, does it not seem incongruous that God should immortalize a corpse in a grave, both of which - the corpse and the grave - were constantly represented by the law as specially unclean? Of the saints we are assured that it will be "mortal bodies" that will be quickened (Rom. 8:11); that "mortality shall be swallowed up of life" (II Cor. 5:4); that both quick and dead shall be "changed in a moment" (I Cor. 15:51-52); that the "mortal shall put on immortality," etc. (verse 53); and we read of persons raised out of the grave in the mortal state, but of such a thing as the immortalization of a corpse, never. Even recent changes admit that their claim makes Jesus an exception in this respect. But why claim such an exception, unless it be one invented theory put forth to sustain another of like character.

The typical high priest, Joshua, when he "stood before the angel of the Lord" in "filth," or common, "garment," was not a corpse. He was a living, mortal man of sin. He was an observer of the change and the subject of it; and there is joy and gladness in the thought that the change from the weak, mortal body to the glorious immortal body will be an actual experience of Him who is our *forerunner*? The thought of placing holy garments on a corpse in a grave is repulsive, and it is repugnant to the types of the law.

Paul calls Christ our passover, who was sacrificed for us. On the Sabbath after the passover He rested in the tomb. On the day after that Sabbath He was the first-fruits of the new harvest. Forty-nine days were to elapse from "the day after the Sabbath," that is, from the day "that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; even seven Sabbaths" (Lev. 23:15) to pentecost. Of this, Smith's Bible Dictionary says, "On the morrow after the passover Sabbath, i.e. on the 16th of Nison, a sheaf of new corn was brought to the priest before the altar, in acknowledgment of the gift of fruitfulness" (Lev. 23:5-6,10,12). At the expiration of seven weeks from this, i.e. at the fest of pentecost, an oblation was made of two loaves," etc. From this we see Jesus as the antitype of the passover; He was in the tomb the Sabbath after. On the day after this Sabbath, that is, the first day of the week (for two sabbaths met) we must look for Jesus becoming the first

fruits from the dead and the first fruits of the harvest of the immortal state. It was a living priest that waved the sheaf of first fruits before the Lord. Jesus was at once the priest and the sheaf. Could he be this as a corpse in the grave? Where is the fitness here? Does not the type require that He first come forth a living priest and then offer the first fruits or become the first fruits, "green ears of corn dried by the fire" (Lev. 2:14) - the immortal fire that swallows up mortality?

Now we are first going to assume, and then will prove, that Jesus had not become the first fruits of the immortal harvest when He met Mary after His coming forth from the tomb; and that this fact is expressed in His declaration, "I am not yet ascended to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (John 20:17).

The mode of resurrection is implied in the words of Rom. 8:11 - "shall quicken your *mortal bodies*." I say implied, because for mortal bodies to be quickened for those who have gone to dust there must be a restoration of mortal bodies. It will be admitted that these words will be fulfilled in the case of those who will be alive when the Lord returns. The quickening of their mortal bodies will be the immortalization of mortal bodies actually in existence. Does this not give us the proper interpretation of the words? If so, it follows that the dead will be restored to mortal bodies and stand on an equality with the quick, when the words "quicken your mortal bodies" will be fulfilled in that "change" of "all" that is to take place in one and the same moment for quick and dead, "in the twinkling of an eye." This lays down the mode of resurrection and immortalization, and unless an exception to this is very clearly revealed it is presumption to assume that there is one. This same rule or mode is declared by our Lord himself in John 5:21 - "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." The quickening according to His "will" must be subsequent to the "raising," for some will be "raised" whom He will not "will" to "quicken" because they will be declared "unjust." Why is this mode not as applicable to the Head of the body as it is to all members of the body? The word "them" in this verse is supplied. Would it be straining the text to keep Jesus himself in mind in the first part, and the worthy saints in the second? We will not press this, but suggest that our Lord may mean that "as the Father raiseth up the dead (Christ), and quickeneth (Him); even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." In any event, the latter part of the verse is a sequence of the former, and we may paraphrase the verse thus: "As the Father would raise up Christ, and quicken Him, so He would *give* to the Son power and authority to raise up the dead and quicken whom of them He willed or found worthy."

In the absence of any clear proof to the contrary, and with this mode or process of resurrection and immortalization laid down for the members of the body of Christ, we may accept Rom. 8:11 as corroborative: "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall *also*" (for you as for Jesus) "quicken your mortal bodies."

Let us now look upon Christ in the presence of Mary as "raised" but not having had His mortal body quickened into immortality, and see if we cannot find in His words, "I am not yet ascended," a statement that He was not immortalized; and in the words "I ascend to my Father," etc., a declaration that He was immediately to be immortalized, "quicken," and become the wave sheaf of the first fruits of the harvest of immortality.

The question depends largely upon the meaning here of the word "ascend" - does it mean bodily ascent literally to the Father or does it mean an ascent or exaltation of nature? It will be admitted that the words ascend and descend are used to describe a going up in the air and coming down; and also to describe aspirations and degradation. If we can rightly say of a bad man, "He *descends* to the lowest depths of vice," we can also say of a good man, "He *ascends* to the highest realms of purity." Many other words may be quoted, but this will help us to free our minds from the thought that "ascend" must be confined to a bodily going up.

It is true that the original word for "ascend" more often relates to bodily ascent, but this is because bodily ascent is more frequently spoken of than ascent of character or of nature, or of condition. If there were no instances of the original word being applied to ascent in any other sense than that of bodily ascent, it would seem like begging the question to insist upon an exceptional meaning in this text. But the word is used, for instance, In Luke 24:38, "And why do thoughts *arise* in your hearts?" Mark 4:7, "The thorns *grew up*;" and in verse 32, "It *groweth up*." Matt. 13:7, "The thorns *sprung up*." Also Mark 4:8, "*sprang up*," and in Rev. 11:12, "*Come up*;" and chap. 4:1, "*Come up* hither."

It will readily be seen that the word *anabano*, rendered in the verse in question "ascend," sometimes means a change of condition from lower to higher, an ascent that takes place *within* the thing spoken of, the springing up of seed, the growing of thorns, etc. When John was invited to "come up hither," he did not bodily ascend, but, first, it was an ascent of mind, to see in vision the great and high things of the future; and, second, he was carried forward in spirit to the Lord's day, and his ascent means his becoming spirit, when he will be exalted (ascend) to the throne with Christ. Here is a case where *anabano* means an ascent from mortality to immortality, and therefore we may, all things else being equal, take it to mean the same when Jesus says, "I ascend to my Father," etc.

The full text in question is as follows: "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and to your God" (John 20:17). Let us observe first what the words, "I ascend" could not mean here. They could not mean His bodily ascent forty days hence, for His message to His brethren was, "I ascend," etc. Since He was shortly to meet His brethren and be with them during the forty days, He cannot be supposed to be sending a message concerning an ascent that He would have ample opportunity to tell them of during forty days. This is evidently seen by those who recently have made a new departure in teaching the immortal emergence of Jesus from the grave; and they had to get rid in some way of the idea that He was changed after He sent Mary with the message. So they assumed, as a means of escaping a difficulty growing out of a false notion, that Jesus must have meant that He was going to heaven bodily as soon as Mary left Him with the message. It is wise to seek any port in a storm, but it is unwise to make the storm. Assume a false premise, and many truths will arise that will not fit, and assumption will not find a stopping place. To assume that Jesus ascended to heaven and returned during the short time that elapsed between His giving the message to Mary and His meeting the brethren himself, upon the face of it is a makeshift; and since there is nothing in words, type or symbols hinting at such a short visit to heaven it is - well, it is assumption; and that is not all, it is a contradiction of testimony. In Heb. 9:12 we read, "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in" and came out and entered in again? "He

entered *once* into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." This holy place is called "heaven itself" in verse 24, and verse 28 says, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear" - the third time? Yes, the third time, if He went to heaven when the new theory claims He did, and came back, and then went to heaven again. But the testimony, in opposition to theoretical assumption, declares, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

We have now seen that the words "I ascend" could not mean his bodily ascent; and there is only one kind of ascent left, and that is, ascent to Spirit nature.

The question has been clouded by disquisitions on the meaning of "Touch me not," which raise a separate issue not relevant to the real one. We may read, "Touch me not," "Hinder me not," "Retain me not," etc., and yet the reason why will remain the same, namely, "For I am not yet ascended." This non ascent - this ascent that was to take place before He met His brethren, and which was the matter of the very message sent by Mary to His brethren - this was the gist of it all, "I am not yet ascended," but go and tell my brethren that before I see them myself, "I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God." Thus the mode of resurrection and immortalization which He had laid down for His brethren, He was subject of as the Head of the body, as the "forerunner;" and of Him it was true that "God raised up the dead (Christ) and quickened" Him. Thus He was the subject of the "change of raiment," the quickening of the mortal body, "mortality was swallowed up of life." He was changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye - a change *experienced*, the heavenly thrill *felt* in the whole human frame, the mortal put on immortality, and He who voluntarily allowed the enemy death to place its tyrannical feet upon Him, He who fell to conquer, rose triumphant from the grave and then ascended from mortality to immortality, and turned upon His momentary captor with the withering words of a glorious triumph, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?"

